

**United Nations Development Programme
Global Environment Facility**

Colombia



Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon

**GEF Full-size Project
(ID GEF 5715)**



Midterm Review Report

Date: August 19, 2021

i. Basic Report Information

Title of the UNDP supported GEF financed project

Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon

Project ID#S

UNDP PIMS ID: 5715

GEF Project ID: 9272

MTR time frame

From June 24 to August 2, 2021

Date of MTR report

August 2, 2021

Region:

Latin America

Country:

Colombia

GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program

Land degradation

Biodiversity

Forest Sustainable Management

Implementing agency

United Nations Development Programme

Executing entities

Government of Colombia: Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), Corporation for the Sustainable Development of Northern and Eastern Amazon (CDA), Corporation for the Sustainable Development of Southern Amazon (CORPOAMAZONIA), Amazon Institute for scientific Research Amazon (SINCHI)

MTR team members

Giacomo Morelli, Internacional Evaluator

María Carolina Pinilla Herrera, Nacional Evaluator

Acknowledgements

A deep thanks to all the people who have taken the time to provide information used in the formulation of this report. A special thanks to the PMU for their support in organizing the entire process of remote meetings and interviews that made possible the review exercise.

ii. Table of contents

i. Basic Report Information	i
ii. Table of contents	ii
iii. Acronyms and abbreviations.....	iv
1. Executive summary.....	1
1.1. Project Information Table.....	1
1.2. Brief project description	1
1.3. Project Progress Summary.....	2
1.4. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table	3
1.5. Concise summary of conclusions.....	4
2. Introduction.....	8
2.1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives.....	8
2.2. Scope & Methodology	8
2.2.a. Principles of design and execution of the MTR.....	8
2.2.b. MTR approach and data collection methods.....	8
2.2.c. Limitations to the MTR	9
2.3. Structure of the MTR report.....	10
3. Project Description and Background Context.....	10
3.1. Development context	10
3.2. Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted.....	11
3.3. Project Description and Strategy	11
3.4. Project Implementation Arrangements.....	12
3.5. Project timing and milestones.....	13
3.6. Main stakeholders: summary list.....	13
4. Findings	14
4.1. Project Strategy	14
4.1.a. Project Design.....	14
4.1.b. Results Framework	17
4.2. Progress Towards Results	20
4.2.a. Progress towards outcomes analysis.....	20
4.2.b. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective	27
4.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	27
4.3.a. Management Arrangements.....	27
4.3.b. Work planning	30
4.3.c. Finance and co-finance	32
4.3.d. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems.....	32
4.3.e. Stakeholder engagement.....	33
4.3.f. Reporting.....	36
4.3.g. Communications.....	36

4.4. Sustainability	37
4.4.a. Financial risks to sustainability.....	37
4.4.b. Socio-economic to sustainability	37
4.4.c. Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability.....	37
4.4.d. Environmental risks to sustainability	38
5. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	38
5.1. Conclusions.....	38
5.2. Recommendations.....	42
6. Annexes	I
Annex 1 - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes).....	II
Annex 2 - MTR evaluative matrix.....	XX
Annex 3 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection	XXV
Annex 4 – Ratings Scale	XXVII
Annex 5 - MTR virtual mission schedule	XXIX
Annex 6 - List of persons interviewed.....	XXXI
Annex 7 - List of documents consulted.....	XXXIII
Annex 8 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form	XXXV

iii. Acronyms and abbreviations

AAMPY	Working Women Environmental Association for the Development of Yari <i>Asociación Ambiental de Mujeres Trabajadoras por el Desarrollo del Yari</i>
ADISPA	Association for the Sustainable Development of the Perla Amazónica <i>Asociación para el de Desarrollo Integral Sostenible de la Perla Amazónica</i>
ASECADY	Farmer Entrepreneurial Association of Yari <i>Asociación Empresarial Campesinos del Yari</i>
ASL	Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Regional Programme
ASIRMTACAMPIC	Municipal Farmer Association of Piamonte Cauca <i>Asociación Municipal de Trabajadores Campesinos de Piamonte Cauca</i>
ASP	Sustainable Amazon for Peace
CDA	Corporation for the Sustainable Development of Northern and Eastern Amazon <i>Corporación para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Norte y el Oriente Amazónico</i>
CORMACARENA	Corporation for the Sustainable Development de La Macarena <i>Corporación para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Área de Manejo Especial La Macarena</i>
CORPOAMAZONIA	Corporation for the Sustainable Development of Southern Amazon <i>Corporación para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Sur de la Amazonia</i>
COVID-19	Corona Virus Disease 2019
CPD	Country Programme Document
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
IDEAM	Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies <i>Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales</i>
MADS	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development <i>Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible</i>
MTR	Mid Term Review
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAD	Nucleus of High Deforestation <i>Nucleó de Alta Deforestación</i>
NDP	National Development Plan
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPIAC	National Organization of the Indigenous People of the Colombian Amazon <i>Organización Nacional de los Pueblos Indígenas de la Amazonía Colombiana</i>
PIGCCT	Comprehensive Territorial Climate Change Management Plans <i>Planes Integrales de Gestión del Cambio Climático Territorial</i>
PNIS	Comprehensive National Programme for Illegal Crop Substitution <i>Programa Nacional Integral de Sustitución de Cultivos Ilícitos</i>

PNN	National Natural Parks of Colombia <i>Parques Nacionales Naturales de Colombia</i>
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SINA	National Environmental System <i>Sistema Nacional Ambiental</i>
SINCHI	Amazon Institute for scientific Research <i>Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones Científicas</i>
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNEG	United Nation Evaluation Group
WB	World Bank

1. Executive summary

1.1. Project Information Table

Project Title:		Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon	
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	00089719	PIF Approval Date:	October 21, 2015
GEF Project ID:	5715	CEO Endorsement Date (FSP) / Approval date::	September 5, 2017
UNDP Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID:	00095817	ProdDoc signature date:	January 15, 2018
Country:	Colombia	Date Project Manager hired:	April 2, 2018
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Inception Workshop Date::	March 15, 2018
Focal areas:	Multifocal	Mid-Term Review Completion Date:	August 2, 2021
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	SFM3/SFM4/SFM1	Planned Operational Closure Date:	January 31, 2024
Trust Fund [GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF	If revised, new closing date:	NA
Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Entity):	United Nations Development Programme		
Other Executing Entities	-----		
Project financing		at CEO Endorsement (US\$)	At MTR (US\$)
[1] GEF Funding		9,000,000	4,020,976
[2] UNDP		7,000,000	11,733,292
[3] Government		34,300,169	1,965,500
[4] Other partners		4,563,180	3,952,908
[5] Co-financing[2+3+4]		45,863,349	8,005,622
Total project costs [1+5]		54,863,349	21,672,676

1.2. Brief project description

The project “Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon” is part of the “Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program” of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) implemented in Brazil, Colombia and Peru, whose main objective is to protect biodiversity of global importance and implement policies to promote sustainable land use and restoration of native vegetation cover.

The lead agency for this program is the World Bank (WB) and it is implemented through five child projects. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the World Bank (WB) are the implementing agencies of the Colombian child project, which in turn is divided into two projects: "Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon" known as "Sustainable Amazon for Peace" (*“Amazonas Sostenible para la Paz”*) and "Conservation of forests and sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon", also known as "Heart of the Amazon" (*“Corazon de la Amazonia”*).

The **objective of the project** is:

To improve connectivity and conserve biodiversity through the strengthening of institutions and local organizations to ensure integral low-carbon-emission management and peace building

The expected results are:

- **Result 1** (or component 1): Rural development with a low-carbon-emission approach and capacity-building for mainstreaming environmental management and peace building.
- **Result 2** (or component 2): Knowledge Management and M&E.

The idea of the project is that in order to reduce deforestation and promote a low-carbon green growth approach, strategies should be developed to improve inter-institutional coordination, promote financial and market incentives, and generate capacities for rural extension work that involves criteria of sustainability and promote platforms for dialogue and peacebuilding.

1.3. Project Progress Summary

As of March 31, 2021, the project reports satisfactory achievements related to the official adoption of 2 Comprehensive Territorial Climate Change Management Plans (PIGCCT) in the departments of Caquetá and Putumayo; the formulation of 3 PIGCCT for Amazonas, Guaviare, and Vaupés; the update of the Guainía PIGCCT; the publication of the environmental determinants¹ (*determinantes ambientales*) for Vaupés and Guainía; and, the adoption of the Amazon Pact for Forests and Climate, and the formulation (still in process) of the “Regional Strategy on Climate Change for a Resilient and Adapted Amazon”.

Regarding the number of beneficiaries of the capacity strengthening processes, the project has involved 1,168 people (406 women and 762 men) in the Sabanas del Yari sector, while 442 people (210 women and 232 men) have participated in the ZRCPA sector. 59 people (24 women and 35 men) have been involved in the work for reincorporation. Other relevant achievements of the project are the identification of the baseline of key species present in the area of ecosystem connectivity and the advance of 120% of the goal set for the mid-term with respect to the number of families linked to social organizations that implement processes of sustainable production.

The MTR found that there are partial achievements regarding the measurement of the areas of sustainable production systems that reduce the pressure on natural forests and increase the connectivity between ecosystems, since 63% of the midterm goal foreseen is reported. In the work with the families of the population victims of the conflict and / or in the process of reincorporation, more than 150% of the beneficiaries foreseen for the midterm have been involved.

Although progress has been made in 5 Initiatives to implement the restoration and reconciliation strategy, the lack of a plan for the commercial sustainability of the community nursery network was found. Another indicator that has not met the goal set for the MTR is the one referring to the number of producers benefiting from the economic and financial mechanisms developed, but it was identified that there are important advances to involve the target population.

On the other hand, it was found that there are indicators that have not yet been measured: i) change in the income of producers; ii) areas of productive landscapes that maintain and / or improve forest cover, ecosystem connectivity and reduce GHG emissions; and, iii) number of public, private and community actors that improve their capacities. The MTR identifies that these are impact indicators and therefore it is fine that they have not yet been measured. Although the MTR identified that the progress made is promising, it should be mentioned that time is required for technical work in the field and capacity building to contribute to improvements in the environmental status.

¹ Environmental determinants are rules of higher hierarchy in environmental matters for the elaboration, adoption and adjustments of the Territorial Ordinance Plans, Territorial Ordinance Schemes and Basic Plans of Territorial Ordinance, which cannot be ignored by municipalities.

1.4. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	The core idea of the project is that by understanding the importance of ecosystem services, communities understand the nexus between sustainable production and conservation. For this to happen, the project executes actions at different levels of governance with the actors that operate in the territory, i.e. regional corporations, community action boards, farmer associations, indigenous communities, and commercial and product transformation companies.
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory	The little progress in the fulfillment of indicators No. 4 regarding forest cover, connectivity and the reduction of GHG emissions is highlighted; and No. 8 regarding capacity development, which have implementation delays due to external events beyond the control of the project. These indicators are the most important in terms of impact for the donor. In any case, the quality of the work is recognized as good and relevant by all the people interviewed, which is a promising element for the continuation of the project.
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory	It is expected that most of the indicators related to outcome 1 will be met. The problem is not the compliance with the indicators but the time required for the consolidation and appropriation of the actions by the actors. The time is adequate to finish the environmental education activities and the implementation of Landscape Management Tools.
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory	The network of community nurseries is being formed but during the review process no evident elements emerged that show that there is a solid strategy to ensure its effective functioning after the closure of the project. This is the most critical element of result 2. From a formal point of view, the indicator is likely to be met by the end of the project.
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	Satisfactory	The execution of the project is going well. The problems are related to the socio-political situation of the territories where the actions are implemented. The most notable elements of adaptive management are the identification of risks, the application of safeguards, and the active involvement of the communities through the small grants (<i>Subvenciones de Bajo Valor</i>) mechanism with farmer association associations. In addition, education and communication work, both at the territorial and regional levels with academic partners, aims to spread attitudes of recognition of the importance of ecosystem services and the possibilities of reconciling sustainable production with conservation and restoration. In short, the execution of the project tries to create a favorable environment so that the bet of promoting a territorial management scheme based on bio-cultural connectivity through the exercise of planning with a landscape scale, may be viable.
Sustainability	Moderately Likely	This rating takes into account the efforts to propose a project strategy that can ensure medium-term effects despite the instability of the social context and the lack of coherence between the different government development policies in the project areas. It also considers that the delays that have characterized implementation can reduce the level of ownership of project actions and therefore negatively affect their sustainability.

1.5. Concise summary of conclusions

C1: In the original Results Framework SMART indicators are included. They refer mainly to stakeholders' participation and to the impact of the project. However, the review has identified gaps or flaws in the formulation of some of them.

C2: The project was designed within the framework of a favorable scenario for the implementation of the peace accords. However, during its implementation, there has been a change of course in the national policy on the accords, which has impacted the management and governance approach to deforestation control and reconciliation with which the project was designed.

C3: The project has had to slow down actions on the ground in response to the situation created by the pandemic and other specific social and criminal events that have occurred to date. The project has been successfully adapted to the best of its ability.

C4: At the time of the MTR, a considerable increase in the price of the materials necessary for the implementation of the landscape management tools has been reported. These price changes can have significant effects on the field realization of these tools.

C5: Despite the problems encountered and consequent delays, the project has the potential to formally achieve its expected results. The review considers that the time remaining until the end of the implementation is not sufficient to ensure a lasting ownership of the project actions by the target populations and local organizations.

C6: Although the project is implemented under UNDP's Direct Implementation Modality, all institutional partners are presiding over its execution and making relevant decisions within the framework of the Project Committee. The actions are aligned with the priorities of the institutions involved in the SINA, so that the project is promoting other institutional processes for the design of policies at the regional level in other areas of the country.

C7: The areas of work, due to their relative stability compared to other conflict areas in the nuclei of high deforestation (NAD) of Sabanas del Yari and Putumayo, constitute a laboratory to promote new processes of landscape management, productive reconversion, restoration, conservation and improvement of living conditions through participatory, inclusive and concerted pedagogical processes with rural communities.

C8: To implement actions in the very particular context of conflict areas, the project planning and management strategy has been highly adaptive.

C9: The main bet of the project is to promote a territorial management scheme based on bio-cultural connectivity through the planning exercise on a landscape scale. The project promotes a change in the culture of use, exploitation and conservation of ecosystems so that these begin to be visualized as central elements of rural development in the Colombian Amazon. The project has committed to strengthening environmental governance at the territorial level through support to farmer associations. This support has generated trust in the target populations and constitutes the strategic element for the project to reach a level of effectiveness and sustainability when it ends. Likewise, significant progress has been made in strengthening the governance of public institutions, which is reflected in the preparation of national and departmental guidance documents that are aligned with management policies on climate change and biodiversity conservation.

C10: The project bet is almost mandatory. Given the tensions and mistrust that exist between the authorities and the communities, providing farmer organizations with environmental governance tools and working for their technical and organizational development is a path that, according to this review exercise, is worth taking.

C11: The intervention strategy has five well-defined intervention axes that are logically related to the fulfilment of the project objective in a complementary way, i.e. each project activity informs other activities and gets feedback from them. The updating and improvement of the risk management strategy (which was not satisfactorily developed in the ProDoc) is as well considered highly satisfactory by this review exercise.

C12: The structure in the work organization, the technical quality of the work carried out in the field and the professional and relational competences of the Project Team are appreciated by all the actors interviewed. Such recognition is reflected in the insertion and acceptance of the project by the communities involved.

C13: Although the conceptual and methodological design of the project incorporated the gender approach in a transversal way in the ProDoc, its integration during the implementation has been a learning process that has allowed the Project Team to provide feedback on the experience and propose improvement mechanisms. The hiring of gender consultant is seen as an opportunity to identify challenges and propose substantive improvement actions to incorporate this approach in all components of the project.

C14: The productive approach with an emphasis on conservation and restoration is well accepted and understood by local stakeholders. They have the positive expectation of replicating the experiences learned in the project in other areas of their territory. They also have the perception that this project is participatory, inclusive, that gives opportunities to women and children. It is recognized that the pedagogical approach of “learning by doing” has facilitated the participation and motivated the interest not only of the beneficiaries but also of the neighbors and people of other communities.

C15: The work with the private sector for the development of value chains with local processing companies and anchor companies that operate at the national level, aims at inclusive processes to benefit all links in the chain. This actions of the project have risks related to the lack of culture on the cultivation, use and management of peppers, turmeric, *asaí* and *canangucha* of the communities. However, from the Project Team and the beneficiaries there is enthusiasm about its potential and the commitment to learn and consolidate the processes before the project ends.

C16: It is evident that the economic sustainability of the nurseries is an issue that deserves a deepening of the analysis so that a sustainability strategy can be developed with a broader time horizon. However, working with the network of nurseries is a strategy that in the short, medium and long term has significant potential. In the short term, it will make it possible to offer plant material to the MADS strategy on planting 180 million trees by 2022, as well as offering restoration services for environmental projects of infrastructure companies that have the legal commitment to make compensation with technical criteria.

C17: In the medium and long term, in the context of the decade of ecological restoration promoted by the United Nations and of the Strategic Biodiversity Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity (whose goals will have an important emphasis on ecological restoration), there are areas of important opportunity to consolidate not only the provision of specialized plant material in restoration and conservation, but also in offering restoration services for Amazonian forests.

C18: The joint work with the CARs has promoted the re-establishment of relations between the MADS, the corporations and the local communities, contributing at the same time to the strengthening of the technical capacities of the CARs.

C19: Sustainability will undoubtedly be greatly affected by the dynamic conditions of the project areas. From this perspective, the efforts to guarantee sustainability are considered pertinent and framed in the technical spaces that define the maneuvering spaces of the Project Team and its institutional and technical partners.

C20: The project has the potential to join forces to anchor community monitoring actions, strengthening capacities of peasant promoters and the network of nurseries, to the management of regional entities with competencies in education issues with the objective of guide the formalization and / or professionalization of these exercises.

C21: The review considers that the project has the potential to articulate community monitoring actions to official institutional management through departmental environmental education committees or CIDEAs (inter-institutional environmental education committees of municipalities, parks, and corporations). Likewise, during the interviews it was identified that in the Putumayo SENA there is a particular interest in carrying out water monitoring and follow-up actions in the context of oil exploration and exploitation in the area, which constitutes an area of opportunity to articulate the actions of the project to the interests of the

entities of the area where there are also possibilities of co-financing these activities through the SENNOVA initiative of SENA.

1.6. Recommendations Summary Table

#	Recommendation	Responsible Entity/ies
1	To request a project extension of at least one year due to events that have caused delays in the implementation of project activities. Obviously, when the request is made, the budget must be readjusted so that the Project Team can continue its work effectively. In this regard, it is advisable to prioritize actions in the field, i.e. with the communities, in order to maintain consistency with the project's objectives. In more concrete terms, it is important that, in the event of an increase in the prices of the material needed to carry out field activities, the distribution of project resources be reconsidered in favor of activities agreed upon with the project communities. Timeline: 2021/2022	UNDP
2	To add a target to indicator 1 "Number of new partnership mechanisms with financing for solutions for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and wastes at national and/or sub-national levels", with a target of at least five projects formulated and under implementation associated with PIGCCTs. It is also recommended to partially change the target from six sectoral strategies to focus on only two. Timeline: 2021	UNDP, PMU and CARs
3	To make adjustments to three project indicators: - To split the indicator 4 " Area (in ha) of production landscapes that maintain and/or increase forest cover, ecosystem connectivity and reduce GHG emissions" into three sub-indicators that measure woody cover, connectivity, and GHG emissions reduction, in order to have a more relevant impact measurement for the project and for the donor. For accountability purposes, the targets of the three new sub-indicators should be equivalent to the target set for the original indicator, as established in the ProDoc. - To Change the formulation of indicator 7 " Number of families of victims of the armed conflict and/or in the process of reintegrating into civilian life associated with social organizations implementing sustainable production activities" and refer to the number of people instead of families, leaving the same value as the indicator target to better align with the possibilities of a more accurate monitoring and therefore, better in terms of accountability. In fact, the project already has a count of individual reincorporated persons. It is only a matter of formalizing what is already being done. - To change the wording of indicator 8 " Number of public, private and community actors that improve their capacities (measured through the UNDP Capacity Development instrument) for the management of low-carbon rural development", and refer to the number of organizations instead of individuals to be consistent with the scorecard system. By changing the formulation it is necessary to define how many organizations should be included in the indicator target. The project already has the baseline for 8 community-based organizations, 10 public institutions, 2 private companies, and 4 educational institutions. The most important is in terms of active involvement in project activities. The revision proposes that at least <i>the Cooperativa Judío Errante</i> and the <i>Resguardo Buenavista</i> be part of the target so that all typologies of organizations involved are included. Timeline: 2021	UNDP and PMU
4	To monitor the effects associated with improvements in livestock management within the farms that apply landscape management tools in the Sabanas del Yará, in terms of GHG reduction. This represents an interesting element to generate useful information that can be used to define lessons learned in terms of landscape management and GHG reduction at a local scale, especially considering that cattle ranching is a very significant source of emissions at a global level. Timeline: 2021	UNDP and PMU
5	To assess the technical and economic feasibility to consider native fruit and food species of the area in the nurseries. This would help to give more scope to the profile of the nurseries: to promote the commitment to food security - already advanced with agro-food courtyard	PMU

	<p>- and to conservation and restoration. Additionally, the work of farmer promoters can serve as a platform to articulate the work carried out in educational institutions and thus, define the nurseries as spaces for educational training. In this way, the nurseries would have more opportunities for their economic sustainability and could also be positioned as meeting spaces where the importance of dietary diversification for the nutritional security of the communities and the importance of the conservation and restoration of the ecosystems can be visualized.</p> <p>Timeline: 2021/2022</p>	
6	<p>To provide an accompaniment of a human rights expert for gender consultancy in the framework of the final drafting of the PIGCCT, in order to strengthen both approaches in the development of the project and more, taking into account the current implementation moment in where the social crisis is an area of opportunity to strengthen and enrich the contributions that can be made from the project to the issue of gender and human rights. Under this perspective, it is also relevant that, within the framework of the gender consultancy, the process be socialized with the regional gender offices of the governorates, municipalities and / or corporations, with the aim of strengthening local capacity to promote dialogues on these issues. At the local level there are also areas of opportunity to socialize the work plans of the PIGCCT with local women's organizations.</p> <p>Timeline: as soon as possible</p>	UNDP, PMU, CDA and Corpoamazonia
7	<p>To focus efforts to develop a strategy that allows anchoring all community monitoring actions to institutional management through departmental environmental education committees or CIDEAs (inter-institutional environmental education committees of municipalities, parks, and corporations).</p> <p>Timeline: 2021/2022</p>	PMU
8	<p>To include in the update of the gender plan the focus of the GEM (Gender Equality Markers), which are resource monitoring mechanisms based on a coding system whose objective is to measure the extent to which the activities to be carried out are expected to contribute to the promotion of gender equality. With this approach, it is possible to define whether the actions or interventions are gender-sensitive and to that extent, establish the gender response, i.e. if the different contributions to women and men are positive, negative or neutral; and if they really promote equal participation and equitable and fair distribution of benefits in terms of workload, use of time, sharing of responsibilities, etc.</p> <p>Timeline: 2021</p>	PMU
9	<p>To promote a field trip for specialists so that, within the framework of strengthening the capacities of farmer promoters, and in association with the IPT, the <i>Universidad Nacional</i> or any other institution that supports the project within the framework of the <i>Cátedra Diálogos ambientales por la Amazonía</i>, an academic emphasis on basic education for adults is given to the process and a diploma can be awarded to farmer promoters. A strategy for this process to be viable is to convene the graduates of the master's degrees or doctoral students from said institutions, so that, in a short mission to the field, they can provide specific academic accompaniment to the promoters and in this way, formalize the process.</p> <p>Timeline: 2021/2022</p>	PMU
10	<p>To articulate community monitoring activities (water monitoring) with the SENA Putumayo initiative, since this institution is interested in monitoring water in the context of oil exploration and exploitation in the area. The participation of the associations and their beneficiaries can be co-financed through the SENNOVA initiative of the aforementioned educational institution.</p> <p>Timeline: 2021/2022</p>	PMU

2. Introduction

2.1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives

The MTR assessed the progress made in achieving the objectives and results of the project defined in the Project Document, identifying and analyzing the first signs of success or failure in order to identify any changes that are necessary to resume the project's course and achieve the desired results.

