

## **Mid-Term Evaluation**

GSI Phase II Project: Ecological and Financial Sustainable  
Management of the Guiana Shield Eco-region

## **Final Draft**

**Submitted by:**

**Mark Johnstad  
P.O. Box 981  
Emigrant, MT 59027 USA  
Email: "mjohsntad@igc.org"**

**November 6, 2009**

## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACATISEMA.....	La Asociación de Cabildos Tradicionales Indígenas de la Selva Matavén
ACTO .....	Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization
CI.....	Conservation International
DRR.....	Deputy Resident Representative
EC.....	European Community
ES .....	Ecosystem Service
GEF .....	Global Environment Facility
GSI .....	Guiana Shield Initiative
IUCN .....	International Union for Conservation of Nature
M&E.....	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU.....	Memorandum of Understanding
MUMA .....	Multiple Use Management Area
NGO .....	Non-Governmental Organization
NL.....	Netherlands
NTFP .....	Non-Timber Forest Products
PES .....	Payment for Ecosystem Services
PMU .....	Project Management Unit
PPC.....	Pilot Project Coordinator
RDS .....	Sustainable Development Reserve
REDD .....	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
RR.....	Resident Representative
SC .....	Steering Committee
SEMA.....	Special Secretariat of the Environment (Brazil)
SMART .....	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-Bound
UNDP .....	United Nations Development Programme
WWF.....	World Wildlife Fund

**Table of Contents**

**Executive Summary**

**Part One: Introduction ..... 1**

**Part Two: Findings ..... 5**

**Part Three: Conclusions ..... 16**

**Part Four: Recommendations ..... 18**

**Part Five: Lessons Learned ..... 23**

**Annexes**

Terms of Reference..... 1

Evaluation Work Plan..... 9

## **Executive Summary**

The project is relevant and addresses emerging international, regional, national and local issues. Qualified individuals and organizations support implementation. The PMU and UNDP are well suited to support this project. IUCN/NL's technical backstopping is useful. Field personnel are solid. The Steering Committee is exemplary.

The project has already delivered some good successes and is on-track to deliver a few positive impacts. The project is generating momentum and support for the concept of more eco-region based decision-making. The project has assembled a strong management team, helped build a regional GSI cohort, successfully completed contracts with two pilot sites, and has begun to generate interesting lessons at the Guyana site where a good team and a vibrant community support fieldwork. Some useful knowledge products have been generated, particularly remote sensing maps that allow for both the conceptualization of the eco-region and the monitoring of ecological alterations.

Unfortunately, the project has been painfully slow to progress. These delays negatively impact both effectiveness and sustainability. Several years into implementation the project's effectiveness, impacts and prospects for sustainability are unknown and/or limited. Delays are in part due to the fact that the project is both innovative and ambitious.

The initial project design failed to take adequate account of the time and financing required when implementing an innovative program in a geographically large, culturally diverse, and politically incongruent region. For instance, simply establishing the groundwork required for the initiative to gain traction in some countries has required years of effort. This work is necessary and important, but not fully reflected in project outputs.

The project does not benefit from a strong and well-reasoned logical framework. This should be a vital concern for stakeholders. The framework lacks measurable indicators that would allow managers to track progress towards clearly defined objectives.

This mid-term evaluation is taking place in the 37th month of a 48-month project. The project is now running out of time and money. If the project continues on its current trajectory it will fall short of many of the more ambitious and complex objectives such as establishing a regional policy network. Decision-makers should realize that the moment has come for adaptive management. This project needs to very quickly deliver and record models of success that motivate action and support by regional governments and international funders.

GSI Phase II is essentially a preparatory endeavor for a GSI Phase III. The final months of project activity will likely focus upon establishing pilot sites in Brazil and Suriname. These are fine outcomes, but these and other project activities are not and will not be self-sustaining by project close. They will all require further financial support. Project stakeholders must use the coming months to prepare for and capture Phase III funding. This will require closely re-examine project short-comings, establish clear and realistic objectives, and designing activities that more closely align with these objectives.

Critical to this effort will be the design of a concise program strategy that is clear and accessible to regional governments, NGO's, and potential funders. The GSI must quickly learn, adapt, and strengthen its approach so that investments are much more strategic and synergetic.

The GSI is a great idea. However, the GSI must be strategic and synergistic. The initiative will not succeed if it is simply a good idea that makes a number of relatively small investments scattered across an enormous region hoping these will eventually take root and bear fruit.

Specific recommendations discussed in the evaluation include:

1. Extend Duration of GSI Phase II to complete key tasks and generate Phase III
2. Revise and improve the project's logical framework
3. Broaden project perspective to encompass all benefits of ecosystem services
4. Expand opportunities for learning and coalition building between tiers
5. Capture lessons learned early and make concrete plan for dissemination
6. Maximize impact of IUCN technical support
7. Identify a transboundary location for replicating project activity
8. Identify and close regional policy gaps related to project objectives
9. Improve Government Engagement
10. Generate a brief communication strategy
11. GSI should not be considered as a climate change only initiative

## **Part One: Introduction**

### **1.1 Background and Context of the Programme**

The GSI Phase II project “Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guiana Shield Eco-Region” was signed in July 2006 and commenced in early 2007. The project’s original duration was 42 months with a closing date of December 2009. The project has received a no-cost extension until June 2010. The project is a multi-donor action financed by a €2.4 million grant of which €1.7 million is a cash contribution from the EC. To date, the project has expended approximately €1,140,690.

### **1.2 Brief Project Description**

The Paramaribo Declaration adopted more than seven years past (April 2002) set the conceptual basis for the Phase II project.

The Guiana Shield Eco-region covers 2.5 million km<sup>2</sup>. It extends from Colombia in the west to the Brazilian state of Amapá in the east, including the Venezuelan states of Delta Amacuro, Bolívar and Amazonas, all of Guyana, Suriname and French Guiana, and continuing into the ecologically associated areas of the Brazilian States of Pará, Roraima and Amazonas.

From the GSI website:

The (Guiana Shield) region as a whole is still mostly intact, but threats, both from the outside and from the inside, are mounting. Oil palm plantations, coca fields and foreign logging companies are moving towards or into the Guiana Shield, the road infrastructure through and inside the Shield is being expanded and there is an urgent need to control the major inside threat: gold mining, with its many environmentally and socially disruptive effects. Therefore, international and regional agencies must cooperate to cope with these threats and to provide the countries and their populations with appealing, sustainable alternatives.

This is exactly what the Guiana Shield Initiative, officially launched in 1996 by IUCN NL, aims to do. One of the main features is setting up financial mechanisms that reward and compensates inhabitants and governments for the conservation of the ecology of the Guiana Shield.

In addition to payments for ecosystem services regarding climate, biodiversity, and watershed management, the Guiana Shield Initiative will promote that income is generated through market-oriented activities such as eco-tourism, sustainable timber harvesting or Non-Timber Forest Products. An innovative monitoring system will verify whether participants live up to the agreements. During GSI - Phase II, which is mainly funded by the European Union, pilot sites will serve as a testing ground to find out how these financial mechanisms can be implemented and replicated throughout the entire Guiana Shield Eco-Region.

The GSI - Phase II June 2007 Inception Report:

This project makes up part of the broader Guiana Shield Initiative (GSI). It will support activities that contribute to the design of financing mechanisms for forest conservation and management, and innovative financial strategies. The pilot projects will be aiming at

setting up an innovative financial mechanism for forest conservation and sustainable management. This project will also work to influence policies and sectors on forests, such as land tenure, logging and mining. As this is a regional project it is anticipated that results can be fed into both national level policy discussion and international processes for forest policy formulation, e.g. Mean's, GEF.

The project will support activities which assist small and community-based enterprises; promote sustainable harvesting, processing and marketing of NTFPs; and support the strengthening of cooperatives concerned with sustainable management of timber and NTFPs. Each pilot project will have an element of sustainable livelihood generation....

Sustainable use of forest biodiversity, development of NTFP's will be sought within the pilot projects that contribute to both improved livelihoods and conservation of biodiversity. Within the pilot project issues relating to sustainable use of wildlife and fish resources in forest areas will be addressed and alternatives to over-exploitation will be sought.

### **1.3 Project's Logical Framework**

The project has a rather convoluted logical framework.

The project's current logical framework outlines one overall and eight sub-objectives. The Overall Objective (Goal) is "To promote the sustainable development of the Guiana Shield by means of an integrated eco-regional (policy, institutional and financial) management framework." The eight sub-objectives are:

1. Set up and implement at least three projects within the Guiana Shield eco-region by year two
2. Develop ecosystem management contracts and benefit sharing mechanisms with pilot project partners by year two
3. Develop and operate an ecosystem monitoring system by year three
4. Conduct a study on market mechanisms and payment systems for ES produced by the pilot projects
5. Institutionally develop the GSI within the Guiana Shield Eco-region
6. Coordinate and manage the GSI Phase II project
7. Monitor and evaluate the GSI Phase II Project
8. Communicate the results of the GSI Phase II Project

The project further aims towards the achievement of eight results:

1. Three pilot projects receiving payments for environmental services, one of which will be trans-boundary
2. A study on market mechanisms and possible payment systems for environmental services
3. Several sustainable livelihood projects ongoing in or near pilot projects
4. An ecosystem monitoring system will be set up for the pilot projects
5. Study on major institutional arrangements within the Guiana Shield
6. Workshop with relevant institutions operating in the region
7. An institutional presence in the region
8. A policy network

### **1.4 Project Management and Technical Support**

UNDP is responsible for project implementation. IUCN NL is the technical implementing partner to the UNDP. IUCN NL was responsible for initial project design and continues to provide technical support.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is situated within UNDP/Guyana and is lead by a full-time Project Manager. The project has two full-time staff persons situated within the IUCN NL offices and several staff located in various pilot sites. The project's active Steering Committee has representation from each GSI member country, donors and conservation organizations.

### **1.5 Project Activities to Date**

The project has managed to generate several knowledge products, including studies on future institutional positioning, inventory of future payment systems for ecosystem services, and a review of potential monitoring approaches (primarily remote sensing). A few major activities remain to be completed, including initiating additional pilot sites and establishment of a policy network.

The project is implementing activities at three pilot sites: Brazil (RDS Rio Iratapuru), Colombia (Matavén) and Guyana (Iwokrama). The project is working towards implementing a fourth pilot project at an additional site in Suriname (North Saramacca MUMA with Coppename River Mouth).

The intention is that activities implemented at each site will generate lessons learned that may be replicated and up-scaled regionally. To date, only Colombia and Guyana are fully operational with activities significantly further along in Guyana. Colombia and Guyana have established agreements for ecosystem services monitoring as well for the development of mechanisms for the generation and distribution of benefits. The Brazil pilot site has been very slow to mature due to political and bureaucratic hurdles. The project recently clarified some challenges in Brazil. This site may soon commence monitoring activities under a framework agreement.