In addition, the review has the following specific objectives:

- Identify the contribution of the project and opportunities for improvement for the accomplishment of CPD, UNDAF, and Strategic Plan within the framework of support carried out by the Country Office in Colombia.
- Identify the contribution of the project and opportunities for improvement in mainstreaming the gender approach.
- From the international context, identify the contributions of the Sustainable Amazon for Peace project to the implementation of environmental policies and goals at the Global level, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- Identify the successes of the project and suggestions to enhance the results achieved to date.
- Identify recommendations for adjustment and changes (if necessary), with emphasis on the context of COVID - 19, to achieve the results of the project and enhance them.
- Evaluate how the Sustainable Amazon for Peace project has been articulated with the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Regional Programme and the level of synergy and coordination with the component implemented by the World Bank in Colombia and make recommendations to improve this coordination and articulation.

2.2. Scope & Methodology

2.2.a. Principles of design and execution of the MTR

The review was carried out through a participatory approach and presents a synthesis of the facts and opinions collected by the evaluators, identifying the findings through the triangulation of the information obtained from the different sources of information.

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations".

2.2.b. MTR approach and data collection methods

The review exercise design used the following research tools:

- Document review
- Individual interviews
- Group interviews

The evaluation matrix, in Annex 2, shows how the Evaluation Team responded to the evaluation criteria defined in the ToR and in the "Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects" (2014). The matrix identifies the evaluation questions, the adopted indicators, the data sources, the methods for data collection and analysis to evaluate the results of the Project. Annex 3 shows the guide used for the interviews and Annex 4 includes the ratings scale applied.

The Evaluation Team reviewed the following four categories of project progress:

Project Strategy

Project Design

Results Framework

Progress Towards Results

Progress towards outcomes analysis

Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements

Work planning

Finance and co-finance

Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

Stakeholder engagement

Reporting

Communications

Sustainability

Financial risks to sustainability

Socio-economic to sustainability

Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

Environmental risks to sustainability

2.2.c. Limitations to the MTR

The entire review exercise was carried out virtually due to the resurgence of the COVID-19 pandemic and the start of the national strike as defined in the Inception Report , in such a way that the Evaluation Team met with all the actors foreseen in the Initial Report and satisfactorily covered all the project activities.

Conducting the review remotely had the following implications for the development of the process:

- The actors in the project areas were interviewed individually or in groups and it was not possible to hold focus groups.
- No field visits were made to the project sites.

The MTR was carried out in three phased during the months of May, June, July and August 2021:

Inception phase – Desk Review

Dates: from May 24 to June 4

The Evaluation Team reviewed the Project documentation and delivered the inception report that was approved by UNDP. The data collection exercise was based on this report, as well as this MTR report.

Data collection phase

Dates: from June 7 to 25.

To carry out the data collection phase, the Evaluation Team worked closely with the PMU to define the schedule of meetings with the stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project.

The Evaluation Team conducted 58 interviews (31 individual and 27 group interviews). The entire interview process involved 94 people (53 women and 41 men) including staff from UNDP (20), MADS (5) the *Corporaciones Ambientales Regionales* (4), SINCHI (4), *Colombia Productiva* (1), academic and educational sector (3), private sector (1), NGOs (7), international organizations (1), representatives of indigenous groups (2), residents of the project areas (37), and consultants (2) . In addition, representatives of the World Bank (3) and *Patrimonio Natural* (4) involved in the sister project "Heart of the Amazon" were interviewed

Reporting phase

Dates: from June 28 to August 19.

The deliverables that were defined are the draft of the MTR report in Spanish (July 9), and the final version of the report (August 19) in English and Spanish. In the final version, the Evaluation Team included the Audit the comments received from UNDP and its partners, surveying each of them and their respective responses through the Audit Trail matrix, which has also been delivered along with the final report.

Annex 5 shows the MTR virtual mission schedule. Annex 6 includes the list of persons interviewed, and finally, Annex 7 the list of documents consulted.

2.3. Structure of the MTR report

The present MTR report consists of three core sections:

Project Description and Background Context

The section briefly describes the project and the context in which it was designed and is being implemented in.

Findings

This section provides answers to the four categories of project progress, i.e. Project Strategy, Progress towards results, Project Implementation and Adaptive Management, and Sustainability.

Conclusion & Recommendations

The section includes an evidence-based conclusion and offers key recommendations that are specific, achievable and relevant.

3. Project Description and Background Context

3.1. Development context

Preventing deforestation in the Amazon is a determining factor in regulating the global climate. The Amazon plays a critical role in climate regulation due to the regulatory functions on temperature and moisture. In addition, the Amazon provides an important environmental service for the planet through the storage of biomass and organic carbon in soil, helping to mitigate the emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) to the atmosphere. Deforestation and selective logging are important causes for changes in the balance of water and energy in the Amazon, as well as for changes in the microclimatic regime and localized fires, which result in generalized collateral damage to the Amazonian biome.

The Colombian Amazon rainforest covers an area of 39.9 million ha (approximately 40% of the continental territory of Colombia and 6.8% of the Amazon biome), but due to the phenomenon of deforestation it lost 1,116,044 ha of natural forest in 2010-2017, reaching a deforestation rate of 5.24%². In recent years, the deforestation trend has decreased, since in 2017 the loss of 219,973 ha of natural forest was reported, in 2018 of 197,159 ha and in 2019 of 115,000 ha. However, during 2020 the phenomenon worsened, since for the first semester of the year only in the Amazon region the loss of 75,031 ha of forest mass was reported, 89% of which was identified in the departments of Caquetá, Meta and Guaviare¹. These areas border the ecosystems of the Colombian Andes and the natural savannas of the Orinoquía, so deforestation affects the natural connectivity with the Amazon biome and contributes to the loss of biodiversity that is characteristic of the ecotones between these biomes.

With current rates of deforestation in the Colombian Amazon, the complete connectivity of the corridor between the Andes and the Amazon forests will be lost within 2030 and will reduce evapotranspiration and rainfall, which will generate Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions of up to 1,020 million tons¹³.

Deforestation in the Amazon region is directly related to colonization processes, the expansion of agriculture, land grabbing and illicit economies associated with livestock, infrastructure construction, mining, timber extraction, illegal crops and the displacement of people. The latter are motivated by circumstances closely related to poverty, social inequality, the lack of alternatives and productive incentives, development policies and the dynamics of the armed conflict in the region, in addition to the illicit crops that have deeply marked the socioeconomic reality of this region⁴.

In response to this problem, in its National Development Plan (NDP) 2015-2018, Colombia established goals related to the reduction of deforestation and the promotion of a low-carbon green growth approach with

² CONPES 4021, 2020

³ Armenteras, D., Rodríguez, N., Retana, J., 2013. Landscape dynamics in north-western Amazonia: an assessment of pastures, fire and illicit crops as drivers of tropical deforestation. PLoS ONE 8, e54310

⁴ Dávalos LM, Bejarano AC, Hall MA, Correa HL, Corthals A, Espejo OJ. 2011. Forests and drugs: coca-driven deforestation in tropical biodiversity hotspots. Environ. Sci. Technol. 45, 1219–1227

the understanding that the integrity of the Amazon biome is highly dependent on the implementation of specific actions. More recently, in 2018 Colombia launched the National REDD + Strategy under the name of Comprehensive Strategy for Control of Deforestation and Forest Management, which, although it has not been formally adopted, has served as a reference to design medium and long-term territorial control policies, protection, recovery of forest ecosystems, sustainable productive development and strengthening of forest governance.

It should be noted that within the framework of the current NDP 2018-2022, there was a change of approach regarding the prevention and control of deforestation. While the previous NDP emphasized comprehensive management actions that involved various actors, the current one takes up this perspective but placed greater emphasis on control, monitoring and punishment from the perspective of security of the public force.

Under these two perspectives, the guidelines and actions of the aforementioned Strategy were incorporated in the document CONPES 4021 National Policy for the control of deforestation and the sustainable management of forests, published in December 2020 and that defined the route criticism and actions to support the country to meet the goal of zero net deforestation by 2030. This document presents the public policy guidelines for reducing deforestation through four strategies:

- i. Consolidate sustainable productive alternatives that affect rural development and the stabilization of the agricultural frontier.
- ii. Strengthening of cross-sectoral articulation and management mechanisms for effective reduction of deforestation and forest management
- iii. Territorial control and reduction of the illegal dynamics that drive deforestation.
- iv. Strengthening of monitoring and follow-up systems for efficient administration of forest resources.

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

To reducing deforestation and promoting a low-carbon, green-growth approach, strategies must be developed to improve inter-institutional coordination, promote financial and market incentives, generate skills for rural extension work that involves sustainability criteria, and promote platforms for dialogue and peace building that address the principal barriers, identified in the ProDoc, that prevent the reduction of deforestation in the Colombian Amazon:

- Amazonian producers and community organizations lack incentives to become involved in landscape management and have limited access to information and training on sustainable production systems.
- Weak governance and absence of strategies and planning tools at the subnational and local levels for incorporating low-carbon and peace-building objectives into rural development.
- Producers have limited access to markets, incentives, and other financial mechanisms for sustainable production, as well as to the necessary financial management skills, to make use of these mechanisms.

3.3. Project Description and Strategy

The project "Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon" is part of the "Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program" of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), whose main objective is to protect biodiversity of global importance and implement policies to promote sustainable land use and restoration of native vegetation cover. The lead agency for this program is the World Bank (WB) and it is implemented through five child projects in Brazil, Colombia and Peru. UNDP and WB are the implementing agencies of the Colombian child project that divided into two projects: "Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon" known as "Sustainable Amazon for Peace" ("*Amazonas Sostenible para la Paz*") and "Conservation of forests and sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon", also known as "Heart of the Amazon" ("*Corazon de la Amazonia*").

In Colombia, these projects are supported within the framework of the *Programa Visión Amazónica*, a Colombian government strategy to support forest protection, biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management. Following the Comprehensive Strategy to Control Deforestation and Forest Management and CONPES 4021, the *Programa Visión Amazónica* seeks to promote a new development model and achieve the goal of zero net deforestation in the Amazon, in such a way that serves as a framework for the implementation of these projects of the Sustainable Amazon Landscape Program, as well as for others that are carried out in the Amazon region of the country.

Objective

Improve connectivity and conserve biodiversity through the strengthening of institutions and local organizations to ensure integral low-carbon-emission management and peace building.

Outcomes and expected results/outputs

Component/Outcome 1:

Rural development with a low-carbon-emission approach and capacity building for mainstreaming environmental management and peace building.

Outputs:

1. Consolidated sustainable production landscapes maintain and/or increase forest cover and ecosystem connectivity.
2. Sustainable production systems developed and consolidated using best production practices.
3. Community, rural, indigenous, and women's organizations strengthened to manage sustainable production practices in a peace-building context.
4. Integrated climate change plans developed and under implementation.
5. Economic, financial, and market mechanisms incentivize sustainable production and conservation in production landscapes in accordance with the conditions of the territory.
6. Regional green businesses program supported for implementation.

Component/Outcome 2:

Knowledge Management and M&E

Outputs:

1. Lessons learned at the level of sustainable production landscapes that maintain and/or enhance forest cover, ecosystem connectivity, and reduce emissions identified and systematized.
2. Thematic studies and other documented knowledge, and communication and awareness-raising materials produced and disseminated.

3.4. Project Implementation Arrangements

The project is implemented following UNDP's direct implementation modality (DIM), according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Colombia, and the Country Programme. UNDP is responsible for the implementation of this project in coordination with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. The following is the project organization structure as per the ProDoc.

The Project Steering Committee (also denominated the Project Board) is made up of the beneficiary entities (SINCHI, IDEAM, CDA, CORPOAMAZONIA, the three departmental governments), the executive entity that presides over it (MADS and its three technical areas involved: Directorate of Climate Change and Risk Management, General Directorate of Forests, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services and Office of International Affairs), and the main provider and guarantor of the project (UNDP Colombia).

This Committee is the body responsible for making management decisions by consensus when the Project Coordinator needs guidance, including the recommendation for the approval of the UNDP / partner in the implementation of plans and project reviews. To ensure ultimate accountability for UNDP, decisions must be made in accordance with standards that ensure management for development results, better value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In the event that a

consensus decision cannot be reached, the final decision is made by the Coordinator of UNDP, which acts as a guarantor so that the activities of the project and its products follow the highest standards.

The Technical Committee is made up of the Project Coordinator, representatives of the technical areas responsible for MADS (Directorate of Climate Change and Risk Management, General Directorate of Forests, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services and Directorate of Territorial Environmental Planning and SINA), IDEAM, SINCHI, CORPOAMAZONIA, CDA, the three Departmental Governments and the Coordinator of the World Bank component. The statutes of the two committees contemplate the possibility of inviting representatives of other institutions to participate in their work sessions according to the agendas and topics to discuss.

The Technical Committee is in charge of the general monitoring of the project so that the project activities and its products comply with the highest standards. The Technical Committee meets every three months or when necessary to provide strategic guidance to the project and evaluate its added value in the measure of the achievements. The Technical Committee also reviews the achievement of the results according to the reports of the Project Coordinator and has the responsibility of approving the work plans and quarterly disbursements, according to the Annual Work Plan approved by the Steering Committee. It also supervises the achievement of quarterly goals and the execution of quarterly disbursements. Promotes administrative efficiency and provides guidance to support decision-making; and, if necessary, requests that the project team implement corrective measures.

Finally, the Project Management Unit (PMU) is in charge of the general monitoring and technical and administrative implementation of the project. The unit composed of the project coordinator, the administrative and financial assistant and the monitoring officer. In addition to the coordination and general monitoring of the project, the PMU is in charge of organizing and liaising with other related projects and programs such as the Vision Amazonia Program and the GEF Heart of the Amazon project, among others that are implemented in the intervention areas of the Amazon region. Thematic leaders for each project result, the advisers from MADS and the Corporations join the PMU to form the Project Team.

3.5. Project timing and milestones

The review exercise took place in the mid of the fourth year of project implementation, where three years at half of implementation remains before close out. It represents the second milestones of the project evaluation plan included in the ProDoc, which entails an inception report, the present mid-term review and a terminal evaluation. The annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) are also contemplated, and the use of GEF tracking tools to monitor the results of global environmental benefits.

No other specific milestones are described either in the Project Document or in the Results Framework.

3.6. Main stakeholders: summary list

The ProDoc identified the following stakeholders:

Stakeholders	Role and relation with the project
MADS	<p>It is the entity that presides over the Steering Committee and the coordination of project management, including the monitoring and evaluation, as well as the achievement of results and the effective use of resources. It provides technical cooperation through studies, methodological development of work methodologies and guidelines for institutional and community strengthening actions so that they are aligned with national policies. Specifically, this entity is in charge of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate existing initiatives in the region (e.g. Amazon Vision Program, GEF-Heart of the Amazon Project and other cooperation projects). • Guide initial assessments, results monitoring and follow-up systems, and progress reporting. • Coordinate the Low Carbon Development Strategy. • Guidance on the process of developing comprehensive climate change plans.

	<p>Support the follow-up to the development of agreements with implementers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide the design of incentives. <p>Articulate with the <i>Programa de Negocios Verdes</i> (Green Business Program).</p>
CDA and CORPOAMAZONIA	<p>They are the entities responsible for the implementation of the project within the prioritized landscapes. Its territorial presence is evidenced in the support staff, office spaces and actions in the territory for institutional and community strengthening. Specifically, Corporations are in charge of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring the results of productive landscapes. • Technical assistance for local associations in the establishment of productive arrangements and business nuclei of sustainable community forestry businesses. • The review and dissemination of procedures for sustainable forest management. • Technical assistance and forestry extension for the implementation of management plans and permits for the use of species of fauna, flora and hydro biological resources. • Technical assistance to departments in the formulation of the PIGCCT. • Technical assistance to initiatives / associations interested in green businesses. • The implementation of actions on the ground to reduce deforestation and promote ecosystem connectivity.
Local organizations (<i>juntas de accion comunal</i> , rural community organizations, indigenous organizations and producer associations)	<p>They have a direct role in project implementation within the prioritized landscapes through the grant budget. Their role is directly related to the implementation through community actions to establish sustainable productive landscapes; develop community monitoring; coordinate the nurseries and other rural extension activities required by each component of the project. Specifically, these organizations are responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The establishment of productive arrangements in their areas of influence. • Support to technical assistance processes. • Coordination of spaces for dialogue and participation in the design of capacity building plans.
IDEAM	<p>In addition to its participation in the Direction Committee and Technical Committee, the Institute is in charge of providing information related to the productive landscapes prioritized in terms of deforestation.</p>
SINCHI	<p>It is in charge of providing technical support to develop the participatory assessment of sustainable landscapes; to provide recommendations for interventions in sustainable landscapes and strategies for productive transformation; to support property zoning and the development of technological packages for the establishment of productive arrangements. It also participates in the preparation of management plans for species of fauna, flora, and hydro biological resources and in providing recommendations for the implementation of management plans.</p>

4. Findings

4.1. Project Strategy

4.1.a. Project Design

The ProDoc includes a theory of change that shows the trajectory of the project from the problems identified as causes of deforestation in the Colombian Amazon, barriers, strategies and expected results, to the achievement of the project goals. There is a visualization of the project logic that helps in understanding the

challenges that will be faced during implementation. From this point of view, the ProDoc constitutes a relevant conceptual guide for those in charge of its implementation.

The formulation of the project is based on other projects previously implemented by the main project partners, i.e. UNDP and MADS. Importantly, the incorporation of the lessons learned in projects such as "Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity in Dry Ecosystems" stands out. It was an initiative that promoted landscape management tools for the recovery of ecosystem services, to promote the use of biodiversity through value chains, and in general for the promotion of effective local environmental governance mechanisms and for capacity development. However, elements that can be defined as lessons learned applicable to the implementation of the Sustainable Amazon for Peace (ASP) project do not emerge clearly in the design.

In its formulation, the project is aligned with the priorities of Colombia, specifically with the then National Development Plan (PND) 2015-2018 and its component on Green Growth and the objectives related to the reduction of deforestation, the promotion of a low carbon green growth approach and the protection and sustainable use of natural capital to improve environmental governance. Importantly, the relevance of the formulation stands out with respect to the comprehensive inclusion of the perspective of territorial peace building through rural development and environmental planning, which contributes to the Colombia in peace component of the aforementioned PND and also constitutes an innovative contribution from the environmental sector to promote spaces for reconciliation around sustainable production and the conservation of ecosystems in the Amazon.

Taking into account that during 2018 the PND of the current government period (2018-2022) was adopted, the flexibility of the adaptive management of the design is highlighted, since beyond the structural changes of the national policy approach on the strategy to avoid deforestation, the project has maintained its design emphasizing the implementation of actions with approaches to land and agro-environmental planning, inclusive and participatory restoration, and revitalization of local economies to promote bio-cultural connectivity and to strengthen the governance of different local actors.

In addition, the project joins the efforts of UNDP to support Colombia in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda. The design aims to contribute to the following SDGs:

- SDG 1: No poverty
- SDG 2: Zero hunger
- SDG 5: Gender equality
- SDG 13: Climate action
- SDG 15: Life of land
- SDG 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions.

The project is also aligned with the United Nations Country Program Document (CPD) and with other planning and execution instruments such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework 2020-2030 (UNSDCF). With this project, UNDP joins its efforts to make technical assistance an accelerator element for the achievement of the SDGs. Likewise, the project supports Colombia in the implementation of inclusive actions aimed at promoting gender equality, improving territorial planning through environmental management, sustainable production, food and nutritional security, as well as the implementation of peace agreements at the local level.

Similarly, the project design is consistent with the relevant aspirations of the GEF focal areas of land degradation, biodiversity, and sustainable forest management.

The MTR notes that the formulation of the project objective and component # 1, although formally different, are substantially identical and redundant. It can be said that the project aspires to strengthen collective and individual capacities of the target groups, of regional institutions and, also, to promote rural development that improves ecosystem connectivity, conserves biodiversity, and reduces greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The following table discusses the assumptions included in the results framework:

#	Assumptions	MTR Considerations
1	Willingness of the decision makers to incorporate biodiversity conservation objectives and sustainable land and forest management into the regional and local planning processes.	It cannot be considered an assumption. It is one of the project's challenges. In addition, regional environmental corporations are partners and participate in the co-financing of the project. If there is a lack of will of decision makers, the project should be assessed as not relevant.
2	Willingness by the local producers to incorporate biodiversity conservation and sustainable land and forest management as part of their production activities.	Like assumption # 1, this is a project challenge. If the project fails to involve the beneficiaries to achieve its objectives, the project should be assessed as not relevant.
3	National, regional, and local economic conditions are stable.	This is an assumption that is clearly out of the project's control. The ProDoc does not identify any type of action to mitigate the negative effects that a political, social and economic instability could entail (as occurs at the current moment of implementation).
4	There are financial feasibility and markets for green products originating in the prioritized areas of the project	This is an assumption that is clearly beyond the control of the project. The ProDoc identifies actions to mitigate the negative effects that a lack of viability could entail.
5	Active participation by the local communities in the implementation of best production practices.	Like assumptions # 1 and 2, this is a project bet. If the project fails to work with the communities to achieve its objectives, the project should be assessed as not relevant.
6	Optimal sampling.	It is not an assumption. If the sampling were not optimal, it would be a technical error.
7	Training processes are carried out within the necessary timeframe of the project.	It is not an assumption. The organization of the internal processes of the project are clearly internal elements that the UNDP and the PMU must know how to manage as responsible parties for the effective implementation of the project activities.
8	Stable political, economic, and social conditions for the reintegration of citizens affected by the armed conflict into civilian life.	This is an assumption that is clearly beyond the control of the project. The ProDoc identifies actions to mitigate the negative effects that a lack of economic and social stability could entail.
9	Public, private, and community organizations satisfactorily apply their new knowledge and skills	Like assumptions # 1, 2 and 5, this is a project challenge. If the project fails to develop the capacities of its target groups to achieve its objectives, the project should be assessed as not relevant or not effective.
10	There is stability in human resources within the national and local agencies that benefit from training activities	This is an assumption that is clearly beyond the control of the project. The ProDoc does not identify any type of action to mitigate the negative effects that could occur (for example, mobility of public officials)
11	Wide and timely dissemination	It is not an assumption. The organization of the internal processes of the project is clearly an internal management element that the PMU must know how to manage.

The review considers that the checklist for of potential social and environmental risks annexed to the ProDoc does not include the relevant risks that, it was anticipated, the project would have had to face, such as: i) the change in national policies and intervention strategies territorial; ii) the hierarchy of public policies on territorial development, where socio-environmental issues lag behind energy and infrastructure projects; iii) the evolution of the armed conflict and its territorial impacts in the framework of the implementation of the peace agreements.

Despite being implemented in areas with a high level of conflict (from the ProDoc the Amazon foothills in the departments of Caquetá, Putumayo and Guaviare are identified as an intervention area, which IDEAM, since 2014, had been classifying as Nuclei of High Deforestation (NAD) with high socio-environmental and political conflict), the section on human rights was drafted in a very superficial way, in particular with the following questions and answers (in the SESP):

- Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project? Answer: No
- Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights? Answer: No
- Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals? Answer: No

It is undeniable that, given the complexity of the socio-political context in the territories, it is far from reality to affirm that these three risks do not exist. Furthermore, these answers are in contradiction with assumptions # 3 and 8 included in the results framework. In short, the project's theory of change identifies situations of crime and conflicts between the problems that affect deforestation.

On the other hand, it is globally recognized that climate change and the management of natural resources can impact social inequalities and especially those of gender. From this perspective, the lack of identification of risks associated with gender equality and the empowerment of women is also considered a flaw in project design. Furthermore, the lack of risk identification is not consistent with the ProDoc annex "Gender Analysis and Project Gender Mainstreaming Plan", which, on the contrary, identifies barriers and proposes solutions for relevant issues.

Specifically, the gender perspective was included in the project design as indicators differentiated by sex and also as a differential and guiding factor in the conceptual and methodological approach for the interventions. From the general objective of the project, there is a specific mention on gender issues and the relevance of the gender approach is recognized in order to contribute to the achievement of the goals defined by the ProDoc.

Finally, the review affirms that the formulation of the project took into account the opinions and perspectives towards the development of the Colombian Amazon of the institutional partners. However, the involvement of the communities occurred only during the implementation of the project, since their representatives did not participate in the process of identification and drafting of the ProDoc. The review values this occurrence as neutral in terms of its implication for the implementation of the initiative.

4.1.b. Results Framework

The project results framework is made up of an objective and two results that are logically related and anchored in the project's theory of change. This clearly defines the causes and barriers that the project intends to address. These barriers are mainly related to low participation and ownership in rural development projects, lack of resources and knowledge, lack of incentives for forest management, and limited access to financing for the transformation of agricultural products.

The project aims to develop capacities to promote the conservation and restoration of ecosystems as an essential element to ensure economic development that is sustainable and takes into account ecosystem services. The central idea of the project is that by internalizing the importance of ecosystem services, communities understand the production/conservation nexus where the landscape provides production opportunities that are compatible with strategies for the conservation and restoration of these service-providing ecosystems.

The following table presents the analysis of the indicators:

#	Indicator	Consideration of the MTR
1	Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, and ecosystems services in selected landscapes of the western Amazon	The indicator SMART ⁵ . Identify the formulation of management and planning documents. It is an indicator of activity rather than result because it does not measure the actual use of these documents.
2	Number of people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through solutions for management of natural resources, and ecosystems services in selected landscapes of the western Amazon	The indicator is SMART. It identifies the number of people benefited who participate in the project. It measures the means (participation of individuals) to reach the goal (improve connectivity and conserve biodiversity). It is relevant because it helps to understand the work, but it only measures the dimension of participation.
3	Change in the income of producers resulting from the adoption of environmentally friendly production practices	The indicator SMART. It identifies the change in income that may result from better productive capacities. It assumes that higher production translates into better income. It has attribution problems because there are economic and political situations that affect the income of the beneficiary population. Although there are project actions that can drive the increase in income, these processes may take time and will not necessarily be measured.
4	Area (in ha) of production landscapes that maintain and/or increase forest cover, ecosystem connectivity and reduce GHG emissions	The indicator is SMART. It is the most relevant indicator for measuring the impact of the project in terms of improvements in environmental status. Although it identifies the area of interest of the project, it does not specify in detail the important elements in terms of forest cover, connectivity, and reduction of GHG emissions. The definition of goals for the mid-term has design problems given the medium and long-term measurement scope of the indicator.
5	Area (in ha) of sustainable production systems that reduce pressure on natural forests, and increase connectivity between ecosystems	The indicator is SMART. It identifies areas under sustainable production systems. Measures the direct contribution of the project to the improvement of environmental conditions.
6	Number of families associated with social organizations implementing sustainable production activities (SFM and/or community forestry) with a gender focus	The indicator is SMART. It can be assumed that the number indirectly identifies the effects of individual and institutional strengthening in terms of natural resource management. However, the very definition of the object of measurement does not allow differentiation by gender as established by the indicator.
7	Number of families of victims of the armed conflict and/or in the process of reintegrating into civilian life associated with social organizations implementing sustainable production activities	The indicator is SMART. Like indicator 6, it can be assumed that the number indirectly identifies the effects of individual and institutional strengthening in terms of natural resource management.
8	Number of public, private and community actors that improve their capacities (measured through the UNDP Capacity Development instrument) for the management of low-carbon rural development	The indicator is SMART. It is the most relevant indicator for evaluating the impact of the project in terms of developed capacities.

⁵ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound

9	Key species present in consolidated connectivity areas by project end (key species common in connectivity areas may include peccaries, small cat predators, birds, and monkeys)	The indicator is SMART. It is evident that the project intends to address for the first time the state of biodiversity in the area. In fact, there is no information available on biodiversity in the project area. Therefore, an indicator that reports only the absence or presence of key species is considered SMART by the MTR. It is the most relevant indicator to evaluate the impact of the project in terms of biodiversity.
10	Number of producers (differentiated by gender) benefitted by developed economic and financial mechanisms	The indicator is SMART. It identifies the number of producers benefitted. It is an ambitious indicator because it implies that there is the possibility of creating or identifying economic and financial mechanisms that support the work of producers in the project areas.
11	Number of initiatives under implementation for sustainable production systems and increased connectivity in other landscapes in the country	This indicator is difficult to interpret. It is not clear if the project itself should implement activities in other landscapes or if it should be understood as the replication of activities by other organizations. Furthermore, it does not quantify the scope of the initiatives in terms of coverage, connectivity and stakeholder participation.
12	Number of media outlets and publications that document and disseminate successful experiences from the implementation of sustainable production systems, low-carbon-emission development, and activities to consolidate peace	It is not a result indicator. At most, it is an activity indicator that refers to the production of communication materials and the collection of good practices and lessons learned. However, the MTR considers it important because it commits the project to make an important documentation effort to extract learnings and improve the approach to the project's themes.

Los indicadores # 3, 4, 8, 9 y 10 representan los indicadores de impacto del proyecto que miden tanto el objetivo de proyecto y el componente 1 (siendo, como ya mencionado, los dos formulados de forma sustantivamente idéntica, aunque formalmente diferentes).

A raíz del análisis de los indicadores del proyecto, el marco de resultados se conforma como un instrumento de monitoreo y evaluación que puede ser utilizado para fines de SyE.

4.2. Progress Towards Results

4.2.a. Progress towards outcomes analysis

Indicator Assessment Key					
Green = Achieved		Yellow = On target to be achieved		Red = Not on target to be achieved	
Objective: To improve connectivity and conserve biodiversity through the strengthening of institutions and local organizations to ensure integral low-carbon-emission management and peace building.					
Indicator	Midterm Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievement rating	Justification for rating
Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, and ecosystems services in selected landscapes of the western Amazon	8 (3 Integrated departmental climate change plans; 2 climate change programs of territorial regional level – CARs; 3 sectoral strategies)	11 (3 Integrated departmental climate change plans; 2 climate change programs of territorial regional level – CARs; 6 sectoral strategies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- 2 Comprehensive Plans for the Management of Territorial Climate Change (PIGCCT, <i>Planes Integrales de Gestión del Cambio Climático Territorial</i>) formulated and adopted by ordinance and departmental decree in Caquetá and Putumayo- 3 PIGCCT in formulation in Amazonas, Guaviare, and Vaupés (June 2021) with a general advance of 85%- 1 PIGCCT in the process of updating (Guainía).- 6 SDG departmental strategies for Caquetá, Amazonas, Guaviare, Vaupés, Guainía and Putumayo.- 2 environmental determinants for Vaupés and Guainía- 2 Regional Strategies: "Regional Climate Change Strategy for a Resilient and Adapted Amazon" and the "Amazon Pact for Forests and Climate"	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	<p>The PIGCCT include the following elements: (a) description of the methodology for its formulation, (b) territorial and climate analysis, (c) articulation with relevant national and international regulations and planning instruments, (d) strategies for the implementation of measures, (e) monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Each PIGCCT is necessarily and logically adapted to the conditions of the department and to how the process has taken place. No person with specific knowledge and experience in gender and human rights worked directly in the process of design, formulation, elaboration, validation and publication of the plans, despite the fact that, as reported by the PIGCCT, "it is recognized that climate change will accentuate social inequalities and especially those of gender ".</p> <p>The 6 departmental strategies are called "guides for the inclusion of the climate change component", they are not complete strategies, but rather guidance documents that aim to highlight the main aspects to be taken into account in the inclusion of the climate change component in the Territorial Development Plans (<i>Planes de Desarrollo Territorial, PDT</i>).</p> <p>- The Regional Climate Change Strategy for a Resilient and Adapted Amazon is made up of</p>

					<p>the sum of the 5 departmental plans. It is literally reported that "the Climate Change Strategy under construction will be an articulating and implementing instrument of those plans." However, it is yet to be completed. Furthermore, elements of great interest to UNDP, such as gender mainstreaming and human rights, are missing. On the other hand, the Amazon Pact for Forests and Climate" can if it can be considered completed.</p> <p>- The six strategies have not yet been developed. Through the interviews, the Evaluation Team has determined that it is not feasible to develop six sector strategies because it is a very ambitious target value.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: Number of people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through solutions for management of natural resources, and ecosystems services in selected landscapes of the western Amazon</p>	1.600	4.000	<p>The project has involved the following beneficiaries: a) 1,168 people (406 women and 762 men) in the sector sabanas del Yará, the strengthening took place around the dairy chain, characterization of Asaí, beekeeping and meliponiculture, aromatic plants, community nursery and productive reconversion.</p> <p>b) 442 people (210 women and 232 men) in the ZRCPA sector, the strengthening took place around meliponiculture, nursery, productive reconversion, rescue of local knowledge and technical strengthening for the conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>c) 59 people in the process of reincorporation in other landscapes (24 women and 35 men), belonging to the Liliana Peña Association, COMUCCON, CONVIBAPAC, COPAZYARÍ Cooperativa JE, CATYPSA who strengthen their livelihoods through restoration and training processes in nursery management.</p>	Satisfactory (S)	<p>The rating is justified by the fact that the project has already seen the participation of 1,395 people who correspond to 87% of the mid-term goal, despite the delays that are occurring in the implementation.</p>

			d) 17 people (7 women and 10 men) who strengthen themselves around the pineapple production chain in Piamonte Cauca. In total 1,395 people (531 women and 864 men), if double counting is excluded, have participated in the project.		
Indicator 3: Change in the income of producers resulting from the adoption of environmentally friendly production practices	Keep the income	+ 13% in Sabanas del Yari + 6% in ZRCPA + 8% for local companies	The indicator was not measured	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	The actions along the value chains of the identified products are taking place. The review has not identified negative elements. On the contrary, the evidence collected highlights the enthusiasm for the work and the possibility that it leads to real commercial agreements, which in principle can lead to a change in the income of farmers and local companies.
Result/Component 1: Rural development with a low-carbon-emission approach and capacity-building for mainstreaming environmental management and peace building					
Indicator	Midterm Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievement rating	Justification for rating
Indicator 4: Area (in ha) of production landscapes that maintain and/or increase forest cover, ecosystem connectivity and reduce GHG emissions	Between 24.000 and 32.000 ha	Between 60.000 and 80.000 ha	The indicator was not measured	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	The rating highlights that the most important impact in ecological terms of the implementation delays is the one that will be negatively affected by eminently ecological reasons: technical work in the field and for capacity building needs time for its contribution to the improvement of the environmental state to be concrete. The achievement of this indicator will depend on local and regional governance processes, therefore time is identified as a critical factor in the rating.
Indicator 5: Area (in ha) of sustainable production systems that reduce pressure on natural forests, and increase connectivity between ecosystems	660 ha	1.600 ha	420.8 ha that correspond to 392.2 Hectares in sustainable production systems that correspond to the Alto Morrocoy - Sabanas del Yari (La Macarena - Meta) sector and that refer to 5 farms with implementation of Landscape Management Tools (HMP for protection, restoration and productive reconversion) and 28.6 Hectares in sustainable	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	At the time of the MTR, 63% of the goal set for the midterm has been met. The work in Sabanas del Yari-Alto Morrocoy has a clear commitment to governance. The SPS intends to provide a comprehensive solution to the water problem, especially in dry times, which is when the shortage generates losses of livestock due to drowning, jaguar attacks, contamination of

			production systems that correspond to the implementation of 26 Ha of food sovereignty systems and 2.6 Ha in restoration in the Area of the Amazon Pearl Peasant Reserve -ZRCPA- (Puerto Asís - Putumayo)		sources, etc. This commitment is strategic in socio-environmental terms at the farm level and if it is replicated and appropriated by more people, it has the potential to become a benchmark model for the sustainable management of productive landscapes in the Amazon. The quality of the work implemented by the project has made the sustainable production systems in both areas appreciated not only by their direct beneficiaries, but also by other members of the communities. Many people who did not join the project at the beginning are now (at the time of this review) showing interest.
Indicator 6: Number of families associated with social organizations implementing sustainable production activities (SFM and/or community forestry) with a gender focus	200 families	500 families	240 families linked to social organizations distributed as follows a) 64 families from the Sabana del Yará sector, involved in sustainable production processes, productive reconversion, community nurseries, characterization of asaí and canangucha, local governance actions; b) 58 families of the ZRCPA, linked in processes of meliponiculture, monitoring, local governance, process of restoration of water riparian zones and strengthening of livelihoods through the implementation of sustainable productive arrangements. c) 43 families of indigenous organizations, linked to the strengthening of livelihoods with a gender perspective. d) 58 families of people in the process of reincorporation in other landscapes, belonging to the Liliana Peña Association, COMUCCON, CONVIBAPAC, Corpoayará, Cooperativa JE, CATYPSA that strengthen their livelihoods through restoration processes and nursery training. e) 17	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	At the time of the MTR, 120% of the goal set for the mid-term has been met. The rating of the achievements is therefore satisfactory. In addition, the evidence collected during the interviews with the project beneficiaries highlights the enthusiasm that has been generated around the project activities. The beneficiaries have also reported that the implementation of the activities has aroused interest in participating from people who did not join the project at first.

			families that are strengthened around the pineapple production chain belonging to the Municipal Association of Peasant Workers of Piemonte Cauca (ASIRMTACAMPIC)		
Indicator 7: Number of families of victims of the armed conflict and/or in the process of reintegrating into civilian life associated with social organizations implementing sustainable production activities	120 families	300 families	466 people	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	The project has come to involve more than 150% of the beneficiaries expected for its closure.
Indicator 8: Number of public, private and community actors that improve their capacities (measured through the UNDP Capacity Development instrument) for the management of low-carbon rural development	140 public stakeholders 100 private stakeholders 320 communities members	350 public stakeholders 250 private stakeholders 800 communities members	The indicator was not measured	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	The project has established the baseline by applying the UNDP Capacity Scorecard instrument to organizations, not individuals. The rating highlights that, having implementation delays, the most important impact, in terms of capacity building, needs time so that its contributions to the improvement of the environmental status can be materialized. The work done up to MTR is promising but only with the full rollout of the implementation will it be possible for capacities to be fully developed.
Indicator 9: Key species present in consolidated connectivity areas by project end (key species common in connectivity areas may include peccaries, small cat predators, birds, and monkeys)	10	10	The baseline identifies 10 key species.	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	The project has monitoring records of ten key species in connectivity areas: Jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>); Tapir (<i>Tapirus terrestris</i>), Manao (<i>Tayassu pecari</i>), Cerrillo (<i>Pecari tajacu</i>), Toucan (<i>Ramphastos tucanus</i>); Gray dolphin or Bufo (<i>Sotalia fluviatilis</i>) and Charapa (<i>Podocnemis expansa</i>).
Indicator 10: Number of producers (differentiated by gender) benefitted by developed economic and financial mechanisms	80 women 80 men	200 women 200 men	0 women 0 men However, the project is working to establish with the producers two revolving funds in the Yará (a revolving social fund for the sustainable dairy chain,	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	At the time of the MTR, the target set for the mid-term has not been met. As already mentioned, this is a very ambitious indicator. However, the work done so far is promising.

			<p>and a jaguar fund to replace the damage caused by the feline).</p> <p>At the time of the MTR, the project has identified and worked with 249 producers (148 men and 101 women) who are interested in joining market instruments, which the review considers relevant for calculating the indicator:</p> <p>Commercial agreements for the dairy chain potentially involving 30 producers (25 men and 5 women).</p> <p>Commercial agreements for the sustainable use of asaí (9 men and 3 women).</p> <p>Green Businesses (<i>Negocios Verdes</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meliponicultura (5 men and 3 women) - Community nurseries (74 men and 61 women) - Aromatic plants (6 men and 16 women) <p>Business articulated with the <i>CORPOAMAZONIA ventanilla</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Piña Piedmont (10 men and 7 women) - Meliponas ADISPA (19 men and 6 women) 		
Result/Component 2: Knowledge Management and M&E					
<p>Indicator 11:</p> <p>Number of initiatives under implementation for sustainable production systems and increased connectivity in other landscapes in the country</p>	3 initiatives	6 initiatives	<p>5 Initiatives under implementation within the framework of the strategy for restoration and reconciliation, through the community nursery network for the restoration of areas that allow connectivity, through the execution of the small grants with the Cooperativa Arando La Peace in the Department of Putumayo:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COMUCCON in Valle del Guaméz (La Hormiga) 2. Cooperativa JE in Uribe - Meta 3. COPAZYARÍ in La Macarena - Meta 4. Lilitana Peña Association located in Puerto Asís 5. CATYPSA in Plateaus - Meta 	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>	The rating of the achievement is justified by the lack of a clear strategy for the commercial sustainability of the community nursery network.

Indicator 12: Number of media outlets and publications that document and disseminate successful experiences from the implementation of sustainable production systems, low-carbon-emission development, and activities to consolidate peace	12 media outlets	30 media outlets	Many media produced as printed pieces (institutional brochure, Foldable Sustainable Productive Landscape Núcleo 5, COVID-19 information brochure and poster, and UNDP website, project space), stories uploaded to online platforms, communication and training videos uploaded to online platforms, radio program conceptualized and produced in a participatory manner " <i>El Yará Despierta, La Voz de la Naturaleza</i> ", Campaign <i>Pasos de fauna, Pasos de Vida</i> , digital pieces (newsletters and podcasts), diffusion in Colombian media, 9 events of visibility, <i>Promesa Climática</i> : communication and participation campaign for youth and women in the Amazon, and various uploads on social networks.	Satisfactory (S)	It is not a result indicator. At most, it is an activity indicator that refers to the production of communication materials and the collection of good practices and lessons learned. However, the MTR considers it important because it commits the project to make an important documentation effort to extract learnings and improve the approach to the project's themes. Although formally completed, the Project Team must continue to document its successful experiences for training and awareness-raising purposes on the project issues. It is substantially about implementing the communication strategy of the project that has the objective of "promoting the social appropriation of knowledge and innovative and diverse experiences, associated with comprehensive adaptation solutions based on resilient communities and in nature."
---	------------------	------------------	---	------------------	---

NOTE: it is relevant to mention that during the review exercise, a series of relevant actions were identified that are being carried out within the framework of the project's implementation but that are not being reported within the framework of official follow-up and monitoring. These relevant initiatives are listed below:

- The project will contribute significantly to the generation of scientific information on issues lagging behind in the study areas, such as information records on water quality in Putumayo oil areas; the basic ecology of aquatic mammals of the Putumayo rivers; problems associated with coexistence with jaguars (number of attacks, profile of the attack, periodicity, affectations, etc.); and the presence of birds in buffer zones of the national parks of the Amazon.
- Support for the construction and implementation of the climate action tool for MADS would help this entity better organize the monitoring of international cooperation projects and their contributions to the national climate change policy. Until now, this monitoring and guideline is non-existent (at least formally), therefore, continuing to work on the development of this tool may be a relevant aspect for the institutional strengthening of MADS.
- The lessons learned in the elaboration of the PIGCCT of the Amazon region are being taken into account for the elaboration of other PIGCCT in the country (Sucre), as well as to adjust/update the guide of elaboration of the PIGCCT according to the regional contexts and territorial in terms of availability of information, management capacities, planning and raising of financial resources, among other criteria that have been adjusted. In the same way, the project has another series of experiences that are not reported but have an impact and relevant added value, such as: the replicas of nurseries in the network and its restoration areas; and, the support to MADS in the elaboration of the departmental climate change policy in Cundinamarca.

4.2.b. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

The project is not facing any specific barrier to achieve the expected results. The problem that can most significantly affect the implementation of activities until the closure of the project, has to do mainly with work restrictions due to security issues and the COVID-19 pandemic, which in fact have already hindered its progress and also, to the evolution of the national strike and its implication in terms of the substantial shortening of the effective time available to carry out activities in the field.