### **1.6 Purpose of the Evaluation**

This mid-term evaluation reviews progress towards the achievement of the project's eight results and detailed logical framework. The evaluation documents lessons learned and will, ideally, help guide continued improvement of project effectiveness.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Identify project design and implementation issues across the Guiana Shield countries,
2. Assess progress towards the achievement of the targets, the results, and impact and use of resources;
3. Review factors influencing the achievement of results;
4. Identify and document lessons learned;
5. Assess the contributions of project partners;
6. Make recommendations regarding specific actions and project adjustments that might be taken to improve the project and support needed to achieve intended impacts at the end of the project.

### **1.7 Evaluation Approach and methodology**



The evaluation relied upon the following methods to generate information and formulate opinions:

1. Document review;
2. Brief field visits to the UNDP/Guyana office and the Guyana pilot site;
3. Email communication with key stakeholders and project implementers; and,
4. Telephone interviews with select stakeholders.

Activity
Field Mission: Guyana
Submit evaluation work plan
Conduct document review and initial stakeholder communication
Submit email questions to stakeholders based upon initial findings
Complete and submit first draft report
Oversight Committee reviews and comments on draft report
Revise report and submit final document with power point

A short field mission to Guyana took place from August 10 – August 13. Extensive meetings were held with key project staff at UNDP/Guyana offices, e.g., project manager, support staff, and Deputy Resident Representative (DRR). The mission included two days visiting the North Rupununi and Iwokrama pilot site where the evaluator met with key stakeholders such as the Pilot Project Coordinator (PPC), Iwokrama field station staff, and a variety of local community representatives, e.g., Ministry of Amerindian Affairs representative, NRDDB, head of the Fairview community, etc. This field visit also involved accompanying project and Iwokrama staff on a GSI monitoring activity.

All major reports, outputs, budgets and other documentation were reviewed. Telephone, Skype, and email interviews were held with key stakeholders including UNDP, IUCN NL, project staff, and members of the Project Steering Committee.

The evaluation culminates with the completion and submission of this concise report. The report reflects the evaluation principles as characterized by the work plan and the terms of reference. The report includes a comprehensive account of the information and data sources utilized without identifying specific individuals, risk factors, assessments of the performance to date, achievements, lessons learned, and implications for future implementation.

This is a rapid evaluation of an ambitious project. There were two key limiting factors for this evaluation. First, due to time and financial constraints, field visits were limited to the Iwokrama site. Second, the evaluation took place near the end of the project cycle. In spite of these challenges, the evaluation hopefully results in a fair and accurate assessment of project successes and challenges.

## **Part Two: Findings**

### **2.1 Overall Finding**

The overall project is satisfactory.

The project concept is very strong and relevant. The project is well managed and supported by qualified technical staff and an active Steering Committee. The project is on-track to deliver innovative and useful products. Unfortunately, the project suffers from a very weak design framework that creates many barriers to efficient implementation.

### **2.2 Project Design**

This is a very ambitious project with a relatively small budget spread across a very large and politically/culturally complex region. The Guiana Shield is a landscape linked ecologically but separated politically and culturally. Language alone is a challenge. National languages include French, English, Spanish, Dutch, and Portuguese. There are numerous more native languages. Pilot projects are established in three countries (Guyana, Brazil and Colombia). Management and technical support rests in UNDP/Guyana, IUCN/Netherlands, and each UNDP country office. Steering committee members are situated in each member country.

The project's basically largely un-documented concept and purposes are clear to most project stakeholders. The region safeguards some of the world's most important biological treasures and is critical to the resolution of global climate challenges. Putting together an initiative to generate momentum that links the diverse cultural landscapes to conserve this remarkable natural landscape is worthy. Creating synergies between a steering committee with some of the region's most respected conservationists, the development experience of UNDP, expertise of the IUCN, donor power of the EU, and action knowledge and potential of local communities is quite good.

However, the project suffers from supporting weak design documents. These fail to provide the project with the logic, clarity and tracking tools required making the most efficient use of time and money. These are particularly important concerns for such an ambitious endeavor.

The most glaring problem is a poorly formulated logical framework. However, documentation that led to funding fails to succinctly state the exact objective of the initiative. For instance, the framework does not clearly elucidate why certain pilot activities are taking place, how these activities will lead to fundamental policy improvements on national and regional levels, and/or provide "SMART" indicators. Not having a clearly thought-out game plan has certainly contributed to the project's numerous delays. Fixing this problem would alleviate project implementation challenges and greatly increase both efficiency and effectiveness.

### **2.3 Project Management**

The project's management team and overall concept are quite strong. This is the main reason for momentum and success to date.

UNDP and IUCN are well suited to the task at hand. IUCN-Netherlands Committee has a long history of support the GSI, enjoys a very solid professional relationship with the EU, and has excellent in-house technical capacity. UNDP's classic comparative advantage is offices in each country that benefit from traditionally strong relations with each national government. This is particularly helpful for a regional project. The project has assembled a stellar Steering

Committee filled with some of the region's most notable conservationists. On the pilot site level, the project has worked diligently to recruit well-qualified national experts and organizations with solid reputations. Project management and technical support staff – both in UNDP/Guyana and IUCN/Netherlands – are very well qualified and dedicated.

## **2.4 Financial Management and Cost-Effectiveness**

**Table: GSI Phase II Budget**

<b>PILOT SITE SUPPORT</b>	<b>€ 648,212</b>
Pilot Projects (selection and hiring of coordinators)	127,946
Contracts and Benefit Sharing (identification, development, negotiation and signature) (Part of ES agreement and budget)	0
Sustainable livelihood alternatives within PPs identified	90,000
Field visits assessing ecosystem goods and services each pilot area	48,000
Four Direct Payments to Pilot Sites	382,266
<b>KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS</b>	<b>€ 216,513</b>
Study on monitoring schemes	59,077
Appropriate ecosystem monitoring scheme assessed and designed	123,726
Remote sense-based survey (baseline & final)	15,923
Institutional arrangements in the Guiana Shield	17,787
Payment systems for ecosystem goods and services (Part of IUCN NL costs)	0
<b>WORKSHOPS and CONFERENCES</b>	<b>€ 5,844</b>
Institutional embedding of GSI within Guiana Shield eco-region	3,165
Sharing lessons learnt	0
Conferences and Seminars	2,202
Translations	477
<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>	<b>€ 17,377</b>
Website restructured and maintained	7,983
News and information database, publications, newsletters	9,394
<b>REPORTING AND MONITORING</b>	<b>€ 5,858</b>
Audit of project accounts (Part of Admin costs UNDP)	0
Monitoring visits to pilot projects carried out External (EC budget)	0
Internal monitoring and evaluation of pilot projects	1,111
Final evaluation of the EC project by external independent consultant	4,747
<b>PROJECT MANGEMENT</b>	<b>€ 278,918</b>
Project Management (PMU, office, travel)	254,922
Steering committee (SC) installed and operating (Part of IUCN NL personnel costs)	0
Annual meeting of SC	23,996
<b>TECHNICAL SUPPORT</b>	<b>€ 525,694</b>
Technical Project Officer selected and hired	392,083
Senior Project Manager selected and hired	133,611

<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>€ 76,995</b>
Administration Charges (7%)	76,995
<b>Total Project Budget (CASH)</b>	<b>€ 1,775,411</b>

The project has a relatively small budget for a big task. This project intends to spend approximately €985,000 for Administration, Technical Support and Project Management. This represents nearly 60% of the project's total "cash" budget (1.7 million Euros). Of course, much of this work contributes to the generation of local level results and related knowledge products. However, such a disproportionate allocation of resources coupled with a weak logical framework generally serves as a red flag that warrants further consideration.

Pilot Projects (selection and hiring of coordinators)	127,946
Project Management (PMU, office, travel)	254,922
Technical Project Officer selected and hired	392,083
Senior Project Manager selected and hired	133,611
Administration Charges (7%)	76,995
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 985,557</b>

The project benefits significantly from co-financing as indirect financial flows via the IUCN small-grants program. This indicator of cost-effectiveness is discussed in more detail later in the report.

## **2.5 Efficiency, Effectiveness and Impact Prospects and Sustainability**

Without the benefit of a proper logical framework, assessing the project's efficiency and effectiveness at achieving indicators is quite challenging. The project is accomplishing things, particularly at the Iwokrama field site. However, overall performance has been defined by very slow progress, particularly with getting pilot sites operational. This is not surprising and reflects the innovative nature of the project and possible project design shortcomings. This does not reflect an unmotivated and/or unqualified PMU. On the contrary, the PMU is both motivated and qualified.

The project's effectiveness was also harmed because the complementary UNDP/GEF project intended to promote a regional institutional mechanism to support integrated ecosystem management never materialized.

At the same time, many of the project's knowledge products are lackluster. They are interesting to read, but do not necessarily offer practical solutions and/or thinking that will help achieve GSI objectives. Most simply present summaries of current global or regional trends and thinking.

One great exception is the maps the project has developed. These maps succeed in showing the region as single ecological entity. The impact of this perspective is important and will likely help decision-makers to view their resource management approaches differently. On a more local scale, these innovative maps are allowing stakeholders to track and monitor ecological changes in a way that was never before possible. Again, this is a substantial contribution that will support the project's long-term impacts.

In spite of these challenges, the project continues to attempt to implement overly ambitious and vague objectives rather than re-evaluate challenges and practice adaptive management. The project waited a bit too long to conduct the mid-term evaluation which would have been the most reasonable time to re-align project activity. This will have a further negative impact on efficiency and effectiveness.

The news is not all bad. At this juncture, the prospects for short-term impact are good. Momentum is picking up significantly. The bureaucratic logjam at the Brazil pilot site seems to be clearing. Colombia is picking up steam. The work in Iwokrama is progressing well. Again, the folks supporting this fieldwork are qualified and dedicated. It's a good team of people. The IUCN/NL technical staff is very excited about the project and concept. The same is true with UNDP and the PMU. The Steering Committee is excellent and their involvement and support will certainly have positive impacts.

The next challenge, however, will be sustainability. The prospects for more wide-ranging, regional impacts are quite low unless the project receives Phase III funding. GSI – Phase II is unlikely to meaningfully achieve standard indicators of sustainability (e.g., mainstreaming, financing, etc.) prior to the June 2010 end-date.

The project is helping to create new knowledge regarding ecosystem valuation and management that will be incorporated to some extent within regional policies and activities. However, governments, local communities, and/or NGO's are unlikely to independently carry on and fund activities implemented to date such as remote sensing and on-the-ground monitoring. They are not economical. As project studies conclude, generating baseline information and monitoring are expensive and time-consuming and receiving cash compensation for conserving ecosystems services remains a remote possibility. The result is very little investment incentive. This situation would change dramatically if the international community alters current carbon policies. This appears highly unlikely and isn't the best horse to bet upon.