In addition, other events can be added to the national strike that are reflected in interruptions or slowdowns in the implementation process. In fact, the project has already suffered slowdowns as a result of events beyond its control (see section 4.3.b. “Work planning”).

The evolution of the national strike, as well as other uncertain events associated with the period 2021-2022 (pre-electoral years in the country), may impact the implementation of the project, however, its forecast is beyond the scope of the exercise of mid-term review. Ultimately, the project is implemented within a national and local context of great conflict and uncertainty, which can only be understood in retrospect once the project is closed.

4.3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

4.3.a. Management Arrangements

The Project is implemented under the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). Therefore, the implementation and execution of the project are under the responsibility of the UNDP Country Office. However, the main institutional partners of the project are presiding over the implementation and decision-making. The partners meet every six months at the meetings of the steering committee, where the following institutions are representative:

- Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS):
 - Directorate of Climate Change and Risk Management
 - Directorate of Forests, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
 - Office for International Affairs
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- Amazon Institute for scientific Research SINCHI.
- Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies (IDEAM).
- The three relevant environmental regional corporations
 - Corporación para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Sur de la Amazonia (CORPOAMAZONIA).
 - Corporación para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Norte y el Oriente Amazónico (CDA).
 - Corporación para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Área de Manejo Especial La Macarena (CORMACARENA).
- *Secretaría de Agricultura, Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo Rural* of the *Gobernación de Guaviare*.
- *Secretaría Ambiental y de Agricultura* of the *Gobernación de Caquetá*.
- *Secretaría de Desarrollo Agropecuario y Medio Ambiente* of the *Gobernación de Putumayo*.
- Sister Project “*Corazón de la Amazonia*”.

The Project Team, through collaboration with different initiatives such as *Corazón Amazonía* (sister project implemented within the framework of the regional program Sustainable Landscapes of the Amazon), *Vision Amazonía* and *Colombia Productiva*, in addition to the agreements that have been made within the Steering Committee, has supported the partner institutions of the project, specifically MADS and CARs, aligning the implementation of the project to their environmental policy guidelines. The process to coordinate the preparation and publication of the Comprehensive Territorial Climate Change Management Plans (PIGCCT) stands out in a significant way. The PIGCCTs are planning instruments that respond to the implementation

of the National Climate Change Policy and that allow articulating the different policies, guidelines and instruments of the national order to actions and adaptation and mitigation measures designed and built from the territories.

Other processes promoted by the project and that respond to the implementation of the National Climate Change Policy under the coordination of national and regional entities, are the updating and adoption of the environmental determinants of Guainía and Vaupés; the formal signing of the Amazon Pact for Forests and Climate; and the preparation of the regional climate change strategy. Likewise, the project has provided support for the strengthening of different instances of regional participation, such as the NORCAs, the sub-nodes and the vision of indigenous people in the face of climate change.

Up to the date of this review, the Steering Committee has not made any decision that moves ProDoc away from implementation. The work of the Steering Committee has been directed to the approval of the Annual Operating Plan of each year after having discussed the progress and the project challenges presented by the Coordinator and other members of the Project Team.

The Team has an adequate work focus to achieve the results. In fact, the PMU in coordination with all the members of the Project Team has developed an intervention strategy and an M&E system that clearly identifies the progress towards the project's achievements (see section 4.3.d. "Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems"). The intervention strategy has five well-defined intervention axes:

- Design and implementation of Sustainable Productive Landscapes;
- Management of knowledge, practices and experiences for the sustainable management of the forest and the territory;
- Enhancement of capacities for environmental governance; • Contribution to the formulation and implementation of public policies for low-carbon rural development and incidence of regional institutional vision; and
- Dynamization of the local economy based on the sustainable use of biodiversity and zero deforestation value chains.

The RMT considers that this strategy is adequate and well thought out because all the intervention axes clearly point to the fulfillment of the project objective.

Local intervention actions have assertively identified the needs of the territory and incorporated them into the project's operating structure, which also includes the establishment of strategic alliances (see section 4.3.e. "Stakeholder engagement"). In addition, in order to identify the path to achieving results and in accordance with the principle of doing no harm, the PMU updated the risks that were not identified in the ProDoc (see section 4.1.a. "Project design"). The risk identification work has been used in a practical way to update safeguards that are essential for the development of activities in a territory with high social and political conflict. At the time of this review exercise, the safeguards have not yet been approved, but the same exercise confirms that the risks identified are elements that, from the beginning, guide all the actions of the Project Team personnel in the territory. The update and improvement that has been made to the risk management strategy is considered highly satisfactory by this review exercise.

This project can be considered as a reference for the country for its adaptive implementation strategy during the pandemic. Support for community shops, the installation of internet antennas, and community gardens, as well as the development of pedagogical guides for virtual teaching in rural areas, are highly valued by all the actors involved and aim to strengthen local capacities beyond the environmental issues of interest of the project.

The entire UNDP team, from the territorial liaisons and the coordinator to the managers of the organization's sustainable development area, are identified and recognized by local actors. This close relationship has facilitated the acceptance of the project by local actors in an atmosphere of trust and enthusiasm for the project activities. The quality of the work organization, the technical quality of the work carried out in the field, the professional and relational skills of the Project Team have been appreciated by all the actors interviewed.

The review values these elements as essential so that the project can develop activities on the ground and have a way of influencing the management of the territory, since for the approach to be successful in these areas of conflict, it is necessary to establish mutual recognition between the actors who want to operate there (national and regional) and the project's target groups. The creation of trust represents the key condition to position and promote the desired changes, and in this sense, the work of the Project Team is recognized by the different actors. These considerations are shared by all the actors interviewed on the subject.

The review found that the main bet of the project is to promote a territorial management scheme based on bio-cultural connectivity through the planning exercise at landscape scale is justified. For this, the project has had to distance itself from the conventional incentive scheme *por cupos*⁶ and promote a collective approach to make contributions at the landscape scale. It is really a bet that, at the time of the RMT, cannot be defined as appropriate and / or inappropriate to achieve the expected results due to the complexities that characterize the territory. However, it is evident that, given the tensions and mistrust that exist between the authorities and the communities, providing farmer organizations with environmental governance tools and working for their technical and organizational development is a path worth taking.

This bet is almost mandatory if the change of course in the implementation of the peace process is taken into account. That is why the project necessarily moves in technical spaces and in the creation of sensitivity towards environmental issues to have a margin of maneuver that otherwise would be too meager to be viable.

With reference to the work with the private sector for the value chain development with local processing companies and anchor companies that operate at the national level and that can commercialize the products of the project communities, the MTR considers that it seems promising. The Evaluation Team has been able to verify that the processes are transparent, i.e. the farmers are becoming aware of the commercial opportunities that may arise, as well as the challenges they may face. From this point of view, the work of the UNDP and the articulation with the government initiative of *Colombia Productiva* is key, since it takes advantage efficiently of the efforts that are being made at the national level to promote the country's agro-industrial sector. In addition, the logic of environmental sustainability points to inclusive processes that strengthen all steps within the value chain with an emphasis on sustainable production that favors the conservation and sustainable use of Amazonian biodiversity.

The technical assistance provided by UNDP in all field activities has been valued positively by all stakeholders interviewed during the review exercise.

Although the ProDoc includes an annex with the gender analysis and an action plan, throughout the implementation the Project Team identified the need to update this plan, since at the time it was useful to provide general guidelines for the approach and to make aware the Team members on different issues related to gender, but it was not enough to meet the needs of the project. For this reason, the need to hire an expert consultant dedicated to the subject was identified. In this sense, the MTR team considers that the self-criticism exercise carried out by the project has been pertinent and necessary to improve the incorporation of the gender perspective in the different components and results of the project.

The project's implementation approach in areas of high ecological importance and conflict has the potential to contribute significantly to the UNDP strategic framework in relation to the CPD and the UNSDCF. Regarding the CPD, the project contributes directly to the creation of resilience (result 3 of the Strategic Plan) and the eradication of poverty (result 1 of the Strategic Plan). Specifically, it can contribute to the goals related to the reintegration of ex-combatants, the development of capacities and the promotion of sustainable production systems. It is important to highlight that the project is providing technical assistance for the acceleration of the catalytic SDGs in line with the result of strategic area 3 of the UNSDCF.

⁶ Incentives *por cupos* are work schemes of some projects that have limited quotas for the participation of the communities and that promote individual involvement.

Finally, the mid-term review indicates that the two PIRs (Project Implementation Reports), referring to 2019 and 2020, report the necessary information so that the progress and challenges of the project can be satisfactorily understood.

4.3.b. Work planning

The PMU and the Steering Committee chose to operate in areas where the socio-economic and security situation allowed the development of project activities, for which NAD territories free from land markets and with landscapes characterized by containing continuous matrices of forest were prioritized that would guarantee the ecological connectivity approach. However, the project has had to face several problems that have happened since its inception and that have meant that the execution of the budget has not been able to comply with what was expected in each Annual Operating Plan (AOP). The problems / factors that have affected the implementation of project activities are the following:

- June 2019: the ASECADY Board of Directors received threats from an unidentified armed actor, which had implications in the delay of the implementation actions of the Jaguar corridor in the Sabanas del Yarí sector.
- November 2019 / February 2020: the occurrence of a national strike made it difficult to implement field activities.
- February 2020: there was a Regional Mobilization of the communities in the *veredas* of the Sabanas del Yarí sector involved in the project in response to the deforestation control operations, which led to a slowdown in the progress of the project, especially at the beginning of the selection of new farms.
- March / September 2020: COVID -19 preventive isolation followed the prevention measures defined by the national government. Face-to-face activities in the territory were stopped, virtual activities were implemented and new strategies for relations with beneficiaries and communities were adopted.
- October 2020: the legal representative of Cooperativa JE, a partner in the project, was assassinated. The homicide led to the suspension of implementation activities in the Uribe municipality until February 2021.
- December 2020: the territorial coordinator of CORMACARENA was assassinated.
- December 2020 / February 2021: with the second peak of the COVID-19 pandemic, there were restrictions for UNDP staff to travel to the territories.
- November 2020 / to date: there is a lot of intimidation and pressure against the ADISPA Board of Directors by armed groups, allegedly linked to oil groups. The threats put pressure on ADISPA to stop leading environmental claims in the territory of the ZRCPA. This situation made it necessary to reschedule project activities with ADISPA so as not to subsequently expose its Board of Directors to new risks. At the time of the MTR, the PMU is negotiating so that the activities that should be carried out by ADISPA, be implemented under the responsibility of the NGO Action Against Hunger, which has a history of work and recognition in the ZRCPA.
- May 2021 / to date: a national strike is taking place whose blockades prevent direct access to work areas. This strike implies the suspension of activities because mobility difficulties are generated due to fuel shortages and the impossibility of locating families that are part of the project in the area. There are also delays in the process of purchasing materials that will be used in each farm, given that there are shortages and rising prices of inputs.
- June 2021: the announcement was made of the alliance between UNDP and GEOPARK, a Latin American company that operates mainly in the oil and natural gas sector, within the framework of another project implemented under the leadership of the Poverty Reduction and the Inequity area of UNDP Colombia. Later ADISPA and the *Buenavista* indigenous *Resguardo* expressed their disagreement in a joint statement. After the meeting between UNDP, ADISPA and the *Resguardo*, UNDP decided to end the Alliance with GEOPARK. Then another joint meeting was held between ADISPA and UNDP to resume project activities and to date the relationship is normalized. However, the dialogues between the *Buenavista indigenous Resguardo* and UNDP have not been able to develop and for this reason, the *Resguardo* decided to suspend the activities of

the Grant agreement with the project. As of the date of the RMT, it is expected to resume the dialogue space with the Resguardo as soon as the 2021 national strike ends.

In summary, to the implications of working in territories so affected by conflicts and criminal actions, elements of political demands at the regional and national level (2 strikes) and the COVID-19 pandemic were added. Both the pandemic and the strikes had obvious consequences on the possibility of carrying out activities in the field, resulting in a general delay in project activities and their consequent budget execution (see section 4.3.c. “Financing and co-financing”). Despite the delays, the review exercise finds that the Project Team chose a relevant intervention strategy and that the problems and consequent delays are due to circumstances that are completely beyond the control of the PMU.

It is relevant to mention that the executing partners perceive UNDP as an agency highly involved in directing, monitoring and accompanying interventions in the field, which is recognized as a positive differentiating factor that facilitates the articulation of approaches and actions to build coherence in all the work fronts of the project. They also recognize that the community approach has a horizontal and inclusive approach that allows communities to recognize each other, feel respected and heard.

The PMU is using the results framework as a project management tool. This represents the main instrument for monitoring progress towards the achievement of results. The PMU has had to enrich the results framework to anchor it in a more specific way to all the actions that are articulated at the field level: the participation indicators have been subdivided into more pertinent indicators that cover the achievements (and the efforts towards the achievement) of the project results in relation to the different activities implemented. In addition, the PMU has done a rigorous job in identifying the risks associated with the implementation of project activities.

The planning and management of the project had, and have, to be highly adaptive due to three main factors:

- The original results framework of the project identified aggregate indicators of participation;
- The identification of risks in the ProDoc was very superficial, so much so that no type of risks were associated with the project; and
- The social dynamics of the intervention areas necessarily imply a high degree of flexibility for the establishment of alliances to implement the activities.

The PMU, the Project Team and the UNDP Sustainable Development Area are well aware of the need to adapt to the social context of the intervention area.

This review exercise assesses that work planning cannot be based on solid assumptions anchored to the social reality of the intervention areas, since, according to all the actors interviewed, it is very unstable.

The technical approach strategy for the establishment of sustainable productive landscapes in two different areas of the Amazon region has been adequately coordinated by the PMU. The participation of two different operators, the SINCHI Institute and *Paisajes Rurales*, has made it possible to arrange and capitalize on the expertise of each operator to promote specialized technical accompaniment according to the particular characteristics of each territory and has facilitated the application of lessons learned on territorial management for restoration.

With reference to the work with the CARs, it is noteworthy that, through the project, UNDP has opened direct financing options to these entities, which has facilitated their involvement and commitment. This commitment to joint work has promoted the reestablishment of relationships between the CARs and local communities. It has also helped to strengthen human resources and technical capacities to attend and follow up on project interventions that also provide feedback on the mission and competencies of the corporations, both at the regional and local levels.

When implementing the project, it must be borne in mind that the evolution of the situation on the ground is very dynamic. The problems encountered (described at the beginning of this section) to date confirm the instability of conditions in the territories.

Finally, it is important to highlight that the project has been able to read the needs of the territory and consequently, it has incorporated emerging actions during the implementation, such as the aqueducts of the farms, the approach of coexistence with the jaguar and the jaguar corridor. Also noteworthy are the meliponiculture approaches, the strengthening of pedagogical approaches in educational institutions through environmental education, participatory environmental monitoring, the provision of laboratories and the development of virtual learning guides.

4.3.c. Finance and co-finance

The financial management of the project has been consistent with the budget lines. However, budget execution has been affected by the slowdowns that have occurred in the implementation of activities on the ground.

In 2018, 3% of the budget was executed, in 2019 and 2020 19%, and during the first quarter of 2021 only 4%. Halfway through the implementation of the project, the disbursement has been equivalent to 35% of the budget. In fact, due to the events already mentioned (see section 4.3.b. “Work planning”) it has not been possible to fully implement the AOPs approved by the Steering Committee. The 2019 POA execution was 79%, while in 2020 it was 51%. Likewise, the execution of the POA for 2021 is proceeding very slowly, since in the first quarter of the year only 4% of the budget was executed.

It has been reported to the Evaluation Team that the Government of Colombia is executing the co-financing, especially that which refers to the *Programa Visión Amazonia*. There are no elements to doubt that the commitments regarding co-financing will be fulfilled before the project closes.

Until the moment of this review, the institutions that signed the cofinancing letter have disbursed the amounts presented in the following cofinancing table.

Source of co-financing	Name of co-financer	Type of co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
UNDP	UNDP	Cash	7,000,000	11,733,292	168%
Government	<i>Programa Visión Amazonia</i>	Cash	34,300,169	1,965,500	6%
Government	CORPOAMAZONIA	Cash	3,005,461	2,507,614	83%
Government	CDA	Cash	1,401,364	1,445,294	103%
Government	SINCH	Cash	156,355	---	0%
Total			45,863,349	17,651,700	38%

4.3.d. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

As already mentioned, the ProDoc provided conceptual elements for understanding the implementation challenges and the results framework proposed aggregated indicators that measure the participation and expected impact of the initiative (see section “4.1. Project strategy”) . In this regard, the PMU has developed an M&E strategy to inform the results framework that the review considers excellent. For better monitoring, the participation indicators have been disaggregated into more relevant indicators that cover the achievements (and efforts towards achieving) the project results. In addition, the system is made up of Excel files that are easy to update and are under the responsibility of the project M&E Officer.

The development of this work is onerous in terms of resources because it has been organized in such a way that each member of the work team can report the data and activities that fall under their responsibility. From this point of view, the M&E system is effective and does not require specific resources for its implementation. As it has been developed jointly by all the members of the PMU, under the leadership of

the Project Coordinator and the M&E Officer, it is calibrated with the project strategy and, in addition, has a highly participatory approach that directly involves all members of the Project Team.

The indicators that measure participation in project activities do not require any additional effort on the part of the Project Team, since both the data and the formats are standardized, are easy to use and aim to report the progress of the implementation of the different activities of the team and the implementing partners, i.e. the SINCHI Institute, the Rural Landscapes Corporation and the local farmer organizations.

The impact indicators fall under the responsibility of the Project Team and only n.9 foresees the involvement of pfarmer organizations (the one related to the presence / absence of key species in the connectivity areas). In fact, the project has designed a community monitoring system that is in charge of the person responsible for this indicator and that is later consolidated by the Project Manager.

The indicator no. 1 that refers directly to the drafting and publication of documents does not require any kind of effort to be measured, and only requires following carefully the process of formulation and publication of said documents.

The indicators n. 4 “Area (in ha) of production landscapes that maintain and/or increase forest cover, ecosystem connectivity and reduce GHG emissions”, n. 8 “Number of public, private, and community actors who improve their skills (measured through the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard,) for managing low-carbon-emission rural development” and n. 10 “Number of producers (differentiated by gender) benefitted by developed economic and financial mechanisms” implies a level of technical complexity of measurement and therefore, must necessarily be under the control of the Project Team.

Finally, through the small grants scheme, the participation of farmer associations in the implementation of activities is made possible, facilitating their involvement in monitoring and follow-up actions, which is why it constitutes a participatory process that aims to strengthen these organizations. Regarding the specific work with environmental education and training issues, the potential of the project to articulate community monitoring actions to official institutional management is identified through the departmental committees for environmental education or the CIDEA (Inter-institutional Committees of Environmental Education of municipalities, parks and corporations).

4.3.e. Stakeholder engagement

The coordination and monitoring of the project through the entity chairing its Steering Committee, i.e. the MADS, has played an important role in promoting alliances and cooperation in order to articulate regional and national actors in the design and preparation of the PIGCCT, which respond to the implementation guidelines of the national climate change policy according to the realities of the regions and territories. In this process there has been an important approach of actors to identify the barriers, lags and opportunities of the regions in matters of adaptation, risk management, human resources, technical capacity, support to local groups, community training and financing opportunities, among others.

Likewise, there have been spaces that allow the collection of lessons learned in these processes led by the project to adjust national technical documents (such as the guide for preparing the PIGCCT) as well as to accompany other national processes (such as the PIGCCT of Sucre and the departmental policy on climate change of Cundinamarca). In this context, the advice and support that the project gives to MADS through technical liaisons in the prioritized technical areas (Directorate of Climate Change and Directorate of Forests, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) stands out as relevant.

The alliances forged in the framework of the project at the field level respond to two needs so that the project can promote sustainable landscape management, productive reconversion, restoration, and conservation and preservation:

- Supporting and strengthening public institutions within the framework of SINA, i.e the CARs environmental; and,
- Strengthening farmers associations active in the project areas.

They are the actors that can influence the development of the communities in the project areas. That is why the alliance with them is an essential prerequisite to move forward with the implementation of the project and envision a certain degree of sustainability once it will end.

The approach to environmental corporations was straightforward. In fact, corporations are part of the Steering Committee. To reinforce the work with corporations, the Project Team has liaison professionals, who are in charge of institutional coordination. The work directly implemented by the CARs has been carried out through the hiring of consultants.

In terms of regional alliances, it is relevant to highlight that the project has facilitated the reestablishment of relations between state institutions and communities, specifically between Corpoamazonia, ASECADY (and local communities), and the municipalities of La Macarena and San Vicente del Caguan. It has also facilitated new approaches between institutions such as Fundación Panthera and Corpoamazonia; as well as between the cooperatives of ex-combatants with the MADS and the Environmental Corporations.

With the communities the approach is more articulated. The Project Team continues the work with personnel who are dedicated to covering all the technical areas of the project and the needs of coordination. The project also has a professional liaison with indigenous communities and a professional dedicated to gender issues.

The communities are linked to the project through Low Value Grants agreed with peasant associations/cooperatives and/or with the *juntas de acción comunal*. In this sense, the role played by the *juntas de acción comunal* and rural producer organizations from the initial stages of the project stands out, since they facilitated the arrival and socialization of the project to the territories, as well as the approach of the communities to express their interests and expectations. Through this strategy, the project has been able to establish itself on the ground from a horizontal approach that recognizes, listens and respects local contexts, which has been a successful approach recognized both by the implementing partners and by the communities and beneficiaries.

Although the communities are organized in their social and governance structure, they did not have collective environmental management approaches and in that sense, the project has promoted new views on the relevance of the sustainable production approach and the integral management of the landscape for the conservation of Amazonian forests.

At the local level, the work with ex-combatants to resume the work carried out in the PNIS (*Programa Nacional de Sustitución de Cultivos Ilícitos*) nurseries stands out. This exercise constitutes an important contribution to the implementation of the peace process starting from the definition of a productive and labor alternative which entails the recovery of the knowledge and experiences of the reincorporated. It is considered that the change in focus of PNIS nurseries towards the use of native species, promoted new learning processes about the propagation and restoration mechanisms with technical approaches, which can be replicated beyond the network.

With both environmental corporations and associations, a “learning by doing” approach was chosen, which is reflected in the agreements that were signed so that each organization takes responsibility and learns from its own experiences. The pedagogical approach “learning by doing” has been extended to all beneficiaries and has spread to other communities.

The capacity strengthening effort delegated to the target organizations of the project has also emphasized an effort to accompany the actions that has three main functions of equal relative importance:

1. To provide knowledge and technical tools for the implementation of activities that have several new technical and cultural aspects;
2. To ensure effective involvement of the communities by building trust towards the project; and
3. To identify risks along the way according to the United Nations do no harm principle.