Conservation communities (e.g. CI, WWF, etc.) seem to be adopting and promoting the GS as an eco-region. The project has not found much success in mainstreaming of objectives within Government frameworks, the typical vehicle used to promote regional level perspectives in decision-making. To improve impact and sustainability, the project will likely need to strengthen the approach towards greater involvement and buy-in by government institutions. This will likely include the design of specific communication strategies, identification and removal of policy barriers and other traditional and non-traditional methodologies.

This aside, the project's prospects for achieving sustainability indicators such as stakeholder mainstreaming and financing the continuation of project products would likely increase significantly under a well-designed Phase III that allows for the maturation of activities initiated regionally and within pilot site. That means in order for the project to achieve impact and sustainability, Phase II must be seen as a preparatory exercise for Phase III with shortcomings alleviated and strategic approaches strengthened. This is discussed at length within the evaluation.

## **2.6 Progress Towards Project Objectives**

***Overall Objective (Goal): To promote the sustainable development of the Guiana Shield by means of an integrated eco-regional (policy, institutional and financial) management framework***

Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
An integrated management programme is operational	Ecosystem services (ES) contracts  MOUs or other formal arrangements with regional entities  Policies and institutional arrangements	Governments and regional entities support the goal of the GSI
An initial payment system for ecosystem services is developed		Countries of the Guiana Shield cooperate to facilitate the set up of an integrated eco-regional management framework
Ecosystems of the Guiana Shield are being managed sustainably and generating income for services provided		Donors or market-based mechanisms support conservation of the Guiana Shield through payment schemes for ecosystem services (ES)
The countries of the Guiana Shield are cooperating on issues relating to integrated ecosystem management		

### Evaluation Findings

These lofty indicators are subjective and not measureable. They read like objectives. None will be achieved within the project's lifespan, but the project is helping to promote momentum towards each. The knowledge products, pilot site activities and decision-making support of the Steering Committee are each helping the region move closer to integrated management. Although none of the project activities will likely result in cash payments for ecosystem services, the project is promoting the PES concept. Likewise, by project end all ecosystems of the Guiana Shield will not be managed sustainably with income services being generated, but progress towards this objective will be made and the countries will be cooperating – through the Steering Committee – on issues related to integrated ecosystem management.

The project has successfully put in place model ecosystem service contacts for Colombia and Guyana pilot sites. The other means of verification are not yet evident. There is an aide memoire with ACTO, letters of support from SEMA (Amapá State, Brazil) and the Government of Colombia, a cooperation agreement with Iwokrama, and a draft cooperation agreement with the Government of Suriname.

### ***Objective One: Set up and implement at least three projects within the Guiana Shield eco-region by year two***

Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Agreements between UNDP and pilot project (PP) management entities	Letters of support Cooperation agreements Lease for PP offices PP signage	Governments support selection of sites for PPs
PP offices		Local people support the initiative

### Evaluation Findings

For the last several years, the project has followed a fairly systematic approach towards establishing pilot site activities:

1. Introducing the project to the governments of the Guiana Shield countries (GS-6), regional conservation organizations, and UNDP country offices
2. Identifying focal points within national governments and setting up communication and procedural approaches
3. Identifying and selecting pilot sites and obtaining government approval for the set up of a GSI pilot project at the approved site
4. Identification of local communities associated with the pilot site

5. Consultations with the management entity of the pilot site as well as associated local communities
6. Carry out baseline missions to each site to identify the ecosystem services, indicator-based framework for monitoring, and benefit sharing approaches
7. Set up the pilot project office and procedures
8. Design and sign the ecosystem services contract / agreements stage in-text
9. Implement the agreements for at least one year, if possible: development of ES management plan and business plan with benefit sharing mechanism
10. Produce project reports and sharing of information with key stakeholders

However, progress towards the objective of fully launching three pilot sites by project year two has been very slow. The project is in the process of implementing pilot projects at sites in Colombia and Guyana and formalizing one in Brazil. Activities including monitoring and capacity building that are well advanced in Guyana, e.g. regular river patrols by protected area staff, community-based conservation and monitoring projects, training programs, remote sensing support, manual on monitoring, etc. The project is on the cusp of formalizing federal support for the Brazil pilot project, and finalizing an agreement for the establishment of a pilot project in Suriname.

Although there are no “transboundary” locations, the project has done a good job of selecting and establishing sites that provide diverse examples of implementation modalities. Each site will present an agreement with a different type of management entity. The Guyana agreement is with an international conservation organization, Colombia with an Amerindian organization, Brazil with local government, and potentially, Suriname with the national government. These models will hopefully assist regional replication with a variety of governmental, non-governmental, and tribal levels. Given time, these should provide good examples for future replication. This diverse experience is reflected in the innovative contracting approach supported by the project.

***Objective Two: Develop ecosystem management contracts and benefit sharing mechanisms with pilot project partners by year two***

Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
Consultations with PP management entities	Consultation reports	Collaborative or benefit sharing agreements exists
ES contracts	ES contract documents	Contracts are flexible to allow inclusion of culturally appropriate language

**Evaluation Findings**

The project has concluded agreements with the pilot sites in Colombia and Guyana. A third is drafted for Brazil and may be signed in late 2009. These are quite innovative and describe the preliminary steps for both the generation and distribution of ecosystem related benefits. However, for Colombia and in Guyana, the Government Agencies typically responsible for resource allocation and management are not signatories. This may weaken future implementation. A tri-partite agreement between the Colombian Ministry of Environment, ACATISEMA and UNDP has been drafted and is undergoing final review.

In the case of Guyana, UNDP supported significant community natural resource management regulations in the North Rupununi prior to the commencement of GSI Phase II. This previous endeavor required nearly two years of community work and is finding traction with villages

adopting and implementing the regulatory framework. This may provide valuable lessons for the GSI.

***Objective Three: Develop and operate an ecosystem monitoring system by year three***

Indicator	Means of verification
Survey of ES monitoring options	ES monitoring reports
Design and testing of ES monitoring system per site	Updated vegetation and other radar-based maps
Collection and evaluation of data on indicators	Site specific data on ES indicators

**Evaluation Findings**

The project is developing ecosystem monitoring within Iwokrama (e.g., forest and riverine wildlife monitoring). This is commencing in Colombia as well. In both instances, IUCN provides technical over-sight and support. The project is moving forward with the creation of satellite imagery with field verification (ground-truthing) for pilot sites. Standardized ecosystem monitoring framework has been developed for the three established sites and the required data lists are being populated. A new vegetation map for Iwokrama Programme Site and change detection maps for the three sites have been produced. By all accounts, this effort has been a success and contributes significantly to the capacity of both the project and pilot sites to monitor ecosystem alterations.

The project is providing Iwokrama with direct financial support (approximately US\$200,000) for piloting the monitoring system from August 2008 to December 2009. The terms of this agreement are quite clear and extensive (see, "Micro-Capital Grant Agreement between UNDP and Iwokrama International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development for the Provision of Grant Funds.) Unfortunately, the delay in start-up and conclusion of the agreement does not allow for the generation of data over a full-two year period.

A similar MOU was established in Colombia between ACATISMA and UNDP. (See, MEMORANDO DE ENTENDIMIENTO ENTRE EL PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL DESARROLLO Y LA ASOCIACION DE CABILDOS TRADICIONALES INDIGENAS DE LA SELVA MATAVEN (ACATISEMA)).

***Objective Four: Conduct a study on market mechanisms and payment systems for ES produced by the pilot projects***

Indicators	Means of verification
Literature review	Report
Interviews	

**Evaluation Findings**

An **"Inventory of existing and possible future payment systems for ecosystem services"** was completed in October 2007. This is a literature review and survey paper providing a broad academic summary of PES as applied to values such as watersheds, carbon, biodiversity and forestry. The study provides less than two pages of vague recommendations that might be considered as specifically germane to the project and this vague guidance applies only to Iwokrama. The study most certainly does not meet Objective Four's aspirations if Objective Four is intended to deliver a practical guide to assist pilot sites understand exactly how to design, implement and market PES programs.



In April 2009, the project completed a second study entitled: **“Carbon Assessment of Three Pilot Areas of the Guiana Shield Initiative: Iwokrama, Iratapuru and Matavén”**. This is a relatively solid product. After reviewing each of the sites, the study concludes... “the three GSI pilot projects assessed in this report for their carbon content, Iwokrama, Iratapuru and Matavén, would currently not be able to qualify for any trading of ‘credits’ due to their non-compliance with the additionality criterion. It is therefore impossible at this stage to attach an economic value to the carbon storage services these projects provide, based on actual carbon market prices. Overall, it seems unlikely that a post-Kyoto REDD deal or voluntary carbon markets will bring much prospect of carbon finance to the Guiana Shield region as a whole.”

Each pilot project is required to develop a business plan based on identification of ecosystem services, monitoring, reporting, verification and incentives for compensation. These are "in process".

***Objective Five: Institutionally develop the GSI within the Guiana Shield Eco-region***

Indicators	Means of verification
Desk study on institutional development of the GSI	Desk study report
Workshop on institutional embedding of the GSI	Workshop report

**Evaluation Findings**

In March 2009, an independent consultant completed a study entitled: **"Institutionalizing the Guiana Shield Initiative: Elements for a well-considered and justified choice and decision."** The desk study considers the future of the GSI as two possible scenarios: A) Benefit the protected areas of the Guiana Shield region and the forest peoples involved in their conservation; or, B) Promote inter-government collaboration for the protection of natural resources and the sustainable development of the Guiana Shield region.

Using primarily Internet derived sources, the report offers three primary options: (1) establishment of a regional center tasked with several functions; (2) creation of a multi-lateral agreement; and/or; (3) nesting with an existing NGO - the other two options discussed.

The report recommends the first option, establishment of a regional center. Although the report does not call the “center” an NGO, this is essentially the core of the recommendation. The center would be a regional organization with an independent budget, terms of reference, diverse board membership, and tasked with incorporating many of the activities currently undertaken by the PMU. The center would be tasked with coordinating with other "less regional" organizations (e.g., ACTO, UNDP, nation research institutions and environmental agencies) and performing GSI support functions such as information generation, capacity development, brokering PES, guiding research and policy, managing the proposed conservation fund, etc.

The workshop on institutional embedding has not taken place. It is planned for February 2010.

***Objective Six: Coordinate and manage the GSI Phase II project***

Indicators	Means of verification
Hire Project Manager for the Project Management Unit (PMU)	Staff contracts
Set up and operationalise the PMU	Office lease
Hire other staff	Equipment and materials purchase receipts

### Evaluation Findings

The project has established a PMU and benefits from the support of a very qualified project manager with strong technical background, language skills, and regional experience.

### ***Objective Seven: Monitor and evaluate the GSI Phase II Project***

Indicators	Means of verification
Visit to GSI PMU	Review of reports Monitoring and evaluation reports
Visit to PP	
Meeting and interview of staff & project partners	

### Evaluation Findings

The project benefits from on-going evaluation efforts and regular reporting according to UNDP standards. The PMU provides quarterly reports/updates and annual reports. Each PPC produces monthly reports on the activities at the pilot sites. The Steering Committee reviews progress annually and provides guidance. This activity is supplemented by EU oversight including the completion of two ROM's.