The follow-up of actions on the ground is guaranteed by the Project Team, which in turn relies on expert implementing partners:

- The *Corporación Paisajes Rurales* provides the project with its experience to carry out the analysis of opportunities for conservation at a landscape scale from the perspective of value for the conservation of local communities. Through the prioritization of areas that allow the increase of the connectivity of nuclei with a high supply of ecosystem services, the work of *Paisajes Rurales* has focused on identifying areas of community environmental importance to define corridors and guide comprehensive landscape management actions.
- SINCHI is in charge of developing and adjusting the participatory property planning exercise in the 170 established farms in order to develop tools for landscape management and the use of stubble for food crops.
- Through the grant agreement, the *Corporación Arando la Paz* is in charge of strengthening the capacities of three local associations or cooperatives in reincorporation processes, to design and structure proposals for the offer of ecological restoration services and products in Amazonian territories that contribute to socio-ecological connectivity and low-carbon rural development, as well as to transformation and reconciliation in the territory. All this work is done within the framework of the project's territorial restoration and reconciliation strategy.
- Through the involvement of the OPIAC, the exercise of strengthening the territorial and environmental governance of the indigenous peoples of the Colombian Amazon was carried out, with emphasis on the conservation of the forest and mitigation-adaptation to climate change from their territories. The work was done through the dynamization of the dialogue of ancestral knowledge and practices and the support of its associated leaders.
- Finally, the collaboration initiatives with the Ministry of Commerce "*Colombia Productiva*", with AMAVIT and Biointropic, support the project in its effort to link together the products identified.

The Project Team ensures that the work carried out by this group of allied actors is coherent, supports it and takes charge of complementing their work. The review exercise assesses that the composition of the Project Team is balanced and its members have the appropriate educational background and technical knowledge to accompany the implementation of the activities.

The project in its entirety wants to position itself as an initiative that catalyzes efforts to mainstream the importance of sustainable agricultural production that has the conservation of ecosystem services as the fulcrum of its functioning. This attempt at mainstreaming is necessary to guarantee local development, preservation and conservation of natural resources. Efforts to articulate regional academic institutions are embedded in this framework, so that the mainstreaming of the project's themes reaches a wider audience in the Colombian Amazon.

Regarding the articulation with the sister project "*Corazón de la Amazonía*", it is identified that there are continuous communication processes evidenced in the mutual participation in the Steering Committees, in the internal feedback that is made from the projects to support the different areas and initiatives of MADS, as well as in active participation in events for the exchange of experiences and knowledge with the other regional projects of the ASL Program. Indeed, the mid-term review of the "*Corazón de la Amazonía*" project was carried out during the months of March - September 2020 and its results were also presented to the staff of the project.

Although the results and intervention framework of the two projects is different, it was identified that at the local level there are no coordination initiatives that allow the articulation of interventions common to the projects, especially those related to Component 3 of the "*Corazón de la Amazonía*" (Sectoral Programs for Integrated Landscape Management), which has specific lines of action that would make it possible to promote work initiatives in the territory around issues of connectivity, closure of the agricultural frontier, promotion of uses and practices of sustainable land management and conservation and no deforestation agreements.

Therefore, the integration of the two projects is better reflected in the field of institutional management - national and regional - than at the local level with the communities of the territories.

4.3.f. Reporting

Until the moment of this evaluation exercise, no formal changes have been made to the results framework. Therefore, the PMU has not needed to inform the Steering Committee of any significant changes in the adaptive management of the project.

The project has done an important job of defining the intervention strategy to a detail that was not included in the ProDoc. However, this strategy aims to meet the goals of the indicators set out in the results framework.

In addition, the Project Team has rigorously rethought and updated the safeguards related to the UNDP social and environmental screening, with special emphasis on issues such as tenure, land use and the land rights of the farmers, which is essential to develop properly the work in the territories involved in the project, which are characterized by conflicts. The review considers that this work is very important to guarantee compliance with the principle of do-not-harm that should characterize the implementation of UNDP initiatives, as well as ensure a minimum of guarantees of sustainability in the strategies and activities developed in the project areas.

During the MTR exercise, it was identified that the project has complied with satisfaction with the delivery of quarterly and annual reports and PIRs, which meet technical quality criteria, present truthful and verifiable information through evidence and the monitoring and follow-up system developed by the PMU. The PIRs have been shared with the Steering Committee and with all project partners. Also, the Project Team are being documented and shared with the relevant stakeholders.

4.3.g. Communications

The internal communication of the project is ensured by the Project Team that collaborates closely with all the actors involved, including the consultants. In addition, it has five professionals called "liaisons" whose function is precisely to ensure dialogue between the PMU and the key partners of the project, i.e. the project communities and associations, the MADS, the corporations and the *Buenavista* indigenous *Resguardo*. Therefore, it can be said that communication between the Project Team and the project partners occurs almost on a daily basis. In addition, the project Steering Committee meets twice a year, highlighting the active involvement and articulation of the MADS focal points, as well as the monthly monitoring of the indications and guidelines from the regional program of Sustainable Landscapes of the Amazon. This form of internal communication ensures that key project partners are aware of the progress of the implementation in all its aspects.

The PMU has designed and launched a communication strategy whose objective is "to promote the social appropriation of knowledge and innovative and diverse experiences, associated with comprehensive adaptation solutions based on resilient communities and in nature." This strategy has two lines of action "Communication - Local Education" and "Content and press management".

Substantially, the first line is a measure of active intervention in the project areas and is complementary to field actions, so that local training and education is coordinated with the beneficiaries, is intergenerational and is linked both with farmer associations and with the educational institutions. This line of action is consistent with the general project strategy and, furthermore, is integrated with it to form a very exhaustive capacity strengthening exercise.

On the other hand, the second line tries to make visible the progress and learnings of the project, with a local, regional and national scope using a variety of media. The variety of means used has turned out to be key so that the communication of the project could take place. Podcasts and radio programs are the two media that have been reported to the Evaluation Team as the most innovative, interesting and of great impact among the different public of interest at the local level.

The benefits of the project, recorded through the interviews, refer above all to the capacity of the project to generate changes in the attitude of the project communities towards the issues promoted. In this sense, the intergenerational pact for the conservation of the jaguar signed in the communities that live in the areas of the Corridor of the Jaguar in the sector of Sabanas del Yará, is paradigmatic and a benchmark for the Jaguar

corridor that runs from Mexico to Argentina. That this change in attitude turns into virtuous, effective and lasting behaviors to guarantee the conservation and preservation of the Amazonian ecosystem, is a commitment of the project that at the moment cannot be defined as won or lost.

4.4. Sustainability

As mentioned in section 4.1 of this document, when evaluating the sustainability of the project it is necessary to take into account the problems that it has, may face, and those that are outside its scope of action. The risk identification work has been used in a practical way to create safeguards that are essential for the development of activities in a territory with high social and political conflict. These risks are elements that, from the beginning, guide all the actions of the Project Team personnel in the territory.

4.4.a. Financial risks to sustainability

The results of the project present different degrees of financial sustainability:

The support work for CARs does not show evidence of poor financial sustainability. The project strengthens and equips the corporations with planning instruments at the territorial level, the elaboration of which has been led by the same institutions and which will be used according to the budget availability that the corporations will have at the end of the project.

On the other hand, the financial sustainability of field achievements with communities, farmer associations, and educational institutions deeply depends on the quality of the achievements themselves and their income-generating capacities. It is about the project bet. The MTR has been able to identify an element of risk for the sustainability of the component related to community nurseries and that is relative to the actors who may request the services of the nurseries. In addition, there is a precedent of the PNIS initiative that has already failed in the recent past. The project has reactivated some of the PNIS network's nurseries. In the context of the financial sustainability of these processes, it is important to identify alternatives to support the professionalization and formalization of the organizations and people who lead and coordinate the nursery network.

4.4.b. Socio-economic to sustainability

Socio-economic risks for sustainability refer to the socio-political situation that characterizes the areas of intervention. From the very formulation of the project, the approach to problems that are reasonably approachable by this type of project was put at the center of its intervention. In this sense, the capacity development and awareness-raising work on a better and environment-friendly development seems understood by the people interviewed by the Evaluation Team, which constitutes an element of sustainability.

On the other hand, the conflicts associated with the change of course in the implementation of the peace process and the criminality are very present in the area and, in fact, their effects have already manifested during the implementation of the project, causing some of the delays accumulated by the project.

4.4.c. Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The presence of GeoPark indicates that, despite MADS's commitment to the project, there are visions and policies at a higher level of strategic orientations for the development of the project areas, which are not consistent with the project objectives, especially with the promotion of a low carbon green growth approach. These are inconsistencies of a higher-level hierarchical political process that are not managed by government officials involved in the implementation of the project, as their competence is limited only to technical guidance and recommendation.

Additionally, it is important to highlight the fact that the project was designed within the framework of a favorable scenario for the implementation of the peace accords. However, since 2018 there has been a change of course in the national policy for implementation of these accords. This change has had territorial impacts in the Colombian Amazon, especially with reference to the change in the approach to territorial control of deforestation through the intervention of public force, which has blurred the management and governance approach to deforestation control and reconciliation with which the project was designed. Additionally, the threats and risks to which the reincorporated communities are exposed have had effects

during the implementation of both this project and the other international cooperation projects in the Amazon region.

However, the project has envisaged some important elements, which, if no significant socio-political deterioration occurs in the implementation areas, are relevant to ensure the sustainability of the project's actions in the medium term after its closure:

Farm safeguards signed with the beneficiary families and with the *Juntas de Acción Comunal* of the villages for the implementation of Landscape Management Tools;

The intergenerational pact for the conservation of the jaguar signed in the communities that live in the areas of the Jaguar Corridor in the sector of the Sabanas del Yari;

The vast capacity development and awareness work on the value of ecosystem services that has gone beyond the project areas, reaching a larger audience. In this sense, the work with the communities of practice and with the *Universidad Nacional de Colombia* to set up and implement a regional diploma is recognized by the review as an initiative that can reinforce the long-term effectiveness of the project, i.e. its sustainability. The promotion of knowledge and change of attitudes about Amazonian ecosystems is part of a larger territorial scale than the project's commitment.

4.4.d. Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR does not identify any environmental risk that may harm the sustainability of the achievements of the project.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

1. In the original Results Framework SMART indicators are included. They refer mainly to stakeholders' participation and to the impact of the project. However, the review has identified gaps or flaws in the formulation of some of them:
 - Indicator 1 "Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, and ecosystems services in selected landscapes of the western Amazon", does not measure the actual use of these documents.
 - Indicator 4 "Area (in ha) of production landscapes that maintain and/or increase forest cover and ecosystem connectivity and reduce GHG emissions", is the most relevant to measure the impact of the project, but does not specify the details of the elements important in terms of forest cover, connectivity, and reduction of GHG emissions.
 - Indicator 7 "Number of families of victims of the armed conflict and/or in the process of reintegrating into civilian life associated with social organizations implementing sustainable production activities cannot be measured because it may be the case that some individuals from the same family are under a re-incorporation process while others are not.
 - Indicator 8 "Number of public, private and community actors that improve their capacities (measured through the UNDP Capacity Development instrument) for the management of low-carbon rural development" is measured differently with respect to the goal (actors) and, furthermore, is very ambitious. However, the PMU has chosen to measure the capacities of organizations, which is consistent with the scorecard system applied by UNDP.
 - Indicator 12 refers to the production of communication materials and the compilation of good practices and lessons learned. Although it is formally an activity indicator, the MTR considers it important because it commits the Project Team to make a systematic documentation effort to extract learnings and improve the approach to the project's themes. In addition, the indicator deals

with complementary actions that have the purpose of reinforcing all the technical work done throughout the implementation.

2. The project was designed within the framework of a favorable scenario for the implementation of the peace accords. However, since 2018 there has been a change of course in the national policy for the implementation of the accords, which has had territorial impacts in the Colombian Amazon, especially with reference to the change in the approach to territorial control of deforestation through the intervention of public force, which has blurred the management and governance approach to deforestation control and reconciliation with which the project was designed.
3. The project has had to slow down actions on the ground in response to the situation created by the pandemic and other specific social and criminal events that have occurred to date. The project has been successfully adapted to the best of its ability. However, due to the seriousness of the events, considerable delays were necessarily encountered in the implementation and execution of the budget. The review states that the strategy defined by the Project Team was up to the task, as there are no elements with which to argue that better management was possible.
4. At the time of the MTR, a considerable increase in the price of the materials necessary for the implementation of the landscape management tools has been reported. It cannot be predicted if the price increase is a temporary contingency related to the national strike, so that when it ends, prices will stabilize again. These price changes can have significant effects on the field realization of landscape management tools.
5. Despite the problems encountered and consequent delays, the project has the potential to formally achieve its expected results. However, the achievements of impact, of those related to the re-incorporated persons and the network of community nurseries, are the ones that are still less likely to be achieved. Finally, it is important to highlight that the formal achievement does not always coincide with the substantial achievement of the results. The review considers that the time remaining until the end of the implementation is not sufficient to ensure a lasting ownership of the project actions by the target populations and local organizations.
6. The Project is implemented under the UNDP Direct Implementation Modality, but all the institutional partners of the project are presiding over the implementation and participating in decision-making during the Project Committees. The actions are aligned with the priorities of the institutions involved in the SINA, so that the project is providing resources for the design of policy instruments in other regions of the country based on the lessons learned in the Amazon and is also resuming and promoting failed experiences in the field (PNIS nurseries) with new approaches that contribute to the processes of territorial reconciliation.
7. The areas of work, due to their relative stability compared to other conflict areas in the nuclei of high deforestation (NAD) of Sabanas del Yará and Putumayo, constitute a laboratory to promote new processes of landscape management, productive reconversion, restoration, conservation and improvement of living conditions through participatory, inclusive and concerted pedagogical processes with rural communities. This project is showing locally a sustainable productive alternative that increases economic profits and helps curb deforestation. This exercise is a laboratory for the country where the potential to initiate productive reconversion with an emphasis on sustainability can be evidenced and, in addition, builds bridges of encounter between conservation and development in the Amazon region.
8. To adapt to the very particular context of conflict areas, the project planning and management strategy has been highly adaptive. To date, no formal changes have been made to the results framework. However, the UMP has developed a rigorous monitoring system that divides the participation indicators into sub-indicators that cover the achievements (and efforts towards achieving) of the project results in relation to the different activities implemented. This type of arrangement is consistent with the intervention strategy.

9. The main bet of the project is to promote a territorial management scheme based on bio-cultural connectivity through the planning exercise on a landscape scale. The project promotes a change in the culture of use, exploitation and conservation of ecosystems so that these begin to be visualized as central elements of rural development in the Colombian Amazon. The project has committed to strengthening environmental governance at the territorial level through support to farmer associations, which has generated trust in the target populations and constitutes the strategic element for the project to reach a level of effectiveness and sustainability when it ends. In the context of instability and conflict that characterizes the territories where it is intervening, relationships of trust and respect with the communities are the only aspects that can be really controlled by the Project Team and its partners. Strengthening farmers associations through small grants schemes is the main means through which ecological connectivity can be improved and biodiversity conserved in the intervention areas.
10. The project bet is almost mandatory considering the change of direction in the implementation of the peace process that occurred between its design and implementation stages. The technical spaces and the creation of sensitivity towards environmental issues represent the project's roadmap. Given the tensions and mistrust that exist between the authorities and the communities, providing farmer organizations with environmental governance tools and working for their technical and organizational development is a path that, according to this review exercise, is worth taking.
11. The intervention strategy has five well-defined intervention axes that are logically related to the fulfillment of the project objective in a complementary way, i.e. each project activity informs other activities and gets feedback from them. Safeguards have also been identified that, although they have not been formally communicated to the Steering Committee, are essential for the development of activities in a territory with high social and political conflict. The updating and improvement of the risk management strategy (which was not satisfactorily developed in the ProDoc) is considered highly satisfactory by this review exercise.
12. The structure in the work organization, the technical quality of the work carried out in the field and the professional and relational competences of the Project Team are appreciated by all the actors interviewed. Such recognition is reflected in the insertion and acceptance of the project by the communities involved. The PMU, the Project Team and the UNDP Sustainable Development Area are well aware of the need to adapt to the social context of the intervention area. This need is also well understood by the other actors involved in the project. The evolution of the implementation context in the field is very unstable.
13. Although the conceptual and methodological design of the project incorporated the gender approach in a transversal way in the ProDoc, its integration during the implementation has been a learning process that has allowed the Project Team to provide feedback on the experience and propose improvement mechanisms. An example of this situation was the limited accompaniment of a person with specific knowledge and experience in gender and human rights throughout the process of formulation, review, validation and publication of the PIGCCT. In this sense, the hiring of gender consultant is seen as an opportunity to identify challenges and propose substantive improvement actions to incorporate this approach in all components of the project.
14. The productive approach with an emphasis on conservation and restoration is well accepted and understood by local stakeholders. They have the positive expectation of replicating the experiences learned in the project in other areas of their territory. They also have the perception that this project is participatory, inclusive, that gives opportunities to women and children. It is recognized that the pedagogical approach of "learning by doing" has facilitated the participation and motivated the interest not only of the beneficiaries but also of the neighbors and people of other communities. It is also very well received that the project supports schools and educational institutions with the incorporation of the environmental approach, with the work of the PRAE and even more, with the support provided to develop the guides for virtual pedagogy in the context of the pandemic.

15. The work with the private sector for the development of value chains with local processing companies and anchor companies that operate at the national level, aims at inclusive processes to benefit all links in the chain. This work has risks related to the communities that do not have a culture of cultivation, use and management of peppers, turmeric, *asaí* and *ganagucha*. However, from the Project Team and the beneficiaries there is enthusiasm about its potential and the commitment to learn and consolidate the processes before the project ends.
16. The review could not reach unambiguous conclusions about the capacity of the nurseries to position themselves as an economic alternative with the capacity to promote the sale and use of native species in a time horizon that goes beyond the implementation of the project. It is evident that the economic sustainability of the nurseries is an issue that deserves a deepening of the analysis so that a sustainability strategy can be developed with a broader time horizon. However, working with the network of nurseries is a strategy that in the short, medium and long term has significant potential. In the short term, it will make it possible to offer plant material to the MADS strategy on planting 180 million trees by 2022, as well as offering restoration services for environmental projects of infrastructure companies that have the legal commitment to make compensation with technical criteria.
17. In the medium and long term, in the context of the decade of ecological restoration promoted by the United Nations and of the Strategic Biodiversity Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity (whose goals will have an important emphasis on ecological restoration), there are areas of important opportunity to consolidate not only the provision of specialized plant material in restoration and conservation, but also in offering restoration services for Amazonian forests. In this context, the Amazon is a strategic region at a global level and therefore, there will be windows of opportunity to finance initiatives with this profile. For this reason, it is relevant that the nursery network advances in its professionalization and formalization processes before the environmental authorities.
18. The joint work with the CARs has promoted the re-establishment of relations between the MADS, the corporations and the local communities, contributing at the same time to the strengthening of the technical capacities of the CARs
19. Sustainability will undoubtedly be greatly affected by the dynamic conditions of the project areas. At the time of review, it can be stated that the path traced by the project is based on a well thought out strategy and executed to the extent possible. From this perspective, the efforts to guarantee sustainability are considered pertinent and framed in the technical spaces that define the maneuvering spaces of the Project Team and its institutional and technical partners. At the time of the RMT, it cannot be confirmed with solid evidence if the community approach is effective in contributing to the project objective, since the social and political conflicts that characterize the territory are notorious and numerous. However, it can be affirmed that such a strategy is viable and reduces / mitigates the identified risks, especially in social terms. From this perspective, the RMT affirms that the project strategy is valid and in accordance with the project bet.
20. The project has the potential to join forces to anchor community monitoring actions, strengthening capacities of peasant promoters and the network of nurseries, to the management of regional entities with competencies in education issues with the objective of guide the formalization and / or professionalization of these exercises. In fact, the implementation of the project during the pandemic contributed to strengthening the capacities of access and use of technologies in these remote areas of the country, which is why all the deployment of support in training that the project has done at the local level (with communities and educational institutions) is very well received by the actors. In this sense, there are expectations that can be channelled to capitalize on the work done so far, so as to further guarantee the appropriation of the project's actions in the medium and long term within the framework of access to technology, the use of digital platforms, access to information and participation.
21. The review considers that the project has the potential to articulate community monitoring actions to official institutional management through departmental environmental education committees or CIDEAs (inter-institutional environmental education committees of municipalities, parks, and corporations). Likewise, during the interviews it was identified that in the Putumayo SENA there is a

particular interest in carrying out water monitoring and follow-up actions in the context of oil exploration and exploitation in the area, which constitutes an area of opportunity to articulate the actions of the project to the interests of the entities of the area where there are also possibilities of co-financing these activities through the SENNOVA initiative of SENA.

5.2. Recommendations

Recommendation n. 1

To request a project extension of at least one year due to events that have caused delays in the implementation of project activities. Obviously, when the request is made, the budget must be readjusted so that the Project Team can continue its work effectively. In this regard, it is advisable to prioritize actions in the field, i.e. with the communities, in order to maintain consistency with the project's objectives. In more concrete terms, it is important that, in the event of an increase in the prices of the material needed to carry out field activities, the distribution of project resources be reconsidered in favor of activities agreed upon with the project communities.

This recommendation is made under the assumption that the regional environmental corporations have the capacity to assume this change in the distribution of resources, while the communities could feel "betrayed" if the expectations generated so far are not met. In addition, field work represents the component of the project with the greatest potential to contribute to the donor's priority objective of improving vegetation cover and increasing ecosystem connectivity under sustainable production and participatory territorial management schemes.

Responsible entity: UNDP

Timeline: 2021/2022

Recommendation n. 2

To add a target to indicator 1 " Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, and ecosystems services in selected landscapes of the western Amazon", with a target of at least 5 projects formulated and under implementation associated with PIGCCTs. It is also recommended to partially change the target from 6 sectoral strategies to focus on only 2.

Responsible entities: UNDP, PMU and CARs

Timeline: 2021

Recommendation n. 3

To make adjustments to three project indicators:

To split the indicator 4 "Area (in ha) of production landscapes that maintain and/or increase forest cover, ecosystem connectivity and reduce GHG emissions" into three sub-indicators that measure woody cover, connectivity, and GHG emissions reduction, in order to have a more relevant impact measurement for the project and for the donor. For accountability purposes, the targets of the three new sub-indicators should be equivalent to the target set for the original indicator, as established in the ProDoc.

To change the formulation of indicator 7 " Number of families of victims of the armed conflict and/or in the process of reintegrating into civilian life associated with social organizations implementing sustainable production activities", and refer to the number of people instead of families, leaving the same value as the indicator target to better align with the possibilities of a more accurate monitoring and therefore, better in terms of accountability. In fact, the project already has a count of individual reincorporated persons. It is only a matter of formalizing what is already being done.