### ***Objective Eight: Communicate the results of the GSI Phase II Project***

Indicators	Sources and means of verification
Set up GSI website	Website address
Upload information to website	Update and maintain website
Allow access to website	User log

### Evaluation Findings

The project has established and is maintaining a very good GSI website ([www.guianashield.org](http://www.guianashield.org)). The website has English and Spanish language capability and documents in Portuguese are uploaded.

The website is attractive and user friendly. The background information on each of the pilot sites is quite interesting.

([http://www.guianashield.org/joomla/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=64&Itemid=73&lang=en](http://www.guianashield.org/joomla/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=64&Itemid=73&lang=en))

As of the evaluation, the website has not yet uploaded any Phase II knowledge products.

([http://www.guianashield.org/joomla/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=38&Itemid=54&lang=en](http://www.guianashield.org/joomla/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=38&Itemid=54&lang=en))

A communication strategy is being developed to capture and disseminate the key outputs from the project whilst respecting the established protocols on sharing of information.

## **2.5 Progress Towards Expected Results**

The project's current logical framework outlines seven results and numerous associated indicators.

1. At least three pilot projects receiving payments for ES
2. At least three ES management contracts signed and benefit sharing mechanisms designed
3. A study on market mechanisms and possible payment systems for ES completed
4. An ecosystem monitoring system set up for the pilot projects
5. Study on the major institutional arrangements for the GSI completed
6. Workshop on institutional embedding of the GSI completed
7. Several sustainable livelihood projects on-going in or near PPs
8. GSI Phase II project coordinated and managed

***Result One: At least three pilot projects receiving payments for ES***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Legally signed contracts with PP partners	Contracts	Government approves the set up of PPs
Transfer of funds and other resources	Payment transfer receipts	

**Evaluation Findings**

As noted above, two pilot sites are established and two are pending. Two sites have draft formal agreements; one has a draft contract and the other a draft cooperation agreement. Both are to be signed shortly. For Suriname, the signing of the cooperation agreement will be followed by the preparation of an implementation plan. It is very unlikely that any sites will receive cash payments for ecosystem services, particularly conservation, directly as a result of this project's activities prior to project close.

***Result Two: At least three ES management contracts signed and benefit sharing mechanisms designed***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Legally signed contracts	Contracts	Government approves the set up of PPs
Analysis of procedures	Benefit sharing agreement	
Benefit sharing mechanism		

**Evaluation Findings**

As noted above, two pilot sites have draft management agreements and two additional sites will likely have agreements within the next 6 – 12 months. These agreements have provisions for the development of benefit sharing mechanisms.

***Result Three: A study on market mechanisms and possible payment systems for ES completed***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Literature review	Study report	Market interest in ES expand beyond carbon to embrace biodiversity and freshwater
Interviews		

**Evaluation Findings**

As noted above, the market study on PES was completed. The study was completed by an organization involved with carbon trading and focused almost exclusively upon carbon related issues. Information on biodiversity and freshwater are being generated through systematic monitoring at the established pilot sites and will be reviewed and reported on by the IUCN NL at the end of the respective pilot projects.

***Result Four: An ecosystem monitoring system set up for the pilot projects***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Systematic monitoring of indicators	Reports (initial and final)	Governments agree to sharing of country-specific information
Testing of satellite imagery		Monitoring partners will continue to support the GSI
Correlation between remote sensing and 'ground truthing'		Complementary remote sensing and ground truthing systems would be cost effective

#### Evaluation Findings

As noted above, progress towards the achievement of these indicators is being made in Guyana and Colombia. In 2007, SarVision completed studies entitled **“Guiana Shield Initiative Monitoring Approach”** and **“Design and application of a dedicated systematic forest monitoring system for the Guiana Shield Initiative”** a mid-term report submitted in March 2009. Based upon these studies, impressive satellite imagery is now developed using an innovative technology allowing for “through cloud cover” imagery to be generated. Although start-up was slow, this work is now adding a very valuable tool to gauge forest cover and monitor impacts from activities such as mining and forestry. The use of this technology is particularly advanced at the Guyana site.

In addition to the satellite work, the monitoring of indicators is moving forward at both the Guyana and Colombia pilot sites. Local residents are primarily responsible for completing these tasks with the technical support of both pilot site managers and IUCN technical staff. The IUCN small-grants program described below will complement these activities.

#### ***Result Five: Study on the major institutional arrangements for the GSI completed***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Desk study	Desk study report	
Interviews		
Literature review		

#### Evaluation Findings

As noted above, this study was completed.

#### ***Result Six: Workshop on institutional embedding of the GSI completed***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Organise workshop	Workshop report	
Identify participants		
Implement recommendations of desk study		

#### Evaluation Findings

This task has not taken place.

#### ***Result Seven: Several sustainable livelihood projects on-going in or near PPs***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
Consultations with local communities	Small grant awards	IUCN NL ensure that projects are GSI-

Proposals on sustainable livelihood to IUCN NL		compatible  Local communities are interested in participating
--	--	---

### Evaluation Findings

The project has benefitted significantly from the introduction of the IUCN small grants program. The examples in Guyana are quite good with the pilot project manager working closely with the communities of the North Rupununi to try and deliver projects that are community beneficial while linking with GSI objectives. Small grant activities in other locations have been challenged due to the stalled over-all project initiation process. Although several interlocutors commented that alignment should be improved through management, the grants do on their face appear to align well with overall project objectives. They strive to enhance the capacities of local communities to continue to sustainably manage their resources. It will be important that these projects are monitored very closely from the beginning so that lessons learned may be captured and used to improve capacities region wide.

Portfolio projects as of July 2009 include:

- ⇒ Community training an integration proposal for the Iratapuru River Sustainable Development Reserve (Brazil: €60,000);
- ⇒ Participative development of a "plan de vida" and environmental management and monitoring;
- ⇒ Plan the Selva Mataven (Colombia: €39,000)
- ⇒ Natural resource management training for youth and communities (Guyana: €36,000)
- ⇒ Forest and Wildlife Monitoring for Fairview Village (Guyana; €10,000)
- ⇒ Community-Based Monitoring and Management of Arapaima (*Arapaima gigas*) in the North Rupununi (Guyana: €52,000)
- ⇒ Development of Surama Wilderness Reserve for Eco- Tourism/Educational (Guyana: €18,000)

### ***Result Eight: GSI Phase II project coordinated and managed***

Indicator	Means of verification
Project structure maintained	Reporting and reports Payment receipts
Results documented and evaluated	

### Evaluation Findings

In spite of indicators such as slow progress and some weak products, the project seems to be well managed.

### ***Result Nine: Increased public awareness of GSI through communication, education and training***

Indicator	Means of verification	Assumptions
GSI website operational	<a href="http://www.guianashield.org">www.guianashield.org</a>	Regional media will pick up communications relating to the GSI and disseminate
Communications on GSI	Communications strategy	

Training on key aspects of the GSI	Training reports	
------------------------------------	------------------	--

#### Evaluation Findings

As noted, the website is operational. There are communications regarding the GSI on going. The project intends to commence training programs at Iwokrama, Guyana field site.

### **Part Three: Conclusions**

The project has had some very good successes and is on-track to deliver some very positive results. The project has assembled a strong management team, helped build a regional GSI cohort, successfully completed conservation monitoring agreements with two pilot sites, and begun to generate interesting lessons at the Guyana site.

The endeavor's successes are due to three factors: (a) The project concept of coordinating conservation of the Guiana Shield is sound; (b) The management structure maximizes comparative advantages and technical skills; and, (c) The persons responsible for project implementation are motivated and capable.

The project has generated important knowledge products such as remote sensing data and studies on PES and institutional frameworks. The project has created models for ecosystem monitoring systems in and around the Guyana pilot site and, to a lesser extent, the Colombia site. In Guyana, the project capitalized upon and added value to a long history of biodiversity monitoring, community benefit sharing, and international donor and private investment. The North Rupununi is also defined by a vibrant set of communities that benefit from strong leadership. The GSI investments in Guyana have helped continue local level momentum with folks honing their abilities to monitor resources and recognize and capitalize upon possible benefits. This should be strengthened further when IUCN small-grants supporting on-going work such as tourism development in Surama and Arapaima management comes on line.

Many interlocutors - and particularly members of the Steering Committee - expressed concerns regarding the project's slow rate of progress. A number of delays hampered achievement of the project's overly ambitious objectives. Most notable is the time required to establish and initiate pilot site work outside of Guyana. Although these delays are not extraordinary for a regional project, the delays have negatively impacted project effectiveness and efficiency at achieving many success indicators.

Unfortunately, the project is overly ambitious relative to time/money constraints. Project designers particularly underestimated the time and expenses required to establish pilot projects in widely divergent locations. As a result, the project has struggled to initiate pilot site activities and generate subsequent benefits (e.g., replicable models, justifications for policy changes, etc.).

The project lacks a strong and well-reasoned logical framework. The logical framework generated during concept and inception is convoluted and does not provide succinct and clear management direction. For instance, objectives are not clearly defined and indicators do not measure progress, e.g., having a website is not an accurate measurement of successful communications.

The weak strategic framework negatively impacts the project's efficiency and effectiveness. The project's investments too often appear to be opportunistic rather than aligned to provide synergistic results. Returns generated from these investments are not always maximized which further stymie's the project's ability to make steady, measurable progress towards a well defined "end of project" situation. Because expectations are not clear, the project's five primary knowledge products (studies on PES, resource markets, monitoring, remote sensing, and institutional forms) are not strong and/or adequately aligned.

Although the project's overall impact is difficult to measure since limited activities have been set in place, the project seems to be on track to help strengthen recognition of the inter-related character of conservation issues within the Guyana Shield and the long term benefits of taking a more holistic, landscape level approach to over-all conservation. Of course, the generation of useful knowledge products and the process of establishing pilot sites augment project momentum towards achievement of objectives. However, the project most benefits from good management and a smart management structure that combines the diverse intellectual and political strengths of IUCN, UNDP, qualified local managers, and an exceptionally strong Steering Committee. This is resulting in momentum and facilitating much improved regional cooperation and coordination in spite of project design limitations.

This is all very important groundwork and quite likely justifies the investment. However, if the project continues on its current trajectory it will fall short of many of the project's more ambitious and complex objectives such as three sites receiving payments for ecosystem services and establishing a regional policy network.

This project is running out of time and money. Decision-makers should quickly realize that the moment has come for some serious adaptive management. This project needs to very quickly deliver a model of success that it can present to governments and funders.

GSI Phase II is essentially a preparatory endeavor for a GSI Phase III. The final months of project activity will likely focus upon establishing pilot sites in places like Brazil and Suriname. These are fine outcomes, but these and other project activities are not and will not be self-sustaining by project close. They will all require further financial support. Project stakeholders must use the coming months to prepare for and capture Phase III funding. This will require closely re-examine project shortcomings, establish clear and realistic objectives, and designing activities that more closely align with these objectives.

Critical to this effort will be design of a concise program strategy that is clear and accessible to regional governments, NGO's, and potential funders. The GSI must quickly learn, adapt, and strengthen its approach so that investments are much more strategic and synergetic. The GSI is a great idea. However, the GSI cannot just be good idea that makes a number of relatively small investments scattered across an enormous region hoping these will eventually take root and bear fruit.



## **Part Four: Recommendations**

### **4.1 Extend Duration of GSI Phase II to complete key tasks and generate Phase III**

Although GSI Phase II is on-track to provide important deliverables, the overall project design was too ambitious and did not adequately account for the time and effort required to implement such an ambitious endeavor. Phase II should have likely been cast as a preparatory project for Phase III.

During the project's final 9 months, efforts will likely be scaled back to focusing exclusively upon supporting implementation of the small grants programs, maintaining and strengthening pilot work (Guyana, Colombia, Brazil and Suriname), and generating the fundament requirements to make certain there is a GSI Phase III. The project will likely require additional funding to support these initiatives beyond the current June 30, 2010 close date. If the current project is not provided with adequate funds to maintain these key activities and bridge between Phase II and III all momentum and success achieved by Phase I and II investments will likely be lost.

Any extension should be granted only if the project submits a brief justification accompanied by a revised logical framework that is succinct, well reasoned, and provides measurable indicators of success.

When developing Phase III, project designers should likely refer to the failed GEF grant that was to support a variety of policy and institutional activity related to the GSI. The outcomes/outputs of the GEF initiative may be worth revisiting during GSI Phase III.

One concern is that Phase III might be eclipsed by the symbol of a building rather than the impact of a concept and verifiable success. The GSI concept is very good and the current partnership is strong. UNDP is very useful with government contacts. IUCN is good technically and with interacting with EU. The Steering Committee is great for helping to ground the initiative and making certain it responds to regional needs. Phase III should work on strengthening assets by doing a few things better such as: facilitating greater government buy-in; vastly improving the project's efficiency and effectiveness through better strategic planning; better branding of the GSI concept in order to gain wider acceptance of the notion and objectives; and, securing long-term funding.

When it's time to institutionalize the GSI, it might be wise to look for examples beyond the immediate region. There are several on-going programs for regional cooperation in natural resource management in Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe that may well provide good lessons for GSI.

### **4.2 Revise and improve the project's logical framework**

The project's weak logical framework has been high lighted as a concern by three evaluations (both ROM's and the mid-term). Part of the Phase III preparatory work should include a fundamental improvement of this project's logical framework. It is highly recommended that the project allocate financing to retain outside counsel to assist with creating the new project design.

Having a solid logical framework with well-reasoned indicators and M&E requirements will greatly enhance transparency, accountability, and efficiency. Consideration should be given to accompanying the revised framework with a 3-page vision paper outlining the initiative's 5 – 10 year objectives. This could be developed by the UNDP, PMU, and IUCN with or without

external support and vetted by the Steering Committee. This should be done to not only support the final part of the Phase II but also put the project in a better place to initiate a Phase III.

The entire package should be tied to conservation management and ecological indicators since conservation of the GS seems to be the over-riding objective.

#### **4.3 Broaden project perspective to encompass all benefits of ecosystem services**

The idea of “PES” is attractive in principle. Many in the conservation community are now noting, however, that the concept of PES in practice can be confusing, impractical, and ultimately result in negative conservation impacts such as the codification of “regulatory takings” and landowner entitlement.

The concept of cash payment is very impractical for the GSI. Indeed, the initiative's own studies commissioned specifically to identify cash-based incentives have concluded that these are either non-existent or impractical.

The GSI should shift away from a PES system towards a BES system that recognizes cash payments as only one of many possible benefits that communities may derive from monitoring and maintaining healthy ecosystems. For instance, a higher quality of life is a very direct and critically important benefit from ecosystem services, particularly for the rural communities where the project is focusing pilot activity. Many members of these communities lead a subsistence or partially subsistence life that relies upon healthy ecosystems for both provision and culture.

Perhaps a less confusing and more accurate term for the activities supported by the GSI would be “Benefits from Ecosystem Services”. Taking a benefit approach would allow the project to more accurately present the value and benefits of sound resource management decision-making. A “benefits” approach would also help alleviate the false expectations the project seems to be building in local communities that now anticipate receiving payments for conserving their region's ecosystem services.

#### **4.4 Expand opportunities for learning and coalition building between tiers**

The project is putting significant efforts into building regional, national and local coalitions. The project should now focus on building better connections between these three tiers. For instance, the project would benefit greatly from more organic and direct exchange of information and ideas between each of the various pilot sites as well as reinforcing connections between the pilot sites and the steering committee.

This might include generating a GSI electronic newsletter distributed regularly (at least each quarter) to pertinent stakeholders such as steering committee members, pilot site managers, government agencies, etc. The newsletter would update recipients of on-going project activity and ideally feature detail and progress of at least on project activity, e.g., NRDDB Arapaima management. This newsletter may also include a brief update from IUCN technicians regarding potential survey methods, progress on international climate negotiations, and/or other information germane to the GSI.

The various pilot sites should also be more closely engaged in on-going project activities such as this evaluation. Guyana is an obvious site for focus. The UNDP office provides support. The PMU is situated in Georgetown. Iwokrama is farther advanced than other locations. However, this is only one small part of the larger story. In the future planning, time and budget should be

reserved that respect the international character of this initiative and allow for more equal participation.

Professional networking forums are another useful mechanism. This could be encouraged and supported through the GSI website. There are several examples of this emerging, including the TerrAfrica Knowledge Base where SLM practitioners from around Sub-Saharan Africa will soon be able to communicate and exchange information using professional networking forums with issues threads, posting of key documents, etc.

Everyone seems to agree that the IUCN small-grants must align with the GSI. However, many expressed concern that outside Guyana, this may not be successful. To reinforce multi-tier connections, regional cooperation, and local participation in decision-making perhaps avenues should be explored that incorporate the Steering Committee in the small-grants decision-making process.

UNDP offices present a strategic and cost-effective platform for strengthening the GSI platform. The project manager certainly works closely with regional offices. However, it seems that there might be opportunities to more fully exploit opportunities to use UNDP's comparative advantage by more actively engaging them to help market and mainstream the GSI concept. For instance, facilitating greater GSI familiarity and relevant information exchange between Energy and Environment staff is useful. Generating interest and support amongst Resident Representatives to encourage mainstreaming of GSI principles within a broader range of regional donor and government initiatives would be very useful. An important message here would be the possible social, political, and ecological benefits that would be derived from cooperative, landscape level conservation of Guiana Shield resources. These principles would then be reflected in over-all donor strategies for the Guiana Shield nations.

Similar GSI mainstreaming approaches should be presented and pursued with other donors, i.e., USAID, EU, etc.

#### **4.5 Capture lessons learned early and make concrete plan for dissemination**

All project activity should be completed in the spirit of creating a legacy of experiences and learning. This is new and experimental activity. If the project is going to learn from these experiments, activity should be tracked very closely, documented regularly and systematically, and results distributed broadly. These activities should be based upon principles that allow for the generation of compatible and comparable data sets. The IUCN small-grants projects associated with GSI Phase II should also be studied and monitored very closely from the beginning so that lessons learned may be captured and used to improve capacities region wide.

All activity should include extensive monthly reporting from each of the pilot sites. These brief monthly reports should be distilled and distributed to key stakeholders such as the IUCN/NL, UNDP, government agencies, Steering Committee members, and participating community, research and non-governmental organizations.

One result of this effort should be the generation of capacity building and teaching materials to help regional, national and local decision-makers replicate approaches. This would include working closely on the generation of the standard environmental services training program being developed at Iwokrama.

#### **4.6 Maximize impact of IUCN technical support**

The relationship between the IUCN/NL technical support staff, pilot project staff, and UNDP/PMU is quite good. There is strong mutual respect and a collegial spirit. Never the less, the project may wish to consider ways to better maximize the impact of IUCN technical support by making better use of available tools such as electronic media.

The GSI needs to have examples that it can hold up to rally regional support. That means that the initiative's products, including monitoring, need to be of the highest international standards and focused upon delivering exactly what is required to state the case for why improved regional cooperation and conservation are beneficial. Although specific terms of reference describing the role of IUCN/NL were not evaluated, it would seem reasonable to anticipate that IUCN/NL's job is to help be certain this occurs. They will only be able to complete this job if communication flow between pilot sites, the PMU and IUCN/NL is systematic, strategic, rigorous and frequent.

Perhaps twenty years ago, the biggest challenge here would have been distance with technical support located a long ways away from the activity. Now each of the pilot sites has access to Internet facilities on or near campus. For instance, it would likely be quite easy for researchers at Iwokrama to record monitoring activity/approaches using a "FLIP" or similar video camera (US\$100), upload the activity when they return from the field, and have a critique from IUCN/NL within hours. The same is true with reporting and data sheets. These could be completed, uploaded, and emailed to the technical support crew in the Netherlands almost immediately.

If all three pilot sites and additional small-grants funded community sites reported electronically to IUCN/NL on a regular and consistent basis, IUCN NL would be able to (1) provide much better immediate technical support; and, (2) serve as an information clearing house able to provide information, lessons learned, technical advice, etc. quickly and efficiently.

Having written protocols detailing these cooperative requirements might be quite useful.

#### **4.7 Identify a transboundary location for replicating project activity**

If there is a going to be a GSI Phase III, work should of course begin now to prepare for a GSI Phase III. A major part of this effort should be the identification of a transboundary area as originally planned for Phase II. This area should be used to replicate and upscale lessons from Phases I and II.

#### **4.8 Identify and close regional policy gaps related to project objectives**

The project has failed to make substantial progress on sub-objectives/results related to the strengthening of policies to support GSI objectives on regional and national level. Some of this might relate to the lack of a clearly stated objective(s). Is this a climate change program; a PES program; community-based natural resource management initiative; a sustainable forestry project; a biodiversity conservation initiative; or a landscape level, transboundary natural resources management project? Each of these alternatives seems viable within the current project's scope.

Without a precise and broadly accepted understanding of exactly what the project hopes to accomplish, it is difficult to determine what policies may be barriers to the stated objective. However, once these hopes are clearly stated, the project will hopefully be able to sponsor the completion of a comprehensive review of policy barriers, proposed alleviation mechanisms, and implement these.

#### **4.9 Improve Government Engagement**

National ownership and support for the GSI evinced by government buy-in is not apparent in the current approach. Better government engagement should be a hallmark of future GSI activity.

Government involvement is required due to legal issues in Brazil. UNDP must also work closely with governments prior to implementing programs such as the GSI. However, none of the pilot projects or other project outputs seem to be designed to directly support the building of government capacity to recognize and support a landscape level conservation approach for the GSI on either bi-lateral or multi-lateral levels. This would be strengthened if the project worked to identify and address specific policy barriers, more closely engaged government agencies as conservation partners, and/or moved towards implementation of model pilot projects that more clearly show the potential political, economical, social and environmental benefits of cooperative transboundary management.

#### **4.10 Generate a brief communication strategy**

A recommendation identified during the June 2009 ROM is the need for a communication strategy. It's a good recommendation. This project would benefit from a 4 - 5 page paper outlining what is the message of the GSI, identifying their priority markets, and presenting a very brief plan of delivery. This should include consideration of possible education materials, presentation forums, gender issues, etc.

#### **4.11 GSI Should Not Become a Climate Change Only Initiative**

Contrary to the findings of the June 2009 ROM, the GSI should not focus exclusively upon climate change. This is too narrow and fails to capture the initiative's ambitious spirit. Most folks seem to recognize that the Guiana Shield's potential contribution to the global challenge of climate change is only one part of a much more complex set of ecological challenges that include forestry, wildlife and water resource conservation.

When anyone mentions conservation challenges for the GSI, they mention the following priorities: illegal/transitory mining, forestry, water management, infrastructure development and unsustainable wildlife harvest. These are the conservation concerns shared by most within the region and should likely be reflected in the GSI's strategic thinking.

Most understand that additional resilience must be built and risk-averse decision-making adhered to in order to allow for management adaptations to respond to climate change. However, very few mention climate change as a conservation priority within the region. Most interlocutors speak of "climate change" only as a way to make money, although few had any ideas on exactly how this was going to be accomplished. This is a fact reflected in the project's own publications.

## **Part Five: Lessons Learned**

A great idea supported by qualified people still requires a well-reasoned and realistic strategy to succeed.

A realistic strategy balances ambition with financial and time constraints.

Although conservation ambition and vision are laudable, the project's first several years of implementation would have benefited from a better-reasoned strategic framework.

Delaying the implementation of a mid-term evaluation until late in the project cycle perhaps minimizes the evaluation's potential positive impacts.

## **Annexes**

Annex 1:	Terms of Reference
Annex 2:	Work Plan
Annex 3:	Electronic Survey Questions
Annex 4:	Documents Reviewed

## **Annex 1: Terms of Reference**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **MID-TERM EVALUATION**

**UNDP DEX Project:** “Ecological and Financial Sustainable Management of the Guiana Shield Eco-region” (GSI Phase II Project)

#### **Project Summary**

The GSI Phase II project aims to promote the sustainable development of the Guiana Shield eco-region by means of an integrated eco-regional (policy, institutional and financial) management framework, designed to enable the six countries and their local communities to benefit from their natural resources. Preserving ecosystem functions (e.g. climate and water regulation, biodiversity preservation) will benefit stakeholders at the local, national and global levels and help fulfill national obligations under the MEAs. By preserving nature and therefore natural livelihood resources, a significant contribution will be made towards poverty alleviation and resource management by the local/indigenous inhabitants. Project activities focus on pilot projects, which will enable testing of mechanisms for compensation for provision of environmental services, as well as culturally appropriate ecosystem management contracts, benefit sharing mechanisms and monitoring schemes.

This project, which makes up part of the broader Guiana Shield Initiative (GSI), is designed to support activities, which contribute to the design of financing mechanisms for forest conservation and management, and innovative financial strategies. The pilot projects aim at setting up an innovative financial mechanism for forest conservation and sustainable management. This project works to influence policies and sectors on forests, such as land tenure, logging and mining. As this is a regional project it is anticipated that results can be fed into both national level policy discussion and international processes for forest policy formulation e.g. MEAs, GEF.

The project supports activities which assist small and community-based enterprises; promote sustainable harvesting, processing and marketing of NTFPs; and support the strengthening of cooperatives concerned with sustainable management of timber and NTFPs. Each pilot project has an element of sustainable livelihood generation. Sustainable use of forest biodiversity, and development of NTFPs are sought within the pilot projects that contribute to both improved livelihoods and conservation of biodiversity.

#### **Annex 1**

The project is being directly implemented by UNDP Guyana country office in collaboration with UNDP country offices in other Guiana Shield countries. The IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands (IUCN NL) is the technical implementing partner of the project. There is an 11-member steering committee that provides governance oversight of the project. The project is a multi-donor project with a total budget of €2.24 million and a duration of 42 months.

#### **Project Expected Results**



- **Result 1**  
Three pilot projects receiving payments for environmental services, one of which will be trans-boundary
- **Result 2**  
A study on market mechanisms and possible payment systems for environmental services
- **Result 3**  
Several sustainable livelihood projects ongoing in or near pilot projects
- **Result 4**  
An ecosystem monitoring system will be set up for the pilot projects
- **Result 5**  
Study on major institutional arrangements within the Guiana Shield
- **Result 6**  
Workshop with relevant institutions operating in the region
- **Result 7**  
An institutional presence in the region
- **Result 8**  
A policy network

## **Project Status**

*Result 1: Three pilot projects receiving payments for environmental services, one of which will be trans-boundary*

Based on the application of six criteria, six pilot sites were proposed to the governments in four countries (Brazil, Colombia, Guyana, Suriname). The proposed sites in Brazil (1) and Suriname (3) were deselected and alternative sites were provided. In all, four sites were approved by government and three are currently hosting pilot projects (Brazil, Colombia, Guyana).

## **Annex 1**

Of these three, one is receiving payments for environmental services. None of the ongoing pilot projects is transboundary.

*Result 2: A study on market mechanisms and possible payment systems for environmental services*

A study entitled “*Inventory of existing and possible future payment systems for ecosystem services*” was completed in October 2007.

The study found that the “Guiana Shield offers all the ecosystem services categories that have been identified by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment of the United Nations (2005), and that a commercial approach (a clear business case) was therefore needed to make a PES scheme succeed.

*Result 3: Several sustainable livelihood projects ongoing in or near pilot projects*

Five NGOs/CBOs are recipients or are in final negotiations to receive funds from the IUCN NL EGP small grants programme. The recipients are associated with the ongoing pilot projects in Brazil, Colombia and Guyana.

*Result 4: An ecosystem monitoring system will be set up for the pilot projects*

In 2007, SarVision, on contract to IUCN NL on behalf of the UNDP, produced a report entitled “Guiana Shield Initiative monitoring approach”. Monitoring visits by SarVision have been made to pilot sites in Colombia and Guyana, and their technicians are currently involved in the preparation of advanced monitoring products in collaboration with pilot project representatives.

*Result 5: Study on major institutional arrangements within the Guiana Shield*

In January 2009, a consultancy was awarded to an expert within the Guiana Shield eco-region for the carrying out of a desk study on the institutional arrangements for the establishment of the GSI within the Guiana Shield eco-region. Plans are in place for the presentation of the draft report to the Steering Committee at its upcoming third meeting in Bogotá, 26-27 February 2009.

*Result 6: Workshop with relevant institutions operating in the region*

The proposed workshop has not been held. Following the presentation and review of the desk study report on GSI institutional development, a workshop with relevant institutions operating in the region will be held.

**Annex 1**

*Result 7: An institutional presence in the region*

This result is not yet achieved. The project’s implementation through the UNDP country offices has deepened and broadened interest in the GSI, within the Guiana Shield eco-region. At the moment, the initiative has institutional home within the UNDP country offices and at the pilot sites. Regionally, UNDP and the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organisation (ACTO) collaborate in a number of areas.

*Result 8: A policy network*

The beginnings of a regional ad hoc group on remote sensing monitoring of forest ecosystems within the Guiana Shield was forged at the 2008 ATBC meeting in Paramaribo. There are good opportunities for formalizing and expanding the group to embrace policy, or to leverage support for the set up of a policy network.

## **Objectives of the Mid-Term Evaluation**

### **General objective:**

The general objective of the Evaluation is to review the achievements of progress up to date, and to develop a plan of action for the achievement of the remaining activities of the project.

### **Specific objectives:**

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- a) To identify project design and implementation issues across the Guiana Shield countries
- b) To assess progress towards the achievement of the targets, the results, and impact and use of resources
- c) To review factors influencing the achievement of results
- d) To identify and document lessons learned
- e) To assess the contributions of project partners
- f) To make recommendations regarding specific actions and project adjustments that might be taken to improve the project, and support needed to achieve intended impacts at the end of the project

## **Scope of the Evaluation**

**Topic:** The mid-term evaluation covers the entire multi-donor project. The evaluation will assess the project implementation progress, achievements and challenges, taking into account the status of the project activities and outputs and the financial disbursements made up to December 31, 2008.

**Geography:** The mid-term evaluation will take place at the UNDP Guyana country office and shall involve travel to other Guiana Shield countries, and to pilot projects.

## **Annex 1**

**Actors:** The mid-term evaluation shall solicit feedback and inputs from all stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project. The stakeholders include governments, NGOs, pilot project partners, local communities, IUCN NL, and UNDP.

## **Methodology or Evaluation Approach**

The mid-term evaluation shall combine methods such as documentation review (desk study), interviews, and field visits. All relevant project documents will be made available to the Consultant by the GSI Project Management Implementation Unit (GSI PMU), facilitated by the UNDP Guyana country office. After studying the documentation, the Consultant will conduct interviews with all relevant partners and beneficiaries. Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders will occur through circulation of preliminary reports for comments or other types of feedback mechanisms.

Throughout the period of the Evaluation, the Consultant will liaise closely with the Resident Representative and Programme Analyst, UNDP Guyana, and the GSI PMU.

## **Management of the Evaluation**

The mid-term evaluation will be guided by the UNDP Guyana country office. The GSI PMU, IUCN NL, pilot project managers and other partners will provide inputs to the evaluation process.

### **Expected Output of the Evaluation**

There will be two deliverables:

- A detailed report with independent assessment of the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of project interventions and contributions of partners. The report may be organized into the following sections:
  - ✚ Executive summary
  - ✚ Introduction
  - ✚ The project description
  - ✚ Findings and conclusions
  - ✚ Recommendations
  - ✚ Lessons learned
  - ✚ Annexes
- A PowerPoint presentation of the findings of the evaluation

### **Annex 1**

### **Duration**

Twenty one days, beginning the 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009 and ending by 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 including time for preparatory work and submission of final document using the suggested timelines as follows:

### **Timelines**

July 20-24	By August 12	By August 19	By September 11
Submission of proposed work plan	Completion of evaluation	Presentation of preliminary findings	Submission of final document

### **Qualifications and experience**

- Advance University degree and professional experience related to the assignment
- Experience in project cycle management
- Previous experience with evaluation of regional projects and/or DEX projects
- Knowledge of the Guiana Shield eco-region and its key environmental and development issues
- Advance analytical skills, sound judgement, resourcefulness, ability to take initiative, capacity to work independently and in a multi-lingual, multi-cultural environment
- Skills in process facilitation, strategic planning and alliance building
- Excellent communication skills and fluency in English and Spanish and working knowledge of Portuguese and French

- Excellent PC user and writing skills

### **Reporting**

The Consultant is required to present a work plan in consultation with UNDP Guyana country office and the GSI PMU, within one week after the signing of the contract.

The Consultant will present his/her interim findings and recommendations to UNDP Guyana country office and the GSI Project Steering Committee for comments and feedback.

The Consultant will prepare and submit Draft Document and PowerPoint presentation in electronic form within one week after the completion of the assignment for review and comments by the UNDP Guyana CO, GSI PMU and the GSI Project Steering Committee.

The Consultant will finalise the Document and PowerPoint presentation based on comments received and return final document to UNDP Guyana country office within one week of receipt of comments.

## **Annex 2: Work Plan Submitted By Evaluator August 16, 2009**

### **1. Brief Description of the Project**

#### Duration and Funding

The GSI Phase II project “Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guiana Shield Eco-Region” commenced in early 2007. The project’s initial duration was 42 months with a closing date of December 2009. The project has requested a no-cost extension until June 2010. The project is financed by a 2.4 million Euro grant.

#### Management and Implementation Arrangements

UNDP is responsible for project implementation. IUCN NL supported initial project design and provides on-going technical support.

The project has an active Steering Committee with representation from each GSI member country. The Project Management Unit is situated within UNDP/Guyana and is lead by a full-time Project Coordinator. The project has two full-time staff persons situated within the IUCN NL offices and several staff located in various pilot sites.

#### Project Purpose and Objectives

As stated in the June 2007 inception report:

“This project makes up part of the broader Guiana Shield Initiative (GSI). It will support activities that contribute to the design of financing mechanisms for forest conservation and management, and innovative financial strategies. The pilot projects will be aiming at setting up an innovative financial mechanism for forest conservation and sustainable management. This project will also work to influence policies and sectors on forests, such as land tenure, logging and mining. As this is a regional project it is anticipated that results can be fed into both national level policy discussion and international processed for forest policy formulation, e.g. Mean’s, GEF.

“The project will support activities which assist small and community-base enterprises; promote sustainable harvesting, processing and marketing of NTFPs; and support the strengthening of cooperatives concerned with sustainable management of timber and NTFPs. Each pilot project will have an element of sustainable livelihood generation....

“Sustainable use of forest biodiversity, development of NTFP’s will be sought within the pilot projects that contribute to both improved livelihoods and conservation of biodiversity. Within the pilot project issues relating to sustainable use of wildlife and fish resources in forest areas will be addressed and alternatives to over-exploitation will be sought.”

The project aims towards the achievement of eight results:

9. Three pilot projects receiving payments for environmental services, one of which will be trans-boundary
10. A study on market mechanisms and possible payment systems for environmental services
11. Several sustainable livelihood projects ongoing in or near pilot projects
12. An ecosystem monitoring system will be set up for the pilot projects

13. Study on major institutional arrangements within the Guiana Shield
14. Workshop with relevant institutions operating in the region
15. An institutional presence in the region
16. A policy network

## **2. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives**

This mid-term evaluation will review progress towards the achievement of the project's eight results and detailed logical framework. The evaluation will document lessons learned and help guide continued improvement of project effectiveness.

## **3. Contents of Final Report**

The main body of the final report will be limited to no more than 20 pages. The report will reflect the evaluation principles as characterized by this inception report and the terms of reference. The report will include a comprehensive account of the information and data sources utilized without identifying specific individuals, risk factors, assessments of the performance to date, achievements, lessons learned, and implications for future implementation.

The proposed Table of Contents is as follows:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- The project description
- Findings and conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Annexes

## **4. Proposed Methodology and Schedule**

The evaluation will rely upon the following methods to generate information and formulate opinions:

5. Document review;
6. Brief field visits to the UNDP/Guyana office and the Guyana pilot site;
7. Email communication with key stakeholders and project implementers; and,
8. Telephone interviews with select stakeholders.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Proposed Dates</b>
Field Mission: Guyana	8/9 – 8/14
Submit evaluation work plan	8/17
Conduct document review and initial stakeholder communication	8/17 – 8/23
Submit email questions to stakeholders based upon initial findings	8/24 – 9/12
Complete and submit first draft report	9/13 – 9/22
Oversight Committee reviews and comments on draft report	9/23 – 9/29
Revise report and submit final document with power point	9/30 – 10/6

## **5. Documents to Review**

This is an initial list of documents. The PMU will review and update the document list and provide the evaluator with requested materials.

<b>Project Management</b>	<b>Have Copy</b>
<b>Project</b>	
Inception Report	X
EU Contribution Agreement	X
UNDP Project Document	X
GSI Logical Framework	X
EU – UNDP Contract Annex: Description of the Action	X
Steering Committee Minutes, June 2007	X
Steering Committee Minutes, March 2008	X
Steering Committee Minutes, March 2009	X
Annual Report 2007	X
Annual Report 2008	X
EU Monitoring Report, October 2007	X
EU Monitoring Report, June 2009	
10 <sup>th</sup> Progress Report (April – June 2009)	X
Budgets	
More?	
<b>Pilot Sites</b>	
Reports	
Work Plans/Programs	
Budgets	
Agreements	
Summary of 5 NGO IUCN small grants projects	
More?	
<b>Delivered Reports</b>	
<b>Project</b>	
Inventory of existing and possible future payment systems for ecosystem services (October 2007)	X
Carbon Assessment of Three Pilot Areas of the Guiana Shield Initiative: Iwokrama, Iratapuru and Matavén (April 2009)	X
Design and application of a dedicated systematic forest monitoring system for the Guiana Shield Initiative (Mid-term Report February 2008 – March 2009)	X
“Guiana Shield Initiative monitoring approach” SarVision 2007	
Desk study on the institutional arrangements for the establishment of the GSI within the Guiana Shield eco-region	
More?	
<b>Pilot Sites</b>	
Anything?	

## **7. Primary Evaluation Stakeholders**

As noted, this is a rapid appraisal of an ambitious and geographically sprawling project. Without taking the time to visit each participating country as well as IUCN/Netherlands, generating and incorporating the



opinions of key project stakeholders must unfortunately rely upon electronic communication. Below is a list of stakeholder groups key to evaluation success. The PMU will work with the evaluator to complete these tables, including providing email contact information.

Country	Names	Title	Tel / Email / Language
<b>BRAZIL</b>	1. Mr. Carlos Castro	Coordinator – Environment Unit United Nations Development Programme, Brazil (UNDP Focal Point)	Tel: 55-61-3038-9030  Email: <a href="mailto:carlos.castro@undp.org">carlos.castro@undp.org</a> Language: English/Portuguese
<b>BRAZIL</b>	2. Ms. Giselle Paulino Lopes	Pilot Project Coordinator – Brazil	Tel: 55-96-8135-0456  Email: <a href="mailto:paulinogiselle@hotmail.com">paulinogiselle@hotmail.com</a> Language: Portuguese/English
<b>BRAZIL</b>	3. Paulo Figueira	Secretary - Amapá State Secretary for Environment (SEMA) (Pilot Project Partner)	Tel: 55-96-9126-3431  Email: <a href="mailto:psptati61@hotmail.com">psptati61@hotmail.com</a> Language: Portuguese
<b>BRAZIL</b>	4. Dr. Ima Vieira	Steering Committee Member – Brazil  Director , Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi, Para, Brazil	Tel: 55-91-217-6082  Email: <a href="mailto:ima@museu-goeldi.br">ima@museu-goeldi.br</a> Language: Portuguese/English
<b>COLOMBIA</b>	5. Mr. Luisz Olmedo Martinez	Programme Analyst United Nations Development Programme, Colombia (UNDP Focal Point)	Tel: 571-488-9033  Email: <a href="mailto:Luisz.olmedo.martinez@undp.org">Luisz.olmedo.martinez@undp.org</a> Language: Spanish/English
<b>COLOMBIA</b>	6. Ms. Ruth Gutierrez	Pilot Project Coordinator - Colombia, (currently on leave of absence)	Tel: 571-488-9000  Email: <a href="mailto:ruth.gutierrez@undp.org">ruth.gutierrez@undp.org</a> Language: Spanish/English
<b>COLOMBIA</b>	7. Mr. Vincent Chipiaje	ACATISEMA Representative (Pilot Project Partner)	Tel: 311-534-3828  Email: <a href="mailto:acatisemavirtual@jhoo.es">acatisemavirtual@jhoo.es</a> Language: Spanish
<b>COLOMBIA</b>	8. Dr. Manuel Rodriguez-Becerra	Steering Committee Member  Professor & Former Minister of Environment in Colombia	Tel: 571-610-0136  Email: <a href="mailto:mcrod@cable.net.co">mcrod@cable.net.co</a> or <a href="mailto:mrb@adm.uniandes.edu.co">mrb@adm.uniandes.edu.co</a> Language: English/Spanish
<b>COLOMBIA</b>	9. Ambassador Frans van Haren	Steering Committee Member  Ex-Netherlands Ambassador to Colombia	Tel:  Email: <a href="mailto:vhfbam@yahoo.com">vhfbam@yahoo.com</a> Language: English/Spanish
<b>FRENCH</b>	10. Mr. Claude	Steering Committee	Tel: 594-694-400-830 / 594-291-252

<b>GUYANA</b>	Suzanon	Member  Vice President, Parc Amazonien, French Guiana	Email: <a href="mailto:claudio.suzanon@wanadoo.fr">claudio.suzanon@wanadoo.fr</a> Language: French/English
<b>GUYANA</b>	11. Mr. Didier Trebucq	Deputy Resident Representative United Nations Development Programme, Guyana (DONOR)  Steering Committee Member	Tel: 592-226-4040  Email: <a href="mailto:Didier.trebucq@undp.org">Didier.trebucq@undp.org</a> Language: English
<b>GUYANA</b>	12. Ms. Patsy Ross	Programme Analyst United Nations Development Programme, Guyana  Steering Committee Member (Alternate)	Tel: 592-226-4040 Ext. 250  Email: <a href="mailto:patsy.ross@undp.org">patsy.ross@undp.org</a> Language: English
<b>GUYANA</b>	13. Mr. Richard Persaud	Pilot Project Coordinator, Guyana	Tel: 592-226-4040 Ext. 262  Email: <a href="mailto:richardlpersaud@yahoo.com">richardlpersaud@yahoo.com</a> or <a href="mailto:rpersaud@iwokrama.org">rpersaud@iwokrama.org</a> Language: English
<b>GUYANA</b>	14. Mr. Dane Gobin  Dr. Raquel Thomas	Chief Executive Officer – IWOKRAMA International Centre for Rainforest Conservation and Development (Pilot Project Partner)  Director – Resource Management & Training, IWOKRAMA Centre for Rainforest Conservation and Development	Tel: 592-225-1504  Email: <a href="mailto:dgobin@iwokrama.org">dgobin@iwokrama.org</a> Language: English  Tel: 592-225-1504 Email: <a href="mailto:rthomas@iwokrama.org">rthomas@iwokrama.org</a>
<b>GUYANA</b>	15. Major General (Ret'd) Joseph Singh	Steering Committee Member  Chief Executive Officer, Guyana Telephone & Telegraph Co. Ltd.	Tel: 592-227-1020  Email: <a href="mailto:jsingh@gtt.co.gy">jsingh@gtt.co.gy</a> Language: English
<b>SURINAME</b>	16. Ms. Christine de Rooij or Mr. Bryan Drakenstein	Project Coordinator United Nations Development Programme, Suriname (UNDP Focal Point)	Tel: 597-425-148  Email: <a href="mailto:christine.de.rooij@undp.org">christine.de.rooij@undp.org</a> Language: English
<b>SURINAME</b>	17. Ambassador Willem Udenhout	Steering Committee Member	Tel: 597-471-436  Email:

		Suriname Conservation Foundation Former Director of Conservation International	<a href="mailto:w.udenhout@conservation.org">w.udenhout@conservation.org</a> Language: English
<b>SURINAME</b>	18. Mr. Dominiek Plouvier	Steering Committee Member  Coordinator, WWF – Guianas Programme, Suriname	Tel: 597-422-357  Email: <a href="mailto:dplouvier@wwf.sr">dplouvier@wwf.sr</a> Language: English
<b>VENEZUELA</b>	19. Mr. Ricardo Petit	Programme Analyst United Nations Development Programme, Venezuela (UNDP Focal Point)	Tel: 58-212-208-4444  Email: <a href="mailto:richardo.petit@undp.org">richardo.petit@undp.org</a> Language: Spanish/English
<b>VENEZUELA</b>	20. Dr. Judith Rosales	Steering Committee Member  Head – Bioguayana Programme, National Experimental University of Guayana, Venezuela	Tel: 58-414-859-9063  Email: <a href="mailto:jrosales@uneg.edu.ve">jrosales@uneg.edu.ve</a> Language: English/Spanish
<b>ECUADOR</b>	21. Mr. Robert Hofstede	Steering Committee Member	Tel: : 593-2-2261-075  Email: <a href="mailto:hofstederobert@gmail.com">hofstederobert@gmail.com</a> Language: English
<b>BRUSSELS</b>	22. Mr. Frank Jacobs	Steering Committee Member  Coordinator – European Commission, Brussels (DONOR)	Tel: 32-2-296-5050  Email: <a href="mailto:frank.jacobs@ec.europa.eu">frank.jacobs@ec.europa.eu</a> Language: English
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	23. Mr. Cas Besselink	Director – IUCN Netherlands Committee (Project Implementing Partner)	Tel: 31-520-344-9454  Email: <a href="mailto:cas.besselink@iucn.nl">cas.besselink@iucn.nl</a> Language: English
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	24. Mr. Wouter Veening	GSI Co-Founder Senior Technical Project Officer	Tel: 31-70-365-2299 / 365-1998  Email: <a href="mailto:wveening@envirosecurity.org">wveening@envirosecurity.org</a> Language: English
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	25. Mr. Hemmo Muntingh	GSI Co-Founder Senior Technical Adviser to the Project, <i>Expert on international environmental conventions, institutions and donor community</i>	Tel: 31- 518-491-673  Email: <a href="mailto:hmuntingh@ifaw.org">hmuntingh@ifaw.org</a> Language: English
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	26. Mr. Laurens Gomes	Secretary – GSI Project	Tel: 31-20-626-1732



### **Annex 3:     Electronic Survey Questions**

*NOTE: The following survey was submitted to project managers, implementers and Steering Committee members in late August 2009. Approximately seven persons responded by email. An additional five persons communicated responses by telephone or Skype.*

Greetings!

I am completing a mid-term evaluation of the Guyana Shield Initiative Phase II and very much hoping to solicit additional stakeholder opinions.

Your insights would greatly strengthen this evaluation. I have listed three guiding questions below. It would be quite helpful if you could take a couple of minutes to share your thoughts.

All responses will be treated with discretion. If you are not comfortable sharing opinions electronically, please let me know. I would be more than happy to contact you by phone and/or Skype.

I am hoping to have all responses by September 9th.

Please accept my apologies for the impersonal mass-mailing and thanks very much for your assistance.

Best regards,

Mark

#### **Project Background**

This project hopes to achieve seven results:

1. Three pilot projects receiving payments for environmental services, one of which will be trans-boundary
2. A study on market mechanisms and possible payment systems for environmental services
3. Several sustainable livelihood projects ongoing in or near pilot projects
4. An ecosystem monitoring system will be set up for the pilot projects
5. Study on major institutional arrangements within the Guiana Shield
6. Workshop with relevant institutions operating in the region
7. An institutional presence in the region
8. A policy network

Major activities and products to date include:

- Pilot projects (Guyana, Columbia, Brazil);
- Sustainable livelihood projects;
- Remote-sensing and monitoring activity;

- Report on institutionalizing the GSI;
- Report on inventory of systems for PES; and,
- Report on monitoring approaches.

### **Evaluation Questions**

#### **Question 1. Overall Project Effectiveness**

How would you describe the overall effectiveness of the GSI at achieving its objective "To promote the sustainable development of the Guiana Shield by means of an integrated eco-regional (policy, institutional and financial) management framework"?

#### **Question 2. Quality of Products and Activities**

How would you describe the quality of products and activities delivered to date? Are these responsive to local, national, and regional needs? Technically sound? Will they have lasting impacts?

#### **Question 3. Lessons Learned and the Future of the GSI**

What has the GSI gotten right? What could or should the GSI be doing better? What important steps should be taken to strengthen this initiative?

## **Annex 4: Documents Reviewed**

A Baseline Analysis for the Guiana Shield Region, Report for NC-IUCN April 2002, EcoSecurities Ltd.

ACUERDO DE VOLUNTADES La organización Asociación de Cabildos y Autoridades Tradicionales Indígenas de la Selva de Matavén- ACATICEMA, el Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial-MAVDT y el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo –PNUD.

Annual Report 2007: (Includes June to December 2006) Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guiana Shield Eco-region A GSI Phase II Project

Annual Report 2008: Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guiana Shield Eco-region - A GSI Phase II Project

Carbon Assessment of Three Pilot Areas of the Guiana Shield Initiative: Iwokrama, Iratapuru and Matavén, A Report for NC-IUCN IUCN EcoSecurities Consulting Ltd.

Climate Change and Guyana; Iwokrama, Annalise Bayney Public Communication and Outreach Coordinator

Commercial Non-Timber Forest Products of the Guiana Shield, Tinde van Andel, Amy MacKinven, and Olaf Banki, Amsterdam 2003

Community-Based Monitoring and Management of Arapaima (*Arapaima gigas*) in the North Rupununi, Proposal for Iwokrama Pilot Site

Conservation Priorities for the Guayana Shield, 2002 Consensus

Creating Incentives to Avoid Deforestation Office of the President, Republic of Guyana, December 2008

Design and application of a dedicated systematic forest monitoring system for the Guiana Shield Initiative Mid-term Report February 2008 – March 2009 Date: 31 March 2009 Version 1.2 Marcela Quinones, Niels WIELAARD, Vincent Schut, Martin Vissers, Dirk Hoekman, Rob Verhoeven

Development of Surama Wilderness Reserve for Eco-Tourism/Educational Trail, Proposal for Iwokrama Pilot Site

Ecosystem Services Module, Iwokrama Pilot Site

Ecosystem Services Monitoring Strategy, Review Workshop, Draft Report, Pilot Project Iwokrama, July 2009

Environmental Monitoring as an Engine for Capacity Building and Ecotourism, Proposal for Iwokrama Pilot Site

European Community Contribution Agreement with an International Organisation; Identification number: EuropeAid/ENV/2006-116455/CSU

Forest and Wildlife Monitoring for Fairview Village, Proposal for Iwokrama Pilot Site

Guiana Shield Initiative monitoring approach, SarVision, November 2007

Hydrology in the Guiana Shield and possibilities for payment schemes, Judith Rosales, 2003

INCEPTION REPORT June 2007 Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guiana Shield Eco-region

Institutionalizing the Guiana Shield Initiative Elements for a well-considered and justified choice and decision, Desk Study Report

Inventory of existing and possible future payment systems for ecosystem services, Guyana Shield Initiative, Daan Wensing, IUCN NL

IUCN NL Ecosystem Grants Program Project Portfolio Guiana Shield July 2009

Logical Framework – GSI Phase II Project [February 2009]

Management Plan for the Iwokrama Forest, June 2009

MEMORANDO DE ENTENDIMIENTO ENTRE EL PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL DESARROLLO Y LA ASOCIACION DE CABILDOS TRADICIONALES INDIGENAS DE LA SELVA MATAVEN (ACATISEMA)

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN IWOKRAMA INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR RAIN FOREST CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT AND NORTH RUPUNUNI DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT BOARD

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN IWOKRAMA INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR RAIN FOREST CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT AND BINA HILL TRAINING INSTITUTE

Micro-Capital Grant Agreement (Ecosystems Services Benefit Sharing) between the UNDP and the Iwokrama International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development for the Provision of Grant Funds

Minutes of the GSI Steering Committee Meetings (2007, 2008, 2009)

MONITORING REPORT Multi-Country – GY, SR, CO, VE, BR, GF – Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guyana Shield Eco-region. MONITORING REFERENCE – 10/11/07 Monitoring Report; MR-122505.01, 01/07/2009, Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guiana Shield Eco-Region

Natural Resource Management Training for Youth and Communities, Proposal for Iwokrama Pilot Site Paramaribo Declaration and Technical Statement

Pilot Program to conserve the Brazilian Rain Forests (PPG-7): possibilities for cooperation with the Guiana Shield Initiative, Dave Zwaanilot

PROJECT: ECOLOGICAL AND FINANCIAL SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF THE GUIANA SHIELD ECO-REGION (GSI Phase II Project) 10th Progress Report Period: April - June 2009  
Projeto Administração Sustentável Ecológica e Financeira da Eco-Região do Escudo das Guianas - GSI Fase II, Projeto Piloto – RDS do Rio Iratapuru

Results Framework: Project: Ecological and financial sustainable management of the Guiana Shield Eco-region 2

Sustainable Ecotourism in the Guiana Shield region; A working document for the Guiana Shield Initiative, Kike Olsder



Transforming Guyana's Economy While Combating Climate Change May 2009 Office of the President,  
Republic of Guyana

UNDP - EU Contract and Annexes

UNDP Project Document: Ecological and Financial Sustainable Management of the Guiana Shield Eco-region

Workplan- Benefit Sharing, Iwokrama Pilot Site

Workplan- Monitoring, Iwokrama Pilot Site