To change the wording of indicator 8 " Number of public, private and community actors that improve their capacities (measured through the UNDP Capacity Development instrument) for the management of low-carbon rural development ", and refer to the number of organizations instead of individuals to be consistent with the scorecard system. By changing the formulation it is necessary to define how many organizations should be included in the indicator target. The project already has the baseline for 8 community-based organizations, 10 public institutions, 2 private companies, and 4 educational institutions. The most important

is in terms of active involvement in project activities. The revision proposes that at least the *Cooperativa Judío Errante* and the Resguardo Buenavista be part of the target so that all typologies of organizations involved are included.

Responsible entities: UNDP and PMU

Timeline: 2021

Recommendation n. 4

To monitor the effects associated with improvements in livestock management within the farms that apply landscape management tools in the Sabanas del Yará, in terms of GHG reduction. This represents an interesting element to generate useful information that can be used to define lessons learned in terms of landscape management and GHG reduction at a local scale, especially considering that cattle ranching is a very significant source of emissions at a global level.

Responsible entities: UNDP and PMU

Timeline: 2021

Recommendation n. 5

To assess the technical and economic feasibility to consider native fruit and food species of the area in the nurseries. This would help to give more scope to the profile of the nurseries: to promote the commitment to food security - already advanced with agro-food courtyard - and to conservation and restoration. Additionally, the work of farmer promoters can serve as a platform to articulate the work carried out in educational institutions and thus, define the nurseries as spaces for educational training. In this way, the nurseries would have more opportunities for their economic sustainability and could also be positioned as meeting spaces where the importance of dietary diversification for the nutritional security of the communities and the importance of the conservation and restoration of the ecosystems can be visualized.

Responsible entity: PMU

Timeline: 2021/2022

Recommendation n. 6

To provide an accompaniment of a human rights expert for gender consultancy in the framework of the final drafting of the PIGCCT, in order to strengthen both approaches in the development of the project and more, taking into account the current implementation moment in where the social crisis is an area of opportunity to strengthen and enrich the contributions that can be made from the project to the issue of gender and human rights. Under this perspective, it is also relevant that, within the framework of the gender consultancy, the process be socialized with the regional gender offices of the governorates, municipalities and / or corporations, with the aim of strengthening local capacity to promote dialogues on these issues. At the local level there are also areas of opportunity to socialize the work plans of the PIGCCT with local women's organizations.

Responsible entities: UNDP, PMU, CDA and Corpoamazonia

Timeline: as soon as possible

Recommendation n. 7

To focus efforts to develop a strategy that allows anchoring all community monitoring actions to institutional management through departmental environmental education committees or CIDEAs (inter-institutional environmental education committees of municipalities, parks, and corporations).

Responsible entity: PMU

Timeline: 2021/2022

Recommendation n. 8

To include in the update of the gender plan the focus of the GEM (Gender Equality Markers), which are resource monitoring mechanisms based on a coding system whose objective is to measure the extent to which the activities to be carried out are expected to contribute to the promotion of gender equality. With this approach, it is possible to define whether the actions or interventions are gender-sensitive and to that

extent, establish the gender response, i.e. if the different contributions to women and men are positive, negative or neutral; and if they really promote equal participation and equitable and fair distribution of benefits in terms of workload, use of time, sharing of responsibilities, etc.

Responsible entity: PMU

Timeline: 2021

[Recommendation n. 9](#)

To promote a field trip for specialists so that, within the framework of strengthening the capacities of farmer promoters, and in association with the IPT, the *Universidad Nacional* or any other institution that supports the project within the framework of the *Cátedra Diálogos ambientales por la Amazonía*, an academic emphasis on basic education for adults is given to the process and a diploma can be awarded to farmer promoters. A strategy for this process to be viable is to convene the graduates of the master's degrees or doctoral students from said institutions, so that, in a short mission to the field, they can provide specific academic accompaniment to the promoters and in this way, formalize the process.

Responsible entity: PMU

Timeline: 2021/2022

[Recommendation n. 10](#)

To articulate community monitoring activities (water monitoring) with the SENA Putumayo initiative, since this institution is interested in monitoring water in the context of oil exploration and exploitation in the area. The participation of the associations and their beneficiaries can be co-financed through the SENNOVA initiative of the aforementioned educational institution.

Responsible entity: PMU

Timeline: 2021/2022

6. Annexes

Annex 1 - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0DC6AEBA-7906-4438-9B64-91CDE3122AEA

TERMINOS DE REFERENCIA

NO DEL PROYECTO	00089719
TITULO DEL PROYECTO	Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz
NO. DEL OUTPUT	00095817
FECHA DE TERMINACIÓN DEL PROYECTO	Enero 2024
AGENCIA	PNUD
TITULO DE LA CONSULTORIA	<i>Consultor internacional para la revisión de medio término (MTR por sus siglas en inglés) de PNUD-GEF para el proyecto Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz PIMs. 5715</i>
TIPO DE CONSULTORIA	Internacional (Requiere conocimiento y experiencia global o internacional)
TIPO DE CONTRATO	IC – Contrato Individual

1. Descripción del proyecto

Estos son los Términos de Referencia (ToR) del Revisión de Medio Término (MTR por sus siglas en inglés) de PNUD-GEF para el proyecto denominado Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz (Nº PIMS 5715), implementado por el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo (PNUD) Colombia que se llevará a cabo en 2017 - 2024. El proyecto se inició el 5 de Diciembre de 2017 y actualmente se encuentra en su tercer año de ejecución. En consonancia con la Guía para MTR de PNUD-GEF, éste proceso de MTR iniciará antes de la presentación del Tercer Informe de Ejecución del Proyecto (PIR por sus siglas en inglés). En los presentes ToR se fijan las expectativas para el actual MTR. El proceso del MTR debe seguir las directrices marcadas en el documento Guía para la Realización del Revisión de Medio Término en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y Financiados por el GEF http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf

1.1. Antecedentes e Información del proyecto

El Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo – PNUD - trabaja en más de 170 países y territorios, dando asistencia para desarrollar políticas, habilidades de liderazgo y asociación, capacidades institucionales y construcción de resiliencia, con el fin de mantener resultados de desarrollo.

El PNUD hace parte de las 26 Agencias, Fondos y Programas de las Naciones Unidas en Colombia y aporta al logro del Marco de Cooperación del Sistema de las Naciones Unidas (UNDAF por sus siglas en inglés), que para el periodo 2015-2019 se concentra en los retos de la construcción de la paz y el desarrollo sostenible, con el propósito de contribuir a la transición del conflicto armado hacia un escenario de paz, bienestar y desarrollo.

El actual Plan Estratégico del PNUD para el periodo 2018-2021, establece como visión para la organización el ayudar a los países a lograr el desarrollo sostenible mediante la erradicación de la pobreza en todas sus formas y dimensiones, la aceleración de las transformaciones estructurales para el desarrollo sostenible y la creación de resiliencia ante la crisis y las perturbaciones. Lo anterior, como respuesta al panorama cambiante del desarrollo y la evolución de las necesidades de los Asociados al PNUD. Para el 2021, se aspira que el PNUD consolide: 1) El Fortalecimiento de su relevancia como asociado digno de confianza en un panorama de desarrollo complejo y cambiante, firmemente comprometido con su mandato de erradicar la pobreza; 2) Ser más ágil, innovador y emprendedor: un referente intelectual que logre asumir y gestionar los riesgos; 3) Ser más eficaz y eficiente en la utilización de los recursos para obtener resultados. De igual manera, se persigue consolidar los siguientes progresos: 1) La erradicación de la pobreza en todas sus formas y dimensiones, y el mantenimiento de las personas al margen de la pobreza; 2) La aceleración de las transformaciones estructurales para el desarrollo sostenible, en particular mediante soluciones innovadoras que tengan efectos multiplicadores en todos los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible; 3) La creación de resiliencia ante crisis y perturbaciones, a fin de salvaguardar los logros alcanzados en materia de desarrollo. El PNUD se plantea fortalecer el compromiso de trabajar en colaboración con los Gobiernos, la sociedad civil y el sector privado, con el objeto de responder a las necesidades que se plantea el país.

El área de Desarrollo Sostenible del PNUD que busca diseñar e implementar soluciones basadas en la naturaleza para abordar los desafíos de desarrollo y promover cambios transformadores en el país, viene ejecutando el proyecto Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz, el cual es financiado por el GEF.

El proyecto hace parte de la iniciativa regional del GEF: “Programa Paisajes Sostenibles del Amazonas (ASL, por sus siglas en inglés) implementado por Brasil, Colombia y Perú a través de 5 Child projects. El Child Project de Colombia tiene dos componentes, el primer componente, implementado por el Banco Mundial lleva por título “Mejorar la gobernanza y promover actividades de uso del suelo sostenibles

para reducir la deforestación y conservar la biodiversidad en el área del proyecto”; el segundo componente, implementado por el PNUD y que lleva por título “Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz” (el cual es objeto del MTR).

El proyecto tiene como objetivo mejorar la conectividad y conservar la biodiversidad bajo un enfoque de fortalecimiento de la institucionalidad y organizaciones locales para la gestión integral baja en carbono y la construcción de paz territorial. Esta iniciativa se logrará a través de una estrategia multifocal que incluye el desarrollo rural sostenible con un enfoque agro-ambiental bajo en carbono que ayude a prevenir la deforestación y la degradación del suelo, conservar la biodiversidad y a mejorar los medios de vida de las personas de la región, generando oportunidades económicas y sociales necesarias para la construcción de paz mediante la implementación de prácticas de producción amigables con el medio ambiente fomentando la innovación de prácticas de acceso sostenible a los bosques, mecanismos económicos y estrategias de mercado para productos amazónicos sostenibles maderables y no maderables y el fortalecimiento de gobernanza forestal y las capacidades de las instituciones públicas y privadas de la región, teniendo en cuenta un enfoque diferencial e integral de género.

Teniendo en cuenta que el proyecto inicio su ejecución en diciembre de 2017 y el Plan de Monitoreo del Proyecto, se hace necesario adelantar el MTR.

1.2. Metas, objetivos y resultados claves del proyecto

El proyecto tiene como objetivo mejorar la conectividad y conservar la biodiversidad mediante el fortalecimiento de las instituciones y las organizaciones locales para asegurar el manejo integral bajo en carbono y la construcción de paz

El proyecto está estructurado en dos componentes y 4 resultados esperados:

- **Componente 1: Desarrollo rural con un enfoque bajo en carbono y desarrollo de capacidades para la integración de la gestión ambiental y la consolidación de la paz**
- **Componente 2: Gestión del conocimiento y monitoreo y evaluación (gestión del conocimiento centrada en la obtención de productos de conocimiento y en la amplia comunicación y difusión de lecciones aprendidas y experiencias del proyecto para apoyar la repetición y ampliación de los resultados del proyecto).**

Resultados esperados

- **Resultado 1.1: Paisajes productivos sostenibles que mantienen y/o mejoran la cobertura forestal, la conectividad ecosistémica y reducen emisiones en territorios**

priorizados para la construcción de paz.

- **Resultado 1.2:** Incorporación de criterios de desarrollo rural bajo en carbono y el manejo sostenible de los bosques en planes de gestión territorial e instrumentos financieros de los sectores priorizados
- **Resultado 1.3:** Desarrollo y/o implementación de mecanismos económicos, financieros y de mercado que promueven sistemas productivos sostenibles.
- **Resultado 2.1:** Un mayor conocimiento sobre los factores que contribuyen el desarrollo rural con un enfoque bajo en carbono, favorece el diseño y la futura implementación de estrategias y el uso de herramientas para la reducción de la deforestación, así como el desarrollo de capacidades para la integración de la gestión ambiental y la consolidación de la paz

1.3.Áreas de trabajo

El área de trabajo del proyecto cubre la jurisdicción de 4Corporaciones Autónomas (CDA, Corpoamazonía, CRC y Cormacarena) 4 municipios (La Macarena, San Vicente del Caguán, Puerto Asís y Piamonte). Por su parte, para el desarrollo de acciones puntuales en territorio se han microfocalizado áreas así:

Áreas microfocalizadas para el diseño y consolidación de paisajes productivos

sostenibles: Se han focalizado dos paisajes que mantienen y/o aumentan la cobertura forestal, la conectividad del ecosistema y reducen las emisiones:

- **Sabanas del Yará - Alto Morrocóy (La Macarena - Meta):** La primera área microfocalizada está ubicada entre los departamentos de Meta y Caquetá, en el Corredor de Conectividad de los Ríos Losada y La Tunia en los Llanos del Yará, jurisdicción del municipio de La Macarena Meta, un enclave del ecosistema de sabana natural en la región amazónica. Esta zona corresponde a un núcleo de cinco veredas que abarca una superficie aproximada de 61.569 Hectáreas, a saberse: Alto Morrocóy, La Palestina, Bajo Recreo, El Recreo y El Yará. A nivel regional los Llanos del Yará se establecen organizativamente en nueve núcleos veredales, dentro de los cuales el denominado núcleo cinco se compone por las veredas referidas anteriormente. En esta zona CORPOYARÁ y AAMPY son las organizaciones sociales vinculadas al proyecto.
- **Zona de Reserva Campesina La Perla Amazónica (Puerto Asís - Putumayo):** La segunda área microfocalizada se localiza geográficamente en el municipio de Puerto Asís, entre los ríos Putumayo y San Miguel, departamento de Putumayo, y abarca una superficie aproximada de 22.439,41 Ha. Esta área comparte un amplio territorio de frontera con el país de Ecuador y corresponde a la Zona de Reserva de la Perla Amazónica, una figura de ordenamiento territorial establecida por la ley 160 de

1994. La ZRC de la Perla Amazónica está compuesta organizativamente por 4 sectores y 24 veredas, donde la Asociación de Desarrollo Integral Sostenible de La Perla Amazónica -ADISPA- es la organización vinculada al proyecto.

Áreas microfocalizadas para conservación del jaguar y cadenas de valor:

- El Edén del Tigre (Meta – Caquetá)
- Piamonte (Cauca)

Áreas microfocalizadas para el desarrollo de Núcleos Forestales

- Zona de Reserva Campesina La Perla Amazónica (Puerto Asís, Putumayo)
- Piamonte (Cauca)
- San Vicente del Caguán (Caquetá)

En torno al trabajo orientado a Planes Integrales de Cambio Climático PIGCCT, el cual tiene un enfoque territorial, abarca la jurisdicción de 5 departamentos (Amazonas, Caquetá, Guaviare, Putumayo y Vaupés).

1.4. Duración del proyecto

Diciembre 2017 – enero 2024.

1.5. Presupuesto

Recursos asignados por el GEF USD 9.000.000

1.6. Impacto COVID

En Colombia, el 6 de marzo se presentó el primer caso de Covid19 y tres semanas después, el gobierno nacional adoptó la medida de aislamiento social obligatorio para todo el territorio (MINSALUD 2020). Estas acciones han tenido efectos en la vida productiva, que han devenido en una crisis social y económica con un impacto en diferentes dimensiones del desarrollo. Para diciembre se registraba más de un 1.6 millones de casos de Covid19 y más de 43.000 fallecidos. La recuperación de más de un millón de personas y un descenso en la tasa de contagios y muertes (MINSALUD Dic. 2020) permitió entrar en una etapa de aislamiento inteligente, permitiendo la apertura gradual de algunos sectores económicos. Sin embargo, los indicadores muestran una caída en el PIB de -9% (DANE III trim. 2020), un aumento en el índice de pobreza monetaria pasando de 35,7% en 2019 a un estimado de 46,7% y el desempleo ubicándose en 14.7 % que significó un aumento de 4,0 puntos porcentuales frente al mismo mes del año anterior (DANE Nov.2020).

Específicamente para el proyecto Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz, la situación de confinamiento producto del COVID 19, retrasó la implementación de acciones de conservación, restauración y uso sostenible para implementar en los predios, acciones que tenía su máximo nivel de ejecución en el año 2020. La situación de confinamiento restringió la movilidad y el desarrollo de viajes y convocatorias con comunidades locales retrasando las acciones en terreno previstas para este año. Las actividades que se han visto más afectadas específicamente son:

- Firma de acuerdos de conservación a nivel veredal y predial para la implementación de las herramientas de manejo del paisaje de protección, restauración y uso sostenible
- Implementación de herramientas de manejo del paisaje de protección, restauración y uso sostenible
- Implementación del programa de educación para el Desarrollo y fortalecimiento de la gobernanza con las organizaciones locales (capacitaciones, intercambios, escuelas de campo).
- Desarrollo de la fase de campo para los inventarios forestales e identificación de productos forestales no maderables con potencial de comercialización

Si bien el proyecto ha seguido su operación (a un ritmo diferente) y orientó grandes esfuerzos a diseñar e implementar acciones de adaptación al COVID-19, el nivel de avance de algunos resultados esperados para mitad de período, específicamente en temas de implementaciones de acciones en territorio se vieron afectados.

2. Objetivo general de la consultoría (Propósito del MTR)

Evaluar el progreso hacia la consecución de los objetivos del proyecto y los resultados como se especifica en el documento del proyecto y evaluar los primeros signos de éxito o fracaso del proyecto con el objetivo de identificar los cambios que sea necesario realizar para retomar el rumbo del proyecto y conseguir los resultados deseados. El MTR también revisará la estrategia del proyecto y sus riesgos para la sostenibilidad.

3. Objetivos Específicos

- Adelantar el MTR del proyecto, a partir de las siguientes 4 categorías de progreso: Estrategia, proceso en el logro de resultados, ejecución del proyecto, gestión adaptativa y sostenibilidad, teniendo en cuenta los lineamientos y directrices del GEF, del PNUD y los lineamientos del anexo que hacen parte integral de los términos de referencia
- Identificar el aporte del proyecto y oportunidades de mejora en el cumplimiento CPD, UNDAF, y Plan Estratégico en el marco de apoyo que realiza la Oficina de País en Colombia.

- Identificar el aporte del proyecto y oportunidades de mejora en la transversalización del enfoque de género.
- Desde el contexto internacional, identificar los aportes del proyecto Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz a la implementación de las políticas y metas ambientales a nivel Global, incluidos los ODS.
- Identificar los aciertos del proyecto y propuestas para potencializar los resultados alcanzados a la fecha
- Identificar recomendaciones de ajuste y cambios (encaso que sea necesario), con énfasis en el contexto del COVID – 19, para el logro de los resultados del proyecto y potencialización de los mismos.
- Evaluar como el proyecto Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz se ha articulado al Programa Regional Amazon Sustainable Landscapes – ASL y el nivel de sinergia y coordinación con el componente implementado por el Banco Mundial (Corazón Amazonía) en Colombia y hacer recomendaciones para mejorar esta coordinación y articulación.
- Elaborar el informe final consolidado del MTR en inglés y español, recogiendo los insumos generados por el evaluador nacional.

4. Actividades y responsabilidades

- Revisar y analizar la información necesaria para llevar a cabo del MTR. Examinar todas las fuentes de información relevantes, incluidos los documentos elaborados durante la fase de preparación (p. ej. PIF, Plan de Iniciación del PNUD, Política de Protección Medioambiental y Social del PNUD, Documento del Proyecto, informes de proyecto como PIR, revisiones del presupuesto del proyecto, informes y documentos técnicos generados en el marco del proyecto, documentos y material de gestión de conocimiento generado en el marco del proyecto, informes de las lecciones aprendidas, documentos legales y de estrategia nacional, y cualquier otro material que el equipo considere útil para este MTR basado en datos objetivos).
- Desarrollar en detalle y de manera coordinada con el evaluador nacional la propuesta metodológica para llevar a cabo la evaluación.
- Acordar con el evaluador nacional, teniendo en cuenta la expertis técnica, cuales son los énfasis de cada uno para el desarrollo del MTR
- Involucrar a los diferentes socios y actores estratégicos del proyecto en el proceso del MTR, con el fin de identificar sus percepciones.
- Diseñar y aplicar los instrumentos de recolección de información. El instrumento de recolección de información final deberá ser coordinado con el evaluador nacional, con el fin de usar un solo instrumento que sirva para ambos evaluadores.
- Adelantar los viajes contemplados para el desarrollo del MTR teniendo en cuenta las directrices de seguridad de Naciones Unidas y los protocolos de bioseguridad nacional y local.
- Adelantar las reuniones que sean necesarias con el coordinador del proyecto, el equipo del proyecto, la asesora de monitoreo del área de Desarrollo Sostenible del PNUD, la gerente del área de Desarrollo Sostenible del PNUD, la RTA del Centro Regional del PNUD, Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, integrantes del Comité Directivo, Comité Técnico, coordinadora ASL (Banco Mundial), Coordinadora child

Project Colombia implementado por Banco Mundial (Corazón Amazonía), partes responsables, socios y actores estratégicos del proyecto (a nivel nacional, regional y local), que hayan sido identificados, con el fin de obtener la información necesaria para el MTR. Las reuniones deberán ser coordinadas con el evaluador nacional, con el fin de optimizar el proceso del MTR y no desgastar a los socios.

- Gestionar la información necesaria para el MTR.
- Tener reuniones de retroalimentación articulación y discusión de los resultados con el consultor nacional (discutir y llegar a acuerdos en caso que sean necesario para lograr unificar criterios y resultados finales del MTR)
- Participar en la reunión de apertura de la Evaluación de MT con el comité directivo del proyecto, donde se presentará el informe de inicio.
- Participar en la reunión de presentación final del MTR al Comité Directivo del proyecto.
- Participar en una reunión de socialización de resultados preliminares, posterior al desarrollo de la fase de campo.
- Consolidar el informe final del MTR en inglés y en español.

5. Ámbito Detallado de la EMT

El equipo del MTR (que estará conformado por un evaluador internacional y un evaluador nacional contratados de manera independiente) evaluará las siguientes cuatro categorías de progreso del proyecto. Para unas descripciones más amplias véase la *Guía para la Realización del Revisión de Medio Término en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y Financiados por el GEF* (Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects).

5.1. Mecanismos del MTR

La responsabilidad principal en la gestión de este MTR corresponde a la Unidad Adjudicadora. La Unidad Adjudicadora para el MTR de este proyecto es la Oficina de País del PNUD Colombia.

La Unidad Adjudicadora contratará a los consultores. El pago de viáticos o dietas y gastos de viaje dentro del país correspondientes al equipo del MTR serán incluidos en el valor total del contrato. El Equipo del Proyecto tendrá la responsabilidad de comunicarse con el equipo del MTR para proporcionarle todos los documentos pertinentes, fijar entrevistas con las partes interesadas y organizar visitas de campo.

5.2. Enfoque y Metodología del MTR

Los datos aportados por el MTR deberán estar basados en información creíble, confiable y útil. El equipo del MTR examinará todas las fuentes de información relevantes, incluidos los documentos elaborados durante la fase de preparación (p. ej. PIF, Plan de Iniciación del PNUD, Política de Protección Medioambiental y Social del PNUD, Documento del Proyecto, informes de proyecto como el PIR, revisiones del presupuesto del proyecto, informes de las lecciones

aprendidas, documentos legales y de estrategia nacional, y cualquier otro material que el equipo considere útil para este MTR basado en datos objetivos). El equipo del MTR analizará la Herramienta de Seguimiento del área de actuación del GEF al inicio del proyecto, enviada a este organismo con la aprobación del CEO, y la Herramienta de Seguimiento a mitad de ciclo, la cual debe ser completada antes de iniciarse la misión de campo del MTR.

Del equipo que lleve a cabo el MTR se espera que siga un enfoque colaborativo y participativo que garantice una relación estrecha con el Equipo de Proyecto, sus homólogos gubernamentales (la persona o entidad designada como responsable o Coordinador de Operaciones del GEF (*Operational Focal Point*), la(s) Oficina(s) de País del PNUD, los Asesores Técnicos Regionales (RTA) del PNUD-GEF, beneficiarios directos, partes responsables y otras partes interesadas clave.

La participación de las partes interesadas resulta vital para el éxito del MTR. Dicha participación debe incluir entrevistas con aquellos agentes que tengan responsabilidades en el proyecto, entre los que están: los socios del Gobierno Nacional (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible), Corporaciones Autónomas Regionales (Corpoamazonía, CDA, Cormacarena), Gobernaciones y Alcaldías, equipo del proyecto, partes responsables (Instituto Sinchi, Corporación Paisajes Rurales), Organizaciones Comunitarias (entre otros). Además se espera que el equipo de evaluadores (en la medida de lo posible y las restricciones por la pandemia lo permitan, realice misiones a campo, específicamente a los sitios focalizados para para el diseño y consolidación de paisajes productivos sostenibles: Sabanas del Yarí - Alto Morrocoy (La Macarena - Meta) y Zona de Reserva Campesina La Perla Amazónica (Puerto Asís - Putumayo). En caso que las restricciones de viaje por motivos de la Pandemia continúen al momento del MTR, o los problemas de seguridad en la zona no permitan hacer los recorridos de campo, se utilizarán herramientas virtuales para garantizar al menos las entrevistas con los socios locales.

El diseño y la metodología específicos de la MTR deben surgir de las consultas entre el equipo del MTR y las partes mencionadas anteriormente sobre lo que es apropiado y factible para cumplir con el propósito y los objetivos del MTR y responder a las preguntas del MTR, dadas las limitaciones de presupuesto, tiempo y datos. Sin embargo, el equipo del MTR debe utilizar metodologías y herramientas sensibles al género y garantizar que la igualdad de género y el empoderamiento de las mujeres, así como otras cuestiones transversales y los ODS se incorporen en el informe del MTR.

El enfoque metodológico final, incluido el calendario de entrevistas, las visitas de campo y los datos que se utilizarán en el MTR, debe describirse claramente en el informe inicial y debatirse y acordarse en profundidad entre el PNUD, las partes interesadas y el equipo del MTR.

El informe final del MTR debe describir el enfoque adoptado y su justificación, haciendo explícitos los supuestos, desafíos, fortalezas y debilidades subyacentes sobre los métodos y el enfoque de la revisión.

Contingencia COVID – 19.

El 11 de marzo de 2020, la Organización Mundial de la Salud (OMS) declaró al COVID-19 una pandemia mundial a medida que el nuevo coronavirus se propagaba rápidamente a todas las regiones del mundo. Si bien los viajes al país y dentro del país estuvieron restringidos durante un tiempo durante el año 2020, a la fecha no se sabe si esta restricción volverá a estar vigente (dado el comportamiento actual de la pandemia Si no es posible viajar hacia o dentro del país para la misión del MTR , el equipo de evaluadores debe desarrollar una metodología que tenga esto en cuenta y considerar la realización del MTR de forma virtual y remota, incluido el uso de métodos de entrevista remota y revisiones documentales extendidas. análisis de datos, encuestas y cuestionarios del MTR. Esto debe ser concertado con el supervisor y detallado en el informe de inicio del MTR.

Si la totalidad o parte del MTRMTR se va a realizar de forma virtual, se debe tener en cuenta la disponibilidad, capacidad o voluntad de las partes interesadas para ser entrevistadas a distancia. Además, su accesibilidad a Internet / computadora puede ser un problema, ya que muchas contrapartes gubernamentales y nacionales pueden estar trabajando desde casa. Estas limitaciones deben reflejarse en el informe final del MTR.

Si no es posible realizar una recopilación de datos o una misión de campo, se pueden realizar entrevistas a distancia por teléfono o en línea (skype, zoom, etc.). Los consultores internacionales pueden trabajar de forma remota con el apoyo de los evaluadores nacionales en el campo si es seguro para ellos operar y viajar. No se debe poner en peligro a las partes interesadas, los consultores o el personal del PNUD y la seguridad es la prioridad clave.

Se puede considerar una misión de validación corta si se confirma que es segura para el personal, los consultores, las partes interesadas y si tal misión es posible dentro del programa del MTR.

Estrategia del proyecto

Diseño del proyecto:

- Analizar el problema abordado por el proyecto y las hipótesis aplicadas. Examinar el efecto de cualquier hipótesis incorrecta o de cambios en el contexto sobre el logro de los resultados del proyecto recogidos en el Documento del Proyecto.
- Analizar la relevancia de la estrategia del proyecto y determinar si ésta ofrece el camino más eficaz para alcanzar los resultados deseados/buscados. ¿Se incorporaron adecuadamente al diseño del proyecto las lecciones aprendidas en otros proyectos relevantes?
- Analizar cómo quedan recogidas en el proyecto las prioridades del país.

Comprobar la propiedad nacional del proyecto.

¿Estuvo el concepto del proyecto alineado con las prioridades de desarrollo del sector nacional y los planes para el país? (o de los países participantes en el caso de proyectos multipaís)

- Analizar los procesos de toma de decisiones. ¿Se tuvo en cuenta durante los procesos de diseño del proyecto la perspectiva de quienes se verían afectados por las decisiones relacionadas con el proyecto, de quienes podrían influir sobre sus resultados y de quienes podrían aportar información u otros recursos durante los procesos de diseño del proyecto?
- Revise hasta qué punto se plantearon las cuestiones de género relevantes en el diseño del proyecto. Consulte el Anexo 9 de la Guía para realizar exámenes de mitad de período de proyectos financiados por el FMAM y respaldados por el PNUD para obtener más directrices.
- ¿Se plantearon cuestiones de género relevantes (por ejemplo, el impacto del proyecto sobre la igualdad de género en el país del programa, la participación de grupos de mujeres, la participación de las mujeres en las actividades del proyecto) en el Documento del Proyecto?
- Si existen áreas importantes que requieren atención, recomendar aspectos para su mejora.

Marco de resultados/marco lógico:

- Hacer un análisis crítico de los indicadores, objetivos y metas del marco lógico del proyecto, evaluar qué tan “INTELIGENTES” son los objetivos a medio plazo y al final del proyecto (específicos, medibles, alcanzables, relevantes, con plazos determinados) y sugerir modificaciones / revisiones específicas de los objetivos e indicadores según sea necesario.
- ¿Son los objetivos y resultados del proyecto o sus componentes claros, prácticos y factibles de realizar durante el tiempo estipulado para su ejecución?
- Examinar si el progreso hasta ahora ha conducido o podría catalizar en el futuro efectos beneficiosos para el desarrollo (es decir, generación de ingresos, igualdad de género y empoderamiento de las mujeres, mejor gobernanza, etc.) que deberían incluirse en el marco de resultados del proyecto y supervisarse anualmente. base.
- Asegurar que los aspectos más amplios de desarrollo y género del proyecto sean monitoreados de manera efectiva. Desarrollar y recomendar indicadores SMART de 'desarrollo', incluidos indicadores desagregados por sexo e indicadores que capten los beneficios del desarrollo.
- Valorar el vínculo del marco lógico con el marco estratégico del PNUD en lo referente al UNDAF, CPD y SP

i. Progreso en el logro de resultados

Análisis del progreso en el logro de resultados:

- Revisar los indicadores del marco lógico y compararlos con el progreso realizado en el logro de las metas, completar la Matriz de progreso hacia el logro de resultados y en función de lo establecido en la Guía para la Realización del Revisión de Medio Término en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y Financiados por el GEF y respaldados por el PNUD; el progreso del código de colores en un "sistema de semáforo" basado en el nivel de progreso alcanzado; asignar una calificación de progreso para el objetivo del proyecto y cada resultado; hacer recomendaciones de las áreas marcadas como "no está en el objetivo de ser alcanzado" (rojo).

Tabla 1. Matriz de progreso en el logro de resultados**(resultados obtenidos en comparación con las metas para el final del proyecto)**

Estrategia del proyecto	Indicador ¹	Nivel inicial de referencia ²	Nivel en el 1er PIR (auto-reporte)	Meta a Mitad de Período ³	Meta a Final de Proyecto	Nivel y de valoración a Mitad de Período ⁴	Valoración de los logros conseguidos ⁵	Justificación de la valoración
Objetivo:	Indicador (si es aplicable):							
Resultado 1:	Indicador 1:							
	Indicador 2:							
Resultado 2:	Indicador 3:							
	Indicador 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

¹ Completar con datos del marco lógico y los cuadros de mando² Completar con datos del Documento del Proyecto³ Si está disponible⁴ Colorear sólo esta columna⁵ Usar la escala de valoración del progreso en el logro de resultados con sus 6 puntos: AS, S, MS, MI, I, AI

Código para la valoración de los Indicadores

Verde= Logrado	Amarillo= Camino de lograrse	Rojo= No lleva camino de lograrse
----------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Además del análisis de progreso en la consecución de resultados, se deberá incluir:

- Comparar y analizar la Herramienta de Seguimiento del GEF los indicadores básicos en la línea de base con la que se completó justo antes del MTR.
- Identificar las restantes barreras al logro de los objetivos del proyecto en lo que resta hasta su finalización.
- Una vez examinados los aspectos del proyecto que han tenido éxito, identificar fórmulas para que el proyecto pueda ampliar los beneficios conseguidos.
- Determinar el desempeño del proyecto en los aspectos relacionados en el aseguramiento de calidad sobre cumplimiento de derechos humanos e igualdad de género.
- Análisis desde el contexto internacional, de los aportes del proyecto Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz a la implementación de las políticas y metas ambientales a nivel Global, incluidos los ODS.
- Análisis de la efectividad de la coordinación del proyecto Amazonía Sostenible para la Paz con el programa regional Regional Amazon Sustainable Landscapes – ASL, así como el análisis del nivel de sinergia y coordinación con el componente implementado por el Banco Mundial (Corazón Amazonía) en Colombia.

ii. Implementación del proyecto y gestión adaptativa

Arreglos de gestión:

- Revisar la efectividad general de la gestión del proyecto como se describe en el Documento de Proyecto. ¿Se han realizado cambios y son efectivos? ¿Están claras las responsabilidades y las líneas jerárquicas? ¿La toma de decisiones es transparente y se lleva a cabo de manera oportuna? Recomendar áreas de mejora.
- Revisar la calidad de la ejecución de la Ejecución / Agencia de Aplicación Socio (s) y recomendar las áreas de mejora.
- Revisar la calidad del apoyo brindado por la agencia asociada del FMAM (PNUD) y recomendar áreas de mejora.
- ¿El organismo ejecutor / socio en la implementación y / o el PNUD y otros socios tienen la capacidad de brindar beneficios o involucrar a las mujeres? Si es así, ¿cómo?
- ¿Cuál es el equilibrio de género del personal del proyecto? ¿Qué medidas se han tomado para garantizar el equilibrio de género en el personal del proyecto?
- ¿Cuál es el equilibrio de género de la Junta de Proyecto? ¿Qué medidas se han tomado para garantizar el equilibrio de género en la Junta de Proyecto?
- Determinar el aporte al marco estratégico del PNUD en lo referente al UNDAF, CPD y SP

Planificación del trabajo:

- Analizar cualquier retraso en la puesta en marcha e implementación del proyecto, identificar sus causas y examinar si ya se han resuelto.
- ¿Están los procesos de planificación del trabajo basados en los resultados? Si no es así, ¿se pueden sugerir maneras de reorientar la planificación del trabajo para enfocarse en los resultados?
- Examinar el uso del marco de resultados/marco lógico del proyecto como herramienta de gestión y revisar cualquier cambio producido desde el inicio del proyecto.

Financiación y cofinanciación:

- Evaluar la gestión financiera del proyecto, con especial referencia a la rentabilidad de las intervenciones.
- Revisar los cambios producidos en las asignaciones de fondos como resultado de revisiones presupuestarias y determinar si dichas revisiones han sido apropiadas y relevantes.
- ¿Cuenta el proyecto con los controles financieros adecuados, incluidos los informes y la planificación, que permitan a la administración tomar decisiones informadas con respecto al presupuesto y permitan el flujo oportuno de fondos?
- Con base en la tabla de seguimiento de cofinanciamiento que debe completar la Unidad de puesta en servicio y el equipo del proyecto, proporcione comentarios sobre el cofinanciamiento: ¿se está utilizando el cofinanciamiento estratégicamente para ayudar a los objetivos del proyecto? ¿El equipo del proyecto se reúne periódicamente con todos los socios de cofinanciamiento para alinear las prioridades de financiamiento y los planes de trabajo anuales?

Fuentes de cofinanciamiento	Nombre del cofinanciador	Tipo de cofinanciamiento	Monto de cofinanciamiento confirmado en el respaldo del CEO (US \$)	Monto real aportado en la etapa de revisión intermedia (US \$)	% Real de la cantidad esperada
		TOTAL			

- Incluya la plantilla de cofinanciamiento del FMAM (completada por la unidad de puesta en servicio y el equipo del proyecto) que clasifica los montos de cofinanciamiento por fuente como 'inversión movilizada' o 'gastos recurrentes'. (Esta plantilla se adjuntará como un archivo separado).

Sistemas de seguimiento y evaluación a nivel de proyecto:

- Revise las herramientas de monitoreo que se utilizan actualmente: ¿brindan la información necesaria? ¿Involucran a socios clave? ¿Están alineados o integrados con los sistemas nacionales? ¿Usan información existente? ¿Son eficientes? ¿Son rentables? ¿Se requieren herramientas adicionales? ¿Cómo podrían hacerse más participativos e inclusivos?
- Examinar la gestión financiera del presupuesto de seguimiento y evaluación del proyecto. ¿Se están asignando recursos suficientes al seguimiento y la evaluación? ¿Se están asignando estos recursos de manera eficaz?
- Revisar en qué medida se incorporaron las cuestiones de género relevantes en los sistemas de seguimiento. Consulte el Anexo 9 de la Guía para realizar exámenes de mitad de período de proyectos financiados por el FMAM y respaldados por el PNUD para obtener más directrices.

Implicación de las partes interesadas:

- Gestión del proyecto: ¿Ha desarrollado y forjado el proyecto las alianzas adecuadas, tanto con las partes interesadas directas como con otros agentes tangenciales?
- Participación y procesos impulsados desde el país: ¿Apoyan los gobiernos locales y nacionales los objetivos del proyecto? ¿Siguen teniendo un papel activo en la toma de decisiones del proyecto que contribuya a una ejecución eficiente y efectiva del mismo?
- Participación y sensibilización pública: ¿Hasta qué punto ha contribuido la implicación y la sensibilización pública en el progreso realizado hacia el logro de los objetivos del proyecto?

Participación de los interesados

- Gestión del proyecto: ¿El proyecto ha desarrollado y aprovechado las alianzas necesarias y apropiadas con partes interesadas directas y tangenciales?
- Participación y procesos impulsados por el país: ¿Las partes interesadas del gobierno local y nacional apoyan los objetivos del proyecto? ¿Siguen teniendo un papel activo en la toma de decisiones del proyecto que respalda la implementación eficiente y eficaz del proyecto?
- Participación y conciencia pública: ¿En qué medida la participación de las partes interesadas y la conciencia pública han contribuido al progreso hacia

el logro de los objetivos del proyecto?

- ¿Cómo involucra el proyecto a mujeres y niñas? ¿Es probable que el proyecto tenga los mismos efectos positivos y / o negativos en mujeres y hombres, niñas y niños? Identifique, si es posible, las limitaciones legales, culturales o religiosas sobre la participación de las mujeres en el proyecto. ¿Qué puede hacer el proyecto para mejorar sus beneficios de género?

Estándares sociales y ambientales (salvaguardias)

- Validar los riesgos identificados en el SESP más reciente del proyecto y las calificaciones de esos riesgos; ¿Se necesitan revisiones?
- Resumir y evaluar las revisiones realizadas desde la aprobación / aprobación del director ejecutivo (si corresponde) para:
 - La categorización de riesgos de las salvaguardias generales del proyecto.
 - Los tipos de riesgos identificados (en el SESP).
 - Las calificaciones de riesgo individuales (en el SESP).
- Describa y evalúe el progreso realizado en la implementación de las medidas de gestión social y ambiental del proyecto, como se describe en el SESP presentado en el Aprobación / Aprobación del CEO (y preparado durante la implementación, si corresponde), incluyendo cualquier revisión de esas medidas. Tales medidas de gestión pueden incluir planes de gestión ambiental y social (PGAS) u otros planes de gestión, aunque también pueden incluir aspectos del diseño de un proyecto; consulte la Pregunta 6 de la plantilla del SESP para obtener un resumen de las medidas de gestión identificadas.
- Un proyecto determinado debe evaluarse en función de la versión de la política de salvaguardias del PNUD que estaba en vigor en el momento de la aprobación del proyecto.

Reportando

- Evaluar cómo los cambios de gestión adaptativa han sido informados por la dirección del proyecto y compartidos con la junta del proyecto.
- Evaluar qué tan bien el equipo del proyecto y los socios asumen y cumplen los requisitos de presentación de informes del FMAM (es decir, ¿cómo han abordado los PIR mal calificados, si corresponde?)
- Evaluar cómo las lecciones derivadas del proceso de gestión adaptativa se han documentado, compartido con socios clave e internalizado por los socios.

Gestión de comunicaciones y conocimiento

- Revise la comunicación interna del proyecto con las partes interesadas: ¿la comunicación es regular y eficaz? ¿Hay partes interesadas clave que no se comunican? ¿Existen mecanismos de retroalimentación cuando se recibe la comunicación? ¿Contribuye esta comunicación con las partes interesadas a su conocimiento de los resultados y actividades del proyecto y a la inversión en la sostenibilidad de los resultados del proyecto?
- Revisar la comunicación externa del proyecto: ¿Se han establecido o se están estableciendo medios de comunicación adecuados para expresar el progreso del proyecto y el impacto previsto para el público (¿hay presencia en la web, por ejemplo? ¿O el proyecto implementó campañas apropiadas de divulgación y conciencia pública?)
- Para fines de informes, escriba un párrafo de media página que resuma el progreso del proyecto hacia los resultados en términos de contribución a los beneficios del desarrollo sostenible, así como a los beneficios ambientales globales.
- Enumere las actividades / productos de conocimiento desarrollados (según el enfoque de gestión del conocimiento aprobado por el respaldo / aprobación del CEO).

iii. Sostenibilidad

- Validar si los riesgos identificados en el Documento del Proyecto, la Revisión Anual del Proyecto / PIR y el Registro de Riesgos de ATLAS son los más importantes y si las calificaciones de riesgo aplicadas son apropiadas y actualizadas. Si no es así, explique por qué.
- Asimismo, evaluar los siguientes riesgos a la sostenibilidad:

Riesgos financieros para la sostenibilidad:

- ¿Cuál es la probabilidad de que se reduzca o cese la disponibilidad de recursos económicos una vez concluya la ayuda del GEF (teniendo en cuenta que los recursos potenciales pueden provenir de múltiples fuentes, como los sectores público y privado, actividades generadoras de ingresos y otros recursos que serán adecuados para sostener los resultados del proyecto)?

Riesgos socioeconómicos para la sostenibilidad:

- ¿Existen riesgos sociales o políticos que puedan poner en peligro la sostenibilidad de los resultados del proyecto? ¿Cuál es el riesgo de que el nivel de propiedad e implicación de las partes interesadas (incluyendo el de los gobiernos y otras partes interesadas) sea insuficiente para sostener los resultados/beneficios del proyecto? ¿Son conscientes las diversas partes interesadas clave de que les interesa que los beneficios del proyecto sigan fluyendo? ¿Tienen el público y/o

las partes interesadas un nivel de concienciación suficiente para apoyar los objetivos a largo plazo del proyecto?

¿Documenta el Equipo del Proyecto las lecciones aprendidas de manera continuada? ¿Se comparten/transfieren a los agentes adecuados que estén en posición de aplicarlas y, potencialmente, reproducirlas y/o expandirlas en el futuro?

Riesgos para la sostenibilidad relacionados con el marco institucional y la gobernabilidad:

- ¿Presentan los marcos legales, las políticas, las estructuras y los procesos de gobernabilidad riesgos que puedan poner en peligro la continuidad de los beneficios del proyecto? Al evaluar este parámetro, es preciso tener en cuenta también si están instalados los sistemas/mecanismos requeridos para la rendición de cuentas, la transparencia y los conocimientos técnicos.

Riesgos medioambientales a la sostenibilidad:

- ¿Hay algún riesgo medioambiental que pueda poner en peligro la continuidad de los resultados del proyecto?

Conclusiones y Recomendaciones

El equipo del MTR incluirá una sección en el informe donde se recojan las conclusiones obtenidas a partir de toda la evidencia, los datos recabados, las pruebas realizadas y los hallazgos encontrados.

Las recomendaciones deberían ser sugerencias sucintas para intervenciones críticas que deberán ser específicas, medibles, conseguibles y relevantes. Se deberá incluir una tabla de recomendaciones dentro del informe ejecutivo del informe. Debe incluirse una tabla de recomendaciones en el resumen ejecutivo del informe. El consultor / equipo del MTR no debe hacer más de 15 recomendaciones en total.

Valoración

El equipo de evaluadores incluirá sus valoraciones de los resultados del proyecto y breves descripciones de los logros asociados en una *Tabla resumen de valoraciones y logros* en el Resumen Ejecutivo del informe del MTR. Véase el Anexo E para comprobar las escalas de valoración. No es necesario hacer una valoración de la Estrategia del Proyecto ni una valoración general del mismo.

Annex 2 - MTR evaluative matrix

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Criterion – Project strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Project design - 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. - Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. - Review how the project addresses country priorities. - 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? - Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.	- Relationships that are established within the project levels (objective, results and products) - Consistency: project design vs implementation approach - Extent of participation and inclusion of stakeholders in project design - Stakeholder perceptions on whether the project responds to national priorities and existing capacities - Evidence of the inclusion of gender issues in the project design.	- ProDoc - UNDP Program Documents - National and local public policies - UNDP Staff - Project partners	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
Result Framework analysis - 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. - Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.	- Relationships established within the project levels (long-term goal, objective, results and products) - Quality of the identified indicators - Evidence of adjustment of activities during implementation due to recently available information on challenges or concerns	- ProDoc - PIRs - Quarterly reports - Technical progress reports - UNDP Staff - Project partners	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation

Criterion - Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Progress Towards Results - Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets	Results framework indicators	- PIRs - Quarterly reports - Technical progress reports - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective - Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.	Identification of barriers	- UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
Criterion - Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Management Arrangements: - 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. - Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement. - Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.	- Evidence of clear roles and responsibilities for the operational and management structure - Extent of achievement of goals according to the results framework - Stakeholder satisfaction with project staff: accessibility, capabilities, experience, knowledge, efficiency, and punctuality.	- ProDoc - PIRs - Minutes of Steering Committee meetings - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
Work Planning: - Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved. - Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results? - Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.	- Evidence of the use of the results framework and AWP, PIRs as management tools - Stakeholder perceptions and evidence of whether project activities are on track - Degree of compliance with the expected work plan	- ProDoc - PIRs - AWP - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation

<p>Finance and co-finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. - Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions. - 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? - Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: 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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perceptions regarding the profitability of the program. - Implementation level of the program budget - Evidence of the use of financial resources to make management decisions / adaptive management - Evidence of coordination with co-funders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ProDoc - PIRs - AWP - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
<p>Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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? - 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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence of the use of M&E information to make management decisions / adaptive management, inform strategy and planning - Percentage of budget spent on M&E systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PIRs - AWP - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
<p>Stakeholder engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders? - 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? - Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extent to which the project implementation has included stakeholders and collaborated with partners - Stakeholder satisfaction with the level of participation in the project's decision-making mechanism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNDP Program Documents - National and local public policies - PIRs - Minutes of Steering Committee meetings - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document review - Interviews - Triangulation

Reporting - Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board. - 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?) - Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.	- Extent to which lessons learned have been communicated to project stakeholders. - Evidence of the use of reporting information to make adaptive management / management decisions, inform strategy and inform planning	- PIRs - Minutes of Steering Committee meetings - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
Communications: - 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? - 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?)	- Internal communication and feedback circuits that generate useful information in decision-making. - Project information, internal and external, is managed and disseminated effectively.	- PIRs - Minutes of Steering Committee meetings - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation
Criterion - Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
- 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. - In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability: <u>Financial risks to sustainability:</u> 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)? <u>Socio-economic risks to sustainability:</u> 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	- Availability of funds to maintain project results at the end of the project. - Stakeholder perceptions of social and political risks, which can harm project implementation and results. - Stakeholder perception of the institutional framework and governance risks for sustainability - Evidence of relevant environmental risks	- UNDP Program Documents - National and local public policies - PIRs - UNDP Staff - Project partners - Beneficiaries	- Document review - Interviews - Triangulation

<p>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?</p> <p><u>Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>Environmental risks to sustainability:</u> Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?</p>			
--	--	--	--

Annex 3 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection

The questions that guided the Evaluation Team during the virtual interviews during the data collection phase are set exposed below.

Introductory questions for all project stakeholders

- What is your general opinion about the project? Or about the project activities in which you were involved?
- What kinds of activities did you participate in?

These questions have two main functions. First, they make the actors feel comfortable, as they will understand that they can say whatever they want. Second, they allow the Evaluation Team to understand what activities/results are of interest to the respondents and thus adjust the remaining part of the interview, meeting or focus group discussion.

Questions for UNDP staff involved in the project

- To what extent are the project activities aligned with your priorities and policies?
- To what extent are the project objectives still valid?
- Is the project relevant to Colombia's environmental and sustainable development goals?
- Are you applying what you learned in other projects to this project? And / or the other way around, are you applying what you learned in this project to other professional activities you are in charge of?
- Do you like what the project has achieved to date? What is your opinion on the quality of the project results?
- How have the project funds been spent? Have the funds been spent as originally budgeted?
- How has the implementation of the project been monitored? What tools are being used for this purpose?
- Please describe the delays in the implementation of the project, and their causes
- Who were the main beneficiaries at the community level? How were they selected?
- Did the project take local capacity into account in project design and implementation?
- What were the main factors that have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the results and the sustainability of the project to date?
- In your opinion, has the project contributed or is it likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical and environmental changes for individuals, communities and institutions related to the project?
- In your opinion, what difference has the project made? What if the project had not been implemented?
- The project and its contribution towards peace. Please describe why the project is important in that sense.
- What effect have the COVID-19 pandemic and the public order situation had on the implementation of the project / its tasks? Please describe

Questions to national, regional and local authorities involved in the project

- Are you implementing other projects in the project area? If so, are there synergies between those projects and the project under evaluation?
- To what extent were the project activities adapted to your priorities and policies?
- To what extent are the project objectives still valid?
- Have you been in charge of making any decisions during the implementation of the project?
- Do you consider the project relevant to Colombia's environmental and sustainable development objectives?
- What was your role (the role of your institution / organization) in the project identification phase?
- What is your role (the role of your institution / organization) in the implementation of the project?

- Did you apply what you learned in other projects to this project? And/or the other way around, are you applying what you learned in this project to other activities that you are in charge of?
- Do you like what the project has achieved to date? What is your opinion on the quality of the project results to date?
- How do you monitor the implementation of the project?
- Who are the main beneficiaries at the community level? How were they selected?
- Did the project take local capacity into account in project design and implementation?
- What were the main factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the results and the sustainability of the project to date?
- Has the project contributed or is it likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical and environmental changes for individuals, communities and institutions related to the project? Please describe how you think you contribute
- How can the benefits of the project be maintained in the long term?
- Do financial, institutional, political, social, economic, cultural and environmental conditions pose risks to the sustainability of project results?
- In your opinion, what difference has the project made? What if the project had not been implemented?
- To date, have there been any successes and/or problems encountered during the implementation of the Project (including any exceptional achievements / problems that go beyond what is considered average in your country)?
- Project Board: what did you do during implementation? What was your role? What kinds of decisions were made?
- Project Board: the project and its contribution towards peace? Please describe why the project is important in that sense
- Technical committee: what did you do during the implementation? What was your role? What kinds of decisions were made by the technical committee?
- What effect have the COVID-19 pandemic and the public order situation had on the implementation of the project / its tasks? Please describe

Questions for community members of Project areas

- How did you get to know the project? Did you face any obstacles to participate in the project?
- To what extent were the project activities tailored to your needs? Why did you participate in the project activities?
- What did you personally do within the framework of the project? Were you able to easily access the project staff?
- Did you understand what the project staff / consultants / trainers / facilitators suggested to you?
- Did you bear any costs to participate in the project including an increased workload shared between housework, project activities, and your regular work?
- Do you like what the project has accomplished in your community?
- Can you still take advantage of the benefits you received from the project?
- What decisions have you taken to make in the course of implementing the project?
- Do you see any risks that prevent your communities from enjoying the benefits of the project when it ends?
- In your opinion, what difference has the project made? What if the project had not been implemented?
- To what extent are the project activities adapted to the priorities of your community?

Annex 4 – Ratings Scale

The table reports the MTR ratings as per the “Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects”.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating::	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating::	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating::	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management		
Sustainability		

Progress Towards Results Rating Scale		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HI)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.

Project Implementation Rating Scale		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.

2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HI)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Sustainability Rating Scale		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future.
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review.
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained.

Annex 5 - MTR virtual mission schedule

Week 1: 7 -11 June 2021

Monday 7

- 9:00 – 10:00: Meeting with Daily Bastidas.
- 10:00 – 11:15: Meeting with Jairo Bárcenas and Ana María Pulido.
- 14:00 – 14:55: Meeting with Rafael Ramírez and Daily Bastidas.

Tuesday 8

- 8:00 – 9:00: Meeting with Alfonso Valderrama.
- 10:00 – 11:00: Meeting with Alexandra Fischer.
- 13:00 – 14:30: Meeting with Miguel Mejía.
- 15:00 – 15:45 Meeting with Isabel Castro.

Wednesday 9

- 8:00 – 9:00: Meeting with Viviana Robayo.
- 9:00 – 9:45: Meeting with Viviana Robayo and Paola Jimenez.
- 10:00 – 11:30: Participation in a meeting of the Steering Committee to present the MTR exercise.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Alejandro Camero.
- 15:00 – 17:00: Meeting with Fabio Lozano, Miguel Sanchez, Helman Cuadraro and Margarita Nieto.

Thursday 10

- 8:00 – 9:00: Meeting with Josué Durán.
- 9:00 – 10:00: Meeting with Ana Milena Duque.
- 10:00 – 11:00: Meeting with Diana Mejía and Buendy Romero.
- 14:00 – 16:00: Meeting with Sandra Aristizábal, Beatriz Agüera and Ana Milena Duque.
- 16:00 – 17:00: Meeting with Jenny Gallo and Elisa Bravo.

Friday 11

- 10:00 – 12:00: Meeting with Sandra Aristizábal, Beatriz Agüera and Ana Milena Duque.
- 13:00 – 14:00: Meeting with Miguel Mejía.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Marbe Luz and Sharon Olaya.
- 15:00 – 16:00: Meeting with Delfin Tovar.

Week 2: 14 -18 June 2021

Tuesday 15

- 8:00 – 10:00: Meeting with Alfonso Valderrama.
- 10:00 – 11:00: Meeting with Guillermo Prieto.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with María Espinoza, Rocío Murcia and Angy Paola Gómez.
- 15:00 – 16:00: Meeting with 5 project's beneficiaries - AAMPY (3 women and 2 men).
- 16:00 – 17:00: Meeting with Maryi Varon and Jhon Jairo Moreno.

Wednesday 16

- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Sandra Aristizábal.
- 15:00 – 16:00: Meeting with Alfonso Valderrama.
- 16:00 – 17:00: Meeting with Daily Bastidas.

Thursday 17

- 8:00 – 9:00: Meeting with Alejandro Camero.
- 9:00 – 10:00: Meeting with Ana María Pulido.
- 10:30 – 11:00: Meeting with Valentina Ordoñez.
- 15:00 – 16:00: Meeting with Nicolás Velázquez and Edwin Vargas.
- 16:00 – 17:00: Meeting with 1 project's beneficiary - ASECADY (1 woman)

Friday 18

- 8:00 – 10:00: Meeting with Yeimy Ramirez, Nicolas Sanchez, Yorleidy Ortiz, Epismenio Tamayo, Aracelis Ramírez, and Jorge Santofimio.
- 10:00 – 11:00: Meeting with Diana Mejía.
- 13:00 – 14:00: Meeting with Fabián Acosta.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Mario Moreno.
- 15:00 – 16:00: Meeting with Claudia Betancur and Camilo Mejía.

Semana 3: 21 -25 June 2021

Monday 21

- 9:00 – 10:00 Meeting with Jani Silva and Ruben Dario Pastrana.
- 10:00 – 11:00: Meeting with Jefferson Varga.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Sandra Aristizábal, Beatriz Agüera, Ana Milena Duque, Miguel Mejia and Fernando Mora.
- 16:00 – 17:00: Meeting with Wilfredo Pachón.

Tuesday 22

- 10:00 – 10:50: Meeting with 6 project's beneficiaries - ADISPA (3 women and 3 men).
- 11:00 – 11:50: Meeting with 9 project's beneficiaries - SENA (5 women and 4 men).
- 14:00 – 14:55: Meeting with Francisco Charry.

Wednesday 23

- 9:00 – 10:00: Meeting with Rubén Guerrero and Luz Stella Pulido.
- 10:00 – 11:00: Meeting with German Palacio.
- 13:00 – 13:45: Meeting with Laura Bermúdez.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Sandra Aristizábal.
- 16:00 – 17:00: Meeting with Juliet Poveda.

Thursday 24

- 8:00 – 10:00: Meeting with Jaime Barrera, Ana Franco, Gerardo Gaviria and Suhad Abdala.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Miguel Mejía.

Friday 25

- 9:30 – 10:30: Meeting with Sidaly Ortega and Rosa Agrada.
- 11:00 – 12:00: Meeting with Adriana Rodríguez, Marcela Rodríguez, Beatriz Gallego and Carolina Arroba.
- 14:00 – 15:00: Meeting with Harold Vaquero, José Rubiano and Esteban Zamora.
- 15:00 – 16:00: Meeting with Ana María Gonzales, Rafael Gómez and Daniel Sumalavia.
- 16:00 – 17:00: Meeting with Jimena Puyana.

Annex 6 - List of persons interviewed

- Mrs. Daily Bastidas, Technical Liaison Officer in Puerto Asís, UNDP.
- Mr. Jairo Bárcenas, Risk Management and Climate Change Advisor, UNDP.
- Ana María Pulido, Climate Change Liaison Officer with MADS, UNDP.
- Mr. Rafael Ramírez, Indigenous Communities Liaison Officer in Puerto Asís, UNDP.
- Mr. Alfonso Valderrama, Productive Projects Officer, UNDP.
- Mrs. Alexandra Fischer Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP.
- Mr. Miguel Mejía, Project Coordinator, UNDP.
- Mrs. Isabel Castro, Administrative and Financial Assistant, UNDP.
- Mrs. Viviana Robayo, Project Communication Officer, UNDP.
- Mrs. Paola Jiménez, Gender Consultant, UNDP.
- Mr. Alejandro Camero, Institutional Liaison Officer, UNDP.
- Mr. Fabio Lozano, Director of Projects, Paisajes Rurales.
- Mr. Miguel Sánchez, Field Officer, Paisajes Rurales.
- Mr. Helman Cuadraro, Agronomist, Paisajes Rurales.
- Mrs. Margarita Nieto, Socio-economist, Paisajes Rurales.
- Mr. Josué Durán, Technical Liaison Officer in San Vicente del Caguán, UNDP.
- Mrs. Ana Milena Duque, Geographic Information System Officer, UNDP.
- Mrs. Diana Mejía, Production Processes Officer, UNDP.
- Mrs. Buendý Romero, Negocios Verdes and Environmental Education, UNDP.
- Mrs. Sandra Aristizábal, Monitoring Officer, UNDP.
- Mrs. Beatriz Agüera, M&E Consultant, UNDP.
- Mrs. Jenny Gallo, Project Coordinator, Fundación Panthera.
- Mrs. Elisa Bravo, Director of Programmes, Fundación Panthera.
- Mrs. Marbe Luz, Education Coordinator, OPIAC.
- Mrs. Sharon Olaya, Social Officer, OPIAC.
- Mrs. Delfín Tovar, Rector, Institución Educativa San José de Caquetania.
- Mr. Guillermo Prieto, Adaptation to Climate Change Group Coordinator, Climate Change Directorate MADS.
- Mrs. María Espinoza, Legal Representative, AAMPY.
- Mrs. Rocío Murcia, Fiscal, AAMPY.
- Mrs. Anggy Paola Gómez, Education and Communication Secretary, AAMPY.
- 5 project's beneficiaries (3 women and 2 men).
- Mrs. Maryi Varón, Deputy Director, CDA.
- Mr. Jhon Jairo Moreno, Technical Officer for Vaupés y Guaviare, CDA.
- Mrs. Valentina Ordoñez, Profesor, Instituto Tecnológico de Putumayo.
- Mr. Nicolás Velázquez, Legal Representative, ASECADY.
- Mr. Edwin Vargas, Secretary, ASECADY.
- 1 project's beneficiary (1 women)
- Mrs. Yeimy Ramírez, Administrative employee, Cooperativa Multi-Activa Judío Errante.
- Mr. Nicolás Sánchez, Greenhouse employee, Cooperativa Multi-Activa Judío Errante.
- Mrs. Yorleidy Ortiz, President, Cooperativa Multi-Activa Judío Errante.

- Mr. Epismenio Tamayo, Legal Representative, Cooperativa Multi-Activa Judío Errante.
- Mrs. Aracelis Ramírez, Vice President, Cooperativa Multi-Activa Judío Errante.
- Mr. Jorge Santofimio Yépez, Legal Representative, Corporación Arando La Paz.
- Mr. Fabián Acosta, Agro-industry Manager, Colombia Productiva.
- Mr. Mario Moreno, Economist, Instituto Interamericano de Desarrollo.
- Mrs. Claudia Betancur, Director, Biontropic.
- Mr. Camilo Mejía, Business Development Officer, Biontropic.
- Mrs. Jani Silva, Legal Representative, ADISPA.
- Mr. Rubén Dario Pastrana, Animal Husbandry Officer, ADISPA.
- Mr. Jefferson Varga, Instructor, SENA.
- Mr. Fernando Mora, GGE Advisor, UNDP.
- Mr. Wilfredo Pachón, CDA Liaison Officer, UNDP.
- 6 project's beneficiaries (3 women and 3 men).
- 9 project's beneficiaries (5 women y 4 men).
- Mr. Francisco Charry, General Director of Climate Change and Risk Management, MADS.
- Mr. Rubén Guerrero, Forest Reserves Management Group Coordinator, Forest Directorate MADS.
- Mrs. Luz Stella Pulido, Officer, Forest Directorate MADS.
- Mr. German Palacio, Profesor, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Amazonia.
- Mrs. Laura Bermúdez, International Affairs Officer, MADS.
- Mrs. Juliet Poveda, Legal Representative, Amavit.
- Mr. Jaime Barrera, Project Responsible, Instituto SINCHI.
- Mrs. Ana Franco, Researcher, Instituto SINCHI.
- Mr. Gerardo Gaviria, Technical Officer, Instituto SINCHI.
- Mrs. Suhad Abdala, Contract Advisor, Instituto SINCHI.
- Mrs. Sidaly Ortega, Director in charge, Corpoamazonia.
- Mrs. Rosa Agrada, Land Use Planning Deputy Director, Corpoamazonia.
- Mrs. Adriana Rodríguez, Project Coordinator, Patrimonio Natural.
- Mrs. Marcela Rodríguez, Communication Officer, Patrimonio Natural.
- Mrs. Beatriz Gallego, Technical Officer, Patrimonio Natural.
- Mrs. Carolina Arroba, Technical Liaison Officer in Putumayo, Patrimonio Natural.
- Mr. Harold Vaquero, CORPOAYARI.
- Mr. José Rubiano, CORPOAYARI.
- Mr. Esteban Zamora, CORPOAYARI.
- Mrs. Ana María Gonzales, Regional Project Director, WB.
- Mr. Rafael Gómez, Regional Project Technical Officer, WB.
- Mr. Daniel Sumalavia, Regional Project M&E Officer , WB.
- Mrs. Jimena Puyana, Sustainable Development Manager, UNDP.

Annex 7 - List of documents consulted

Documents

- ⇒ *Documento de proyecto Estrategia para la promoción y comercialización de productos sostenibles como medida de reactivación económica post COVID.*
- ⇒ *Documento guía sobre la inclusión de los ODS en los PIGCCT.*
- ⇒ *Documento sobre priorización inicial de sectores de trabajo.*
- ⇒ *Documento sobre escuelas de promotorías campesinas.*
- ⇒ *Documento sobre salvaguardas prediales en relación con la tenencia y uso de la tierra y derechos territoriales de los campesinos.*
- ⇒ *Documento sobre la identificación de áreas ambientales y ecosistemas estratégicos de importancia para la conservación desde la perspectiva comunitaria.*
- ⇒ *Documento sobre Conectividad del paisaje a escala predial y zonificación agroambiental en Putumayo.*
- ⇒ *Documentos sobre planeación participativa predial y seguridad alimentaria.*
- ⇒ *Documento sobre identificación de la meta a alcanzar por el proyecto en torno al indicador “emisiones de gases efecto invernadero mitigadas”.*
- ⇒ *Estrategia de comunicación – Amazonia Sostenible para la Paz.*
- ⇒ *Estrategia de gestión de conocimientos- Amazonia Sostenible para la Paz.*
- ⇒ *Estrategia regional de cambio climático para una Amazonia Resiliente y Adaptada.*
- ⇒ *Estrategia de fortalecimiento pedagógico de las instituciones educativas rurales.*
- ⇒ *Estrategia de monitoreo comunitario participativo.*
- ⇒ *Fichas de los determinantes ambientales de Guainía y Vaupés.*
- ⇒ *Fichas de indicadores y core indicators.*
- ⇒ *Guía para la inclusión del componente de Cambio Climático.*
- ⇒ *Informe de resultados de los talleres de socialización del inventario forestal y la identificación de especies útiles del bosque con comunidades del área del interés del proyecto Asociación de trabajadores campesinos de Piamonte Cauca.*
- ⇒ *Informes finales talleres POA.*
- ⇒ *Informes Plan de Acción acuerdo PNUD – Colombia Productiva.*
- ⇒ *Lista de verificación de detección de riesgos sociales y Ambientales.*
- ⇒ *Plan de Pueblos Indígenas.*
- ⇒ *Plan Integral de gestión de cambio climático territorial para el departamento Amazonas.*
- ⇒ *Plan Integral de gestión de cambio climático territorial del departamento del Caquetá 2050.*
- ⇒ *Presentación del proyecto “Amazonia Sostenible para la Paz” (junio 2021).*
- ⇒ *PPS Sector alto Morrocoy.*
- ⇒ *ProDoc and annexes.*
- ⇒ *Project Implementation Reports 2018, 2019, 2020.*

⇒ *Reportes trimestrales 2018, 2019, 2020.*

Webpages:

- ⇒ www.thegef.org
- ⇒ <https://www.co.undp.org>
- ⇒ <https://www.colombiaproductiva.com>
- ⇒ <https://www.corazondelaamazonia.org>
- ⇒ <http://paisajesrurales.com>
- ⇒ <https://www.sinchi.org.co>
- ⇒ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/amazon-sustainable-landscapes-program>
- ⇒ <https://www.minambiente.gov.co/index.php/noticias/5177-red-de-viverismo-comunitario-un-proyecto-que-fortalece-la-paz-y-los-bosques>
- ⇒ <https://www.elspectador.com/colombia-20/paz-y-memoria/una-apuesta-que-reune-la-paz-y-el-medio-ambiente-en-el-amazonas-article/>
- ⇒ <https://www.semana.com/sostenible/negocios-verdes/articulo/con-red-de-viveros-fortalecen-la-paz-y-restauran-los-bosques-de-la-amazonia/202138/>
- ⇒ <http://podcast.unradio.unal.edu.co/programa/ambiente-glocal#>

Annex 8 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

Evaluators/Consultants:

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project mid term review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of the International Evaluator: Giacomo Morelli

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

Signed on 20/05/2021

Signature:

Name of the National Evaluator: Maria Carolina Pinilla Herrera

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

Signed on 20/05/2021

Signature:

