

**MIDTERM REVIEW (MTR) OF THE
FIFTH OPERATIONAL PHASE OF THE
GEF SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM IN BOLIVIA**

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by Alejandro C. Imbach

November 2014

I. BASIC REPORT INFORMATION

Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project

Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Bolivia

UNDP and GEF project ID#s.

GEF ID#: 83342

UNDP PROJECT#: 4562

Evaluation timeframe and date of evaluation report

The evaluation was carried out in October-November 2014. The field visit occurred from October 19 to 25, 2014. The Initial Findings Report was sent on November 3, 2014 and comments were received up to November 12th. The Draft Final Report Draft is dated November 14th, 2014. The Final Report is dated November 28, 2014.

Region and countries included in the project

The Project was implemented in Bolivia in the UNDP Latin America and the Caribbean Region

GEF Focal Area / Operational Programs

The GEF Focal Area of this project is Multifocal (Biodiversity; Climate Change Mitigation and Land Degradation)

Implementing Partner and other project partners

The GEF Implementing Partner of the Project is UNDP with UNOPS as executing agency. Other Project Partners include the organizations receiving the small grants and other national organizations (Governmental, academic and civil) participating in different steering and advising structures.

Evaluation team members

The Midterm Review (MTR) was carried out by Alejandro C. Imbach.

Acknowledgements

The evaluator would like to thank the members of the SGP National Coordination Team (Rubén Salas and María Inés Santos), the SGP National Steering Committee, the UNDP Project Officer at the UNDP Country Office (Rocío Chain), the SGP Global Coordinator for SGP Upgraded Programs (Nick Remple), the SGP Bolivia advisors in M&E (Mario Tapia) and Climate change (Jaime Quispe) and all persons from the technical teams, community groups and the different organizations providing time for interviews and visits and valuable information, for their support to the evaluation process.

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

i.	Basic Report Information	2
ii.	Table of Contents	3
iii.	Acronyms and Abbreviations	5
1.	Executive Summary	6
	• Project Information Table	6
	• Project Description	6
	• Project Progress Summary	7
	• MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table	12
	• Conclusions	14
	• Recommendations	15
2.	Introduction	16
	• Purpose of the MTR and objectives	16
	• Scope & Methodology	16
	• Structure of the MTR report	17
3.	Project Description and Background Context	18
	• Development context	18
	• Problems that the project sought to address	18
	• Project Description and Strategy	20
	• Project Implementation Arrangements	29
	• Project timing and milestones	29
	• Main stakeholders Summary list	30
4.	Findings	30
4.1	Project Strategy	30
	• Project Design	30
	• Results Framework/Logframe	32
4.2	Progress Towards Results	32
	• Progress towards Outcomes analysis	32
	• Progress towards Project Objectives	43
	• Remaining barriers to achieving project objectives	48
4.3	Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	48
	• Management Arrangements	48
	• Work planning	49
	• Finance and co-finance	49
	• Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems	50
	• Stakeholder engagement	51
	• Reporting, including GEF Tracking Tools	52
	• Communications	52

4.4	Sustainability	53
	• Financial risks to sustainability	53
	• Socio-economic risks to sustainability	53
	• Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability	54
	• Environmental risks to sustainability	54
5.	Conclusions and Recommendations	55
5.1	Conclusions	55
5.2	Recommendations	56
ANNEXES		57
1.	MTR ToR	58
2.	MTR evaluative matrix	65
3.	MTR Ratings and Ratings Scales	69
4.	MTR mission itinerary	72
5.	List of persons interviewed	73
6.	List of documents reviewed	75
7.	Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form	76
8.	Signed MTR final report clearance form	77
9.	Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail	--

III. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR	Annual Project Report
APR/PIR	Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Review
BC	Biological Corridor
BD	Biodiversity
CBD	Convention of Biological Diversity
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CCM	Climate Change Mitigation
CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
CO	Country Office
CP	Country Program
CPAP	Country Program Action Plan
CPD	Country Program Document Framework
CPMT	Central Program Management Team, SGP-UNDP
CPS	Country Program Strategy
COP	Conference of the Parties
FSP	Full Size Project
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IW	International Waters
LD	Land Degradation
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
LULUCF	Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-government Organization
NSC	National Steering Committee
OP	Operational Program
PA	Protected Area
PES	Payments for Environmental Services
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Program Management Unit
PPR	Project Progress Reports
QPR	Quarterly Project Review
RR	Resident Representative
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
SGP	GEF Small Grants Program
STA	Senior Technical Advisor
STAR	System for Transparent Allocation of Resources
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Information Table

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE				
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Bolivia			
GEF Project ID:	83342		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>At completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4562	GEF financing:	4,166,167.-	
Country:	Bolivia	IA/EA own:	1.192,250.-	
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government:	784,682.-	
Focal Area:	Multifocal	Other:	4,023,068.-	
Operational Program:	Biodiversity Climate Change Land Degradation	Total co-financing:	6,000,000.-	
Executing Agency:	UNOPS	Total Project Cost:	10,166,167.-	
Other Partners involved:		PRODOC Signature (date Project began):		July 20, 2012
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: June 30, 2015	Actual: December 31, 2015

Project Description

The Bolivia SGP Country Program was “upgraded” at the start of GEF OP5. “Upgrading” means that the Country Program is implemented as a GEF full-size project financed under the OP5 STAR allocation to Bolivia.

The Project Objective is to secure global environmental benefits through strategic and integrated community-based actions in biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management in the Chaco eco-region of Bolivia

The project is securing global environmental benefits through:

- i. Improved management effectiveness of four protected areas with dual category, and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed in the production landscape of PA buffer zones through community initiatives and actions;
- ii. Climate change mitigation through promoting investments in renewable energy technologies and through land use, land-use change and forestry in community lands;
- iii. Land degradation reduced by maintaining or improving the flow of agro-ecosystem services in community lands for sustainability and improved livelihoods;
- iv. Community capacities to address global environmental challenges developed, and knowledge acquired through project implementation documented, shared and applied.

The project is executed by UNOPS as Implementing Partner using the existing Country Program mechanism of the GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) in Bolivia, including grant approval by the National Steering Committee and day-to-day management by the Country Program Team under the leadership of the Country Program Manager (National Coordinator). The project collaborates with a large number of partners including Governmental institutions, national and local NGOs and scientific institutions.

The Bolivia SGP adopted a strategic geographic intervention focus in OP5. In consultation with SGP's government and non-government partners, and building on prior SGP work, it decided to support communities in the Chaco region living inside or around four National Protected Areas. The four protected areas are:

- i. Kaa-Iya del Gran Chaco National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management (1995);
- ii. El Palmar Natural Area for Integrated Management (1997);
- iii. Serrania del Aguaragüe National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management (2000);
- iv. Serrania del Iñaño National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management (2004).

Together, these protected areas encompass 38,719 Km² or 22% of the entire Bolivian Chaco eco-region.

The main project stakeholders are local communities, and in particular indigenous peoples, that live within the 4 protected areas and their buffer zones. Ethnic groups supported by SGP are Izoceño-Guarani, Chiquitano, Ayoreo, and Weenhayek. Communities of "mestizo" farmers who live within the buffer zones of the PA will also be involved. SGP Bolivia partners with national NGOs with technical and financial management skills that are present in the project areas to mentor community groups and to contribute to capacity building efforts and monitoring on the ground.

Project Progress Summary

The Project is progressing in a highly satisfactory way as shown in the Summary Tables of Progress Towards Results and Progress Towards Objectives below. Call for proposals were made as planned, grants were allocated and grant implementation is progressing well. A total of 57 grants were already allocated.

The National Steering Committee works satisfactorily; they meet frequently and perform what was expected from them (project strategic orientation, selection of proposals for grants, etc.) very well.

The different Project internal processes (planning, M&E, reporting, communications, etc.) are well performed and no major concerns were identified by the MTR

The relationship with the UNDP Country Office is good; the program officer is updated about the progress of the project and participates in project activities.

Project Progress Towards Project Objectives Summary Table

	Indicator	Targets End of Project	Achvement Rating
<p><u>Project Objective:</u> Global environmental benefits secured through strategic and integrated community-based actions in biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management in the Chaco eco-region of Bolivia.</p>	<p>Improved BD conservation and sustainable use in four existing PAs inhabited by indigenous communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAA-IYA National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management (NAIM). • EL PALMAR Natural Area for Integrated Management. • SERRANIA DEL AGUARAGÜE National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management. • SERRANIA DEL IÑAO National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management. 	666,760 ha of PAs and community lands with biodiversity conservation practices and under sustainable management:	Achieved
		Kaa-lya: 446,369 ha in the NAIM of the PA which include areas in the CLO Isoso.	Achieved
		Aguaragüe: 108,307 ha, i.e 100% of the total area of the PA which is both National Park and NAIM and that includes the CLOs of Weenhayek and Guarani People Assembly (APG) Yacuiba.	Achieved
		El Palmar: 59,848 ha which correspond to the total area that is NAIM	Achieved
		Iñao: 52,600 ha which correspond to 20% of the total area under National Park and NAIM categories	Achieved
	Biodiversity mainstreamed in the production landscape in the Buffer zones of the 4 PAs (hectares certified for sustainable management)	Sustainable livelihood interventions implemented by local communities in 132,352 ha and the process to obtain national or international environmental certification initiated. At least 20% of applications achieve certification during the lifetime of the project.	Achieved
	Increased investment in renewable energy technologies (Measured in number of RE systems installed, value and number of institutions making such investments) Tons of CO2 e mitigated	Renewable energy investments increased by at least 100% with contributions from at least 3 entities other than GIZ. 25,000 t/CO2 e avoided in 4 years through RE applications in the Chaco area	Cannot be assessed by MTR
	Carbon stocks maintained in the Chaco area through good forest management practices in forest and non-forest lands including reforestation and natural regeneration. Tons of CO2 e mitigated	Carbon stocks maintained or enhanced in 100,014 ha through avoided deforestation, reforestation, and natural regeneration. 22,503,132 t/CO2 e mitigated (see Annex 6 for data used in calculations)	Cannot be assessed by MTR
	Avoided land degradation and increased resilience of agro-ecosystems to climate change (Measured as a proxy by the number of hectares of community land under SLM practices and with increased vegetation cover, and by the percentage of community land with increased productivity measured in tons per hectare)	320 ha of community lands with sustainable land management practices that reduce land degradation including increased vegetation cover: 200 ha with sustainable agro-ecological/agro-forestry management practices; 100 ha with improved vegetation cover through reforestation and natural regeneration; 20 ha with soil erosion control. At least 30% of the land of SGP supported communities shows increased productivity	Achieved
	Improved gender equity as a result of increased income generation opportunities for women from sustainable livelihood activities within the buffer zones of four PAs. (Measured as a proxy by the percentage of increase in women's income)	At least 20% of initiatives supported by SGP are managed by women groups and generate income from sustainable use of non-timber forest products and sustainable production practices in production landscapes around PAs (e.g., handicraft production, organic apiculture, medicinal plants, etc.) All SGP projects involve both men and women in their design and implementation	Achieved

	Indicator	Targets End of Project	Achvement Rating
	Increased capacity of SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems, and to develop local solutions	70% of participating community members (both men and women) will be able to describe the relation between the SGP-supported intervention and the global environmental benefits it generates At least 80% of projects will be rated satisfactory or above with respect to meeting their objectives	Achieved
	Enhanced public awareness of communities' contributions towards addressing global environmental challenges	30% of SGP-funded interventions will be featured by the national and local media	On-target
	Increased capacity of SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects according to GEF policies, strategies, objectives and indicators; increased capacity of grantees to monitor local environmental trends	At least 80% of SGP grantees demonstrate application of adaptive management to their projects as a result of M&E activities, gather and maintain relevant data (social, economic and environmental), and their reports meet GEF/SGP standards	Achieved

Project Progress Towards Outcomes Summary Table

	Indicator	Targets End of Project	Achvement Rating
Outcome 1: Improved management effectiveness of four protected areas with dual category, and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed in the production landscape of PA buffer zones through community initiatives and actions.	Increased number of Protected Area management plans with input from local communities developed, approved and under implementation.	The project target concerning development and approval of PA management plans includes two areas: Management plan for <u>El Palmar</u> updated and approved. Management Plan for the <u>Aguaragüe</u> formulated within the framework of the "Strategic Plan for the Integral Development of the <u>Aguaragüe</u> and the Ancestral Territory of the Guaraní People", harmonized with the Indigenous Territorial Management Plan of the CLO Weenhayek. It is expected that the Plan will be reviewed, approved and under implementation by the end of the project. Concerning PA management plan implementation the targets are: 15 initiatives with 30 communities supported by SGP within the Indigenous Territory of <u>Kaa-lyá</u> and <u>Aguaragüe</u> PAs contributing to the implementation of the management plans.	On-target
	Improved governance mechanisms of PAs that enable informed and effective local community participation.	The following are the targets for the project: MC for Aguaragüe established and functioning in a participatory manner; MCs for Iñao, El Palmar and Kaa-lyá with strengthened capacities for the participatory management of the PAs Capacities of at least 20 community leaders, men and women from indigenous peoples and other communities, as well as other members of the MC, on legal issues developed (i.e., constitutional mandates on protected areas, legislation on protected areas, and legislation on land tenure and rights, among others). Leaders trained transfer these capacities to other community members (at least 10 people per community)	On-target
	Increased number of community members able to contribute to applied research, and number of community-based initiatives on applied research for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in partnership with relevant government and non-government entities	At least 60 community members trained in species management, data collection and interpretation, monitoring and other technical issues with SGP support. At least 6 of community research initiatives supported by SGP and partner organizations generate information for sustainable management of species and other biodiversity conservation and environmental management issues.	On-target

	Indicator	Targets End of Project	Achvement Rating
	Increased number of community-based initiatives conserving and sustainably using threatened and near threatened plant and animal species	At least 8 animal and plant species (see list in Annex 3 for potential species and their status) sustainably managed and conserved through the development of management plans and the implementation of 20 community-based initiatives	On-target
	Number of ecotourism ventures established with local communities within the Natural Areas for Integrated Management zones of the PAs as a conservation strategy	3 sustainable tourism activities involving 9 communities established and under implementation	On-target
	Improved capacity of communities to mainstream biodiversity in land use planning, and to consider environmental sustainability in livestock management and agricultural production within 132,352 ha of production landscapes	Guidelines for the preparation of community land use plans developed at project inception At least eight land-use plans in PA buffer zones developed by communities and their partners using information from a variety of sources and following the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Approach, and considering as much as possible all ecosystem services. Additional initiatives on sustainable livestock management and agricultural production in PA buffer zones reducing negative impacts on BD from these economic activities: (Kaa-lya: 4 initiatives; Aguaragüe: 4 initiatives; El Palmar: 4 initiatives; and El Iñáo: 3 initiatives) Sustainable use of non-timber forest products and sustainable production practices in production landscapes around PAs. At least 20 initiatives.	On-target
	Improved local capacity for valuation of ecosystem services and for integrated watershed management	At least 2 watersheds with ecosystem services valued and plans for integrated watershed management developed in buffer zones of PAs	Achieved
Outcome 2: Climate change mitigation through promoting investments in renewable energy technologies and through land use, land use change and forestry in community lands.	Increased adoption of renewable energy technologies in target areas measured by the number of RE technologies adopted and the number of households and communities using RE	At least 3 RE technologies adopted through at least 10 initiatives: PV panels: 500 Micro-hydro: 3 Solar dryers: 50 MoUs with 2 or more entities to support and contribute additional investments in RE resulting in at least: PV panels: 250 Micro-hydro: 3 Solar dryers: 25	Cannot be assessed by MTR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of hectares of community lands with agro-forestry systems established and tons of CO₂ e mitigated Number of hectares of forestlands with increased vegetation cover and tons of CO₂ e mitigated Number of hectares of forestland previously devoid of trees with forest cover and tons of CO₂ e mitigated 	14 community-based initiatives with 30 communities implement: 5,000 hectares with agro-forestry systems mitigating 194,563 t/CO ₂ e 90,014 hectares with natural regeneration mitigating 21,776,274 t/CO ₂ e 5,000 hectares reforested mitigating 532,295 t/CO ₂ e	On-target

	Baseline data established and monitoring system adopted for measuring carbon stocks at local level in target areas to contribute to the national forest database, and to land use and land use change monitoring.	Monitoring system for carbon stocks designed and operational by end of first year. Training to communities (men and women of indigenous peoples and community members) and supporting organizations (NGOs and staff of municipalities) at local level within second year of project along with validation of protocols and method. Community carbon monitoring system designed with SGP support transferred to the PNCC-VMA at the end of the project for maintenance and administration	Cannot be assessed by MTR
<u>Outcome 3:</u> Land degradation reduced by maintaining or improving the flow of agro-ecosystem services in community lands for sustainability and improved livelihoods.	Increased number of communities applying sustainable land management techniques in agro-ecosystems	At least 8 community-based initiatives on sustainable land management (e.g., techniques such as 0 tillage, water management and conservation, crop diversification, conservation of crop genetic diversity, sustainable fodder production, fire control, etc.). Selection of SLM techniques to be determined with communities.	Achieved
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased amount of food available to each family throughout the year Increased yield per hectare Improved income from agricultural products 	An average of 10% increase in food availability per household To be determined at project inception per crop 15% increased income	Cannot be assessed by MTR
	Reduced soil erosion in community lands	Soil erosion reduction of at least 30% in project areas	On-target
<u>Outcome 4:</u> Community capacity to address global environmental challenges developed & knowledge acquired through project implementation documented, shared and applied.	Increased number of eligible projects demonstrating community understanding of global environmental issues and with viable local solutions	At least 50% of project proposals received from CBOs are eligible for SGP financing.	On-target
	Enhanced capacity of SGP Grantees to monitor and evaluate projects according to GEF policies, strategies, objectives and indicators.	Some 200 community members trained on project M&E At least 20% of community members demonstrate a good understanding of M&E and contribute to data collection and project monitoring activities. At least 80% of projects achieve adequate monitoring and reporting standards, and apply an adaptive management approach to project implementation	Achieved
	Increased number of contributions from SGP Bolivia to local and national publications and media, as well as to knowledge products of the Global SGP and UNDP	At least 6 SGP projects picked-up by the media. Six knowledge products available in SGP's website and disseminated in hard copy At least 4 projects in Bolivia selected as best practice by the Global SGP or UNDP	On-target

In both cases, Objectives and Outcomes, the progress is highly satisfactory. Despite having the necessary information (as shown below) the Project has not yet completed its reports to the GEF Tracking Tools.

Evaluation Rating Table

Based on the above results and other information presented in the main text, the following Project Evaluation Rating Table was prepared.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	The Project strategy is sound. The Project LFA is well constructed and it is constantly used by the project (National Steering Committee and National Coordination).
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating <u>Project Objective:</u> <i>Global environmental benefits secured through strategic and integrated community-based actions in biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management in the Chaco eco-region of Bolivia.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory	The Achievement Rating is based on the Achievement of Project Indicators. As presented in the Summary Table of Progress Towards Objectives and the fully detailed table in section 4.2 Progress Towards Project Objectives. According to the Tables mentioned above, the SGP has already achieved 7 of the 14 indicators and targets of this Outcome. In another 4 indicators the SGP shows considerable progress and they are assessed as On-target. There are 2 remaining indicators that were not assessed by the MTR because in one case the achievement of the indicator is planned to be determined at the end of the project and in the other case the Carbon stocks and biomass were being measured at the MTR time and the final data were not available at that time.
	Outcome 1 <i>Improved management effectiveness of four protected areas with dual category, and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed in the production landscape of PA buffer zones through community initiatives and actions.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory	In this Outcome the SGP Bolivia has already achieved 2 indicators (8 in total), in another 6 the achieved progress shows is high and therefore they are assessed as on-target considering the achieved progress and that the project still have 15 months for implementation and one full call for proposals to be done after MTR.
	Outcome 2 <i>Climate change mitigation through promoting investments in renewable energy technologies and through land use, land use change and forestry in community lands.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory	According to the Tables mentioned above, this is an Outcome affected by the delay in measuring biomass and carbon fixation in several forestry and agroforestry systems under implementation. While the activities are on-target, the specific indicators related to biomass and carbon were not assessed because data were not yet available. The HS assessment of this Outcome is based on its similarity with other Outcomes and indicators who were similarly rated

	<p>Outcome 3 <i>Land degradation reduced by maintaining or improving the flow of agro-ecosystem services in community lands for sustainability and improved livelihoods.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory</p>	<p>According to the tables, one indicator was already achieved, another is on-target and the third was designed to be assessed at the end of the project but there are clear indications that it is progressing well. Therefore, having achieved one indicator by MTR and having the other two on-target means deserves to be rated as HS.</p>
	<p>Outcome 4 <i>Community capacity to address global environmental challenges developed & knowledge acquired through project implementation documented, shared and applied.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory</p>	<p>This Outcome has 3 indicators and some of them have many targets. One indicator is already achieved and surpassed and the other two are on-target.</p>
<p>Project Implementation & Adaptive Management</p>	<p>6 Highly Satisfactory</p>	<p>According to the results shown in Section 4.3 (Management Arrangements) regarding Work planning, Finance and co-finance, Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, Stakeholder engagement, Reporting and Communications, all these areas are managed adequately and the MTR did not identify any major concern about them. Minor issues as the delay in reporting to the GEF TT or in having the quantitative estimations of biomass and carbon in forestry and agroforestry systems finished (all of which are under process) are not significant enough to reduce the rating</p>
<p>Sustainability</p>	<p>4 Likely</p>	<p>According to the results shown in Section 4.4 Sustainability, the MTR did not identify major concerns about different sustainability areas (financial, socioeconomic, institutional and environmental) were assessed as Likely. There is a minor concern about socio-economic risks caused by the eventual and complete shift of SGP to other regions in the country, but this issue is not beyond SGP control.</p>

Summary of conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

1. The current project full size corresponding to the 5th Operational Phase of the GEF SGP is relevant to the GEF and country objectives with which it must be consistent.
2. The progress made until the MTR time shows that the project is progressing towards its planned objectives and outcomes in a highly satisfactory way.
3. The project has operated within the historical average efficiency of SGP projects. Some previous studies have shown that this efficiency is good in relation to the general average of GEF funded projects.
4. The products of the SGP investments and activities are visible in the field in form of better practices in the farms, reforestations, silvopastoral systems, new productive sustainable alternatives, equipment, installations, plans, strengthened organizations, better water management, etc.
5. The SGP main partners such as CBOs, NGOs, involved Protected Areas, local Governments, etc, have a very high opinion about the SGP involvement and commitment.
6. The relationship with the UNDP Country Office is excellent. There is good knowledge of the activities, active involvement of the UNDP Program Officer in the NSC and cooperation between SGP and other UNDP and GEF projects.
7. The monitoring and evaluation system is very good and provides appropriate information for both decision-making and reporting. There is a delay in reporting to the GEF Tracking Tools than can be addressed easily because the required information was already generated by the M&E system.
8. Monitoring of co-financing commitments is strong. Actual progress in co-financing is close to 40%. Considering that the majority of the grant Projects are still under implementation and have not submitted their final reports, and there is still one major call for proposals in OP5 due after the MTR, the level of co-financing achieved is good.
9. There are a few key aspects to be addressed by the NSC and the National Coordination in order to prepare a new proposal for GEF OP6. Two of these aspects are: a) to develop an agreement about which one of the two principles (impact or fairness) will be the one guiding the SGP strategy in the future and what indicators and criteria will be used to decide that the expected results have been achieved in terms of the chosen principle . b) to define how the upgrading Bolivia SGP is going to make the best possible use of the strategic advantages of being an upgrading program. Both aspects complement each other and need to be addressed jointly.
10. The varied and numerous strengths and opportunities of the project and its innovative potential provide a strong basis for the development of an attractive proposal for the GEF OP6 aiming to continue and expand the SGP actions and impacts.

Recommendations

1. To complete the current phase of the SGP Bolivia maintaining the current ways operation that has proven effective and efficient to achieve the proposed results. Overall the SGP Bolivia is implementing this project in a very successful way and so the first recommendation is to maintain the good work until the end of OP5.
2. To complete the pending tasks of the SGP Monitoring and evaluation activities; that is the reporting to the GEF tracking Tools using the existing information and the completion of the quantitative assessment of biomass and carbon in different forestry and agroforestry systems.
3. Maintain the close follow-up on the co-financing commitments by grantees and other organizations to ensure that the overall commitment defined in the PRODOC is achieved by the end of the project.
4. To maintain the SGP focus on the four Protected Areas where it is currently active at least until obtaining adequate evidence that the expected results at both territorial and community levels are achieved. This task may imply a better identification about the sustainable results that the SGP is attempting to achieve in terms of territories, communities and organizational development of the local CBOs.
5. To start interacting with the UNDP-GEF Global Technical Advisor for SGP Upgrading Country Programs about the situation of multiple and simultaneous reporting lines that currently underlie the Bolivia SGP operations. As reported in the main text, this issue is not a problem in the SGP Bolivia today but, hypothetically, it may lead to conflicting views about the SGP eventually affecting its operations and performance; hence the need to open a conversation about it.
6. To make all efforts to achieve a project proposal for the next operational phase of the GEF that maximizes the chances of being incorporated into the national GEF portfolio under the GEF STAR allocation.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

This mid-term review (MTR) has the following purposes according to the new UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference:

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

2.2 Scope & Methodology

Scope

The MTR assessed the main key areas related to the above purposes as follows:

- a. Project Strategy
 - Project design
 - Results framework / Logframe
- b. Progress Towards Results
 - Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis
- c. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work Planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy
 - Stakeholder Engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
- e. Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic risks to sustainability
 - Institutional Frameworks and Governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability

Methodology

Based on the evaluation purpose and scope, an evaluation matrix including evaluation questions, indicators, sources of information and methods to obtain information was developed and used to guide the evaluation. This matrix was included in the Evaluation Inception Report submitted to the different stakeholders before the beginning of the evaluation. This matrix is presented as Annex 2.

The evaluation process was carried out according to the following steps:

1. Reading and analysis of existing documentation (including those documents listed in the TOR and the UNDP guidelines for these evaluations, as well as websites and information available online and documents provided directly by the visited organizations and institutions). The list of documents analyzed is included as Annex 5.
2. Development of data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides and field visits, observation and other protocols.
3. Field visit to collect primary information through interviews, observations, field visits and meetings. The itinerary of this visit is included as Annex 4. The list of persons interviewed for this evaluation is included as Annex 5.
4. Preparation of an Initial Findings Report immediately after the field visit. This Report was distributed to the key stakeholders for verification of information accuracy.
5. Preparation of the Draft Final Report and distribution to users established for feedback and comments.
6. Reception of comments and feedback and preparation of the "audit trail"
7. Preparation and submission of the Final Report , including verification of the facts on the basis of comments on drafts , incorporating new materials and adjustments to the Draft Final Report

2.3 Structure of the evaluation report

The contents for the report were organized on the basis of the Table of Contents included in the new UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference to be used from July 1st, 2014.

This Table of Contents has some differences with the one originally included in the TOR but it was adopted aiming to comply with the new UNDP-GEF requirements in place since the mentioned date.

The Table of Contents complies and is consistent with the original TOR and the guidelines established in the GEF-UNDP Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects guiding the mid-term reviews from July 1st, 2014.

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

3.1 Development context

The Gran Chaco is a transboundary eco-region shared by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, and Paraguay encompassing some 850,000 Km² stretching from about 17° to 33° South latitude and between 65° and 60° West longitude. The eco-region harbours the largest forested area in the Continent after the Amazon region and shows an impressive wealth of plant and animal diversity. The predominant vegetation of the Gran Chaco is open dry woodland dominated by *Schinopsis sp* with cacti and bromeliads, stretching continuously over large areas, with a grass ground cover. Other typical vegetation types are palm savannahs, savannah parkland, low tree and shrub savannah, with halophytic shrubs on saline patches. The eco-region is an important bird migration route between the southern (Austral) and northern (Neotropical) regions. The Chacoan Pecary (*Catagonus wagneri*), discovered in the 1970's is undoubtedly the most famous endemic mammal in the region. The Chaco is also a center of endemism for armadillos and other important species.

The Bolivian Chaco, which encompasses approximately 15% of the Gran Chaco area, covers the Eastern and South Eastern parts of the Departments of Chuquisaca (18,772 km²), Santa Cruz (22,737 km²), and Tarija (86,246 km²). Large tracts have high soil fertility and a topography that is favourable for agricultural development, but this is in combination with aspects that are challenging for farming: a semi-arid to semi-humid climate (600-1300 mm annual rainfall) with high evaporation levels, a six-month dry season and sufficient fresh groundwater restricted to roughly one third of the region, two thirds being without groundwater or with groundwater of high salinity. Soils are generally prone to wind erosion once the vegetation cover has been cleared.

The Bolivian Chaco is sparsely populated with an estimated 300,000 inhabitants. Population density in the 3 Departments is as follows: 4 inhabitants per km² in Santa Cruz, 3 inhabitants per km² in Chuquisaca, and 2 inhabitants per km² in Tarija. According to the last census (2001) 57% of the population of the 3 Departments is urban. This means that the average population density in the rural areas of the Chaco is approximately 1 inhabitant per square kilometre. There are several settlements of Ayoreo, Chiquitano, Weenhayek and Guarani indigenous peoples who maintain their languages and traditional lifestyles, often combining hunter-gathering activities with agriculture depending on the season. According to the 2001 census the indigenous population in the Bolivian Chaco is about 80,000 of which 78% live in poverty. The population of the Chaco eco-region also includes cattle ranchers and large and small-scale farmers.

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

The main threats to Bolivia's biodiversity are the loss, conversion, and degradation of forests and other natural habitats. According to greenhouse gas inventories made by the PNCC, the vast majority—83 percent—of CO₂ emissions stem from changes in land use, in particular the conversion of forests to fields and pastures for agriculture and livestock grazing. It is estimated that over 300,000 hectares of forest nationwide are being lost each year due to an expanding agriculture/livestock frontier (large-scale agro-industry, including possible biofuel crops, and small-scale colonization), forest fires, large-scale infrastructure projects (roads, dams, oil and gas prospection and infrastructure), and illegal logging.

Climate change may further exacerbate biodiversity loss by causing alterations in geographical and altitudinal distribution of species and ecosystems or by reducing populations of sensitive species, making them more susceptible to overexploitation.

Droughts are chronic in the Chaco leading to significant losses of cattle and crops. The government has declared the Chaco an area of natural disaster in several occasions in the last few years. Land degradation due to eolic erosion, over-grazing, soil compaction, and vegetation cover loss is increasing.

Unsustainable exploitation of selected animal species (due to subsistence hunting, sports hunting and commercial wildlife exploitation) is another important cause of biodiversity loss in the Chaco. Unsustainable biomass burning to meet the energy needs of local populations is another factor degrading the fragile ecosystems of the Chaco, particularly in the drier areas.

Overgrazing and uncontrolled fires resulting from poorly managed extensive cattle ranching significantly affects the Kaa-lya and Serranias de Aguaragüe national parks. Illegal hunting to eliminate cattle predators and for subsistence, and unsustainable wildlife trade are significant threats to many animal species in the Serranias de Aguaragüe. Large-scale monoculture for commercial agriculture as well as expanding small-scale agriculture affects all four protected areas. The activities related to oil and gas prospection and extraction in the Kaa-lya PA area, which include drilling, road and pipeline construction, have negative environmental impacts such as habitat loss, changes in the hydrological system, and opening up pristine areas to new settlements or to exploitation of natural resources by *colonos* or settlers

Barriers

The key barriers addressed by the Bolivia SGP are those related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management by communities. Within this broad category, the following specific barriers were identified.

1. *Weak knowledge of the legal regime of protected areas and BD among local communities.* Communities do not have a good understanding of the limitations and opportunities brought about by the national legislation on protected areas. This results in illegal exploitation of natural resources and illegal settlements within the core conservation area of the PAs, and in missed sustainable development opportunities.
2. *Weak community participation in the governance of PAs and in the development and implementation of PA management plans.* All four protected areas selected by SGP allow legal occupation by farmer communities and indigenous peoples in the zones demarcated as Natural Areas for Integrated Management. These communities are expected to actively participate in the governance of the Natural Area and in the development of the PA management plan, but the actual situation in the selected Protected Areas at the beginning of the GEF OP5 was far from this situation.
3. *Lack of community know-how and resources to develop and implement sustainable land use plans that mainstream biodiversity conservation. The same barrier exists for the development and implementation of sustainable fauna and flora species management plans, and for watersheds and forest management.* Land use change is progressing rapidly in the absence of livelihood alternatives that would arrest the expansion of extensive cattle ranching and unsustainable farming practices. On the other hand, there was a total absence of land use plans that would reduce land and water resource degradation in areas currently under production or that would guide the expansion of the agricultural/livestock frontier. While the Bolivian legislation provides avenues for adopting more sustainable land use practices, the actual conditions on the ground are quite challenging. SGP is helping to overcome these obstacles but the extent of the problem exceeds its funding capacity.

4. *Lack of resources and staff within national and local agricultural extension institutions to provide technical assistance and financial resources to communities to implement SLM practices and sustainable livelihoods using natural resources.* Due to the remoteness of the PAs and insufficient human and financial resources government institutions had a weak presence in the geographic areas of this project. The Bolivia SGP activities helped substantially to overcome this barrier in the selected Pas.

5. *Lack of community and local authorities awareness on the importance of forest ecosystem services and lack of know how and incentives for communities to maintain forest areas avoiding land use change, and to improve vegetation cover in agricultural lands, maintaining or enhancing carbon stocks.* In 2007, there were about 25,000 fires in Bolivia, most of which were the result of the traditional practice of using fire to clear land for planting and pasture (chaqueo), used in both large and small-scale agriculture. The SGP actions contributed to reduce these forest fires around and inside the selected PAs.

6. *Lack of access to renewable energy alternatives to meet the energy needs of communities without emitting GHG and depleting forests and other vegetation types.* Renewable energy (RE) or energy efficient (EE) technologies have not reached these remote rural areas to support agro-industry development and household heat and electricity needs. The SGP support to alternative energy sources (photovoltaic or PV) is helping to change this situation significantly in its areas of work.

3.3 Project Description and Strategy

Project Description

The SGP Bolivia Country Program as a GEF full-size project

A first key aspect that should be kept in mind when analyzing the SGP OP5 Project in Bolivia is that this is an unusual GEF full-size project. A typical Project defines a priori results to be achieved, inputs to be used to generate outputs to reach the results (all evidenced by indicators) and the required resources (funding and time) to perform the activities. The SGP Country Program does not work this way.

The SGP was created by GEF as a funding window to support projects from CBOs (community based organizations) and small and medium NGOs. It was established to balance the portfolio of full-size and medium-sized projects aimed at Governmental organizations and, to some extent, large NGOs (national and international).

Because of this origin, the SGP was established as a GEF corporate program, implemented by UNDP on behalf of the GEF partnership. This GEF-UNDP SGP has a centralized unit at UNDP Headquarters (CPMT) and from which the national SGPs (such as the former Bolivia SGP) were coordinated and funded. The national SGPs, in turn, channeled small funds (usually around US\$ 50,000 in Bolivia) to CBOs and NGOs in the form of small grants with specific requirements.

This initiative was highly successful as documented in different evaluations and it was renewed with each one of the different GEF OPs. Therefore, and given both its continuity and *modus operandi* these national SGPs became programmatic, in the sense of long-term interventions based on the demands from local communities and civil society.

SGP success led to increased demand from the countries, quick program growth and the expected problems of managing a program in dozens of different countries with a limited budget. Therefore, at the end of OP4 there was a decision to “upgrade” or “graduate” the most successful and best

established national SGPs to a different category. The chosen way to accommodate these new upgrading SGPs was to incorporate them as full-size Country Program projects within the GEF national portfolios starting with GEF OP5.

Therefore, at the end of OP5, these so called “projects” are evaluated in a similar way to the traditional GEF full-size projects. Obviously, it is necessary to briefly recall the SGP history to understand that this type of full-size project has some very specific characteristics that should not be forgotten at evaluation time.

A key aspect to be considered is that SGP Country Programs Projects do not implement directly. They don't have staff, resources, equipment or the mandate for direct implementation of activities leading to results and fulfillment of agreed indicators. These projects work by opening calls for proposals from CBOs and NGOs with a scope of areas of work based on the Project Document; therefore, the implementation of activities and achievements of results depends on the interest and willingness of other organizations to submit proposals within the defined scope of actions. If the organizations do not submit proposals the calls go unanswered and there are no actions made, money spent or results achieved.

Considering these aspects it is easy to understand that different aspects of the planning, monitoring and evaluation cycle are significantly affected by these conditions of operation and they need to be considered when assessing the different components and parts of the project cycle.

Strategy

The GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) in Bolivia is a multifocal project. Bolivia has ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, and is therefore eligible for GEF financing in the three Focal Areas.

The SGP in Bolivia is directly relevant to, supportive of, and consistent with national priorities and policies. This project is in the framework of the principles and legal bases of the new Political Constitution of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, and within the national priorities of the National Development Plan (NDP). The NDP established that “environmental resources include tangible goods such as forests, water resources, and biodiversity with all their biological richness and variety of environments, and intangible goods such as the hydrological cycle and carbon sequestration, which act to mitigate climate change, and which certification will generate advantages for the development of the country”.

The NDP also includes strategies to reduce poverty in which environmental conservation plays an important role. It emphasizes harmony with nature, which is based on traditional economic and cultural linkages of local communities to nature and natural resources. The NDP speaks of reestablishing a balance between nature conservation and economic needs to improve livelihoods, particularly of indigenous communities.

With respect to Biodiversity, this project is aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) approved in 2001 by the then Ministry of Sustainable Development and Planning. With regards to Climate Change, SGP responds to priorities identified in the National Climate Change Program (NCCP). The NCCP is responsible for the implementation of Bolivia's commitments as a Party to the UNFCCC.

The 2008-2012 UNDAF for Bolivia was focused on increasing national productivity in the context of sustainable development. The UNDAF aimed at achieving a balance between development goals and natural resource conservation, and UNDP is playing a major role in supporting the government in meeting those goals. Outcome 4 of the UNDAF aimed to strengthen the capacity of institutions and organizations to increase productivity and generate employment while improving environmental management. Country Programme included outputs relevant to SGP activities in Bolivia: (i) conservation, management and use of natural resources for agricultural and non-agricultural processes promoted; (ii) production activities based on natural resources enhanced through combining traditional knowledge and modern technology to improve food security; (iii) production activities in areas of significant biodiversity increasingly under organic and sustainable production certification; and (iv) access to renewable energy technologies in off-grid rural areas increased. Initiatives led by women are given priority across all UNDAF outputs and outcomes.

In terms of the SGP project itself, in the Biodiversity focal area it aims at improving the management effectiveness of four protected areas of the National Protected Areas System of Bolivia through improved governance, conservation actions, and sustainable use of biodiversity by communities that live legally within these areas or in their buffer zones. SGP integrates conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into the production landscape in the buffer zones of the selected four protected areas, through community-based action.

In Climate Change helps to demonstrate renewable energy technologies in off-grid areas and increase investments in such technologies to reduce unsustainable use of biomass and mitigate climate change. SGP also supports good management practices that maintain or enhance carbon stocks in forest and non-forest community lands.

SGP Bolivia is addressing land degradation through maintaining or improving the flow of agro-ecosystem services to improve the livelihoods of rural communities . SGP actions contribute to increase agro-ecosystem resilience to climate change by introducing more sustainable agriculture and livestock management techniques, and water conservation, erosion control, and soil restoration practices in community lands.

SGP focuses all its interventions in the Bolivian Chaco eco-region. By embracing a landscape approach, SGP contributes to create synergies across focal areas to achieve global environmental benefits while also supporting sustainable livelihoods of local communities.

A cross-cutting project objective is about knowledge management and capacity development of community-based and civil society organizations for: generation, access and use of information and knowledge; support to participatory processes that contribute to policy, legislation development, and good governance of protected areas and natural resources; awareness and implementation of Convention guidelines; and monitoring and evaluation of social and environmental impacts and trends.

During OP5, the Bolivia SGP is funding 71 projects, and a last call for proposals aims to fund another 20 projects. All grant projects have a budget in the US\$ 30,000 - 50,000.- range. All projects should provide co-financing as globally defined for SGP (1:1 relation).

Objectives, outcomes and indicators

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project
<p>Project Objective: Global environmental benefits secured through strategic and integrated community-based actions in biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management in the Chaco eco-region of Bolivia.</p>	<p>Improved BD conservation and sustainable use in four existing PAs inhabited by indigenous communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAA-IYA National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management (NAIM). • EL PALMAR Natural Area for Integrated Management. • SERRANIA DEL AGUARAGÜE National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management. • SERRANIA DEL IÑAO National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management. 	51,696 ha under sustainable management by communities in the geographic area of the project:	666,760 ha of PAs and community lands with biodiversity conservation practices and under sustainable management:
		Kaa-lyya: 41,901 ha in the NAIM/CLO1 Isoso area of the NP.	Kaa-lyya: 446,369 ha in the NAIM of the PA which include areas in the CLO Isoso.
		Aguaragüe: 4,468 ha in the NAIM/CLO "Weenhayek" and "Guarani Peoples Assembly-Yacuiba" areas of the NP.	Aguaragüe: 108,307 ha, i.e 100% of the total area of the PA which is both National Park and NAIM and that includes the CLOs of Weenhayek and Guarani People Assembly (APG) Yacuiba.
		El Palmar: 2,973 ha which corresponds to 5% of the total target area.	El Palmar: 59,848 ha which correspond to the total area that is NAIM
		Iñao: 2,354 ha which corresponds to 4% of the total target area	Iñao: 52,600 ha which correspond to 20% of the total area under National Park and NAIM categories
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity mainstreamed in the production landscape in the Buffer zones of the 4 PAs (hectares certified for sustainable management) 	While there are several national and international certification mechanisms that have been applied in different parts of Bolivia, communities in the PAs and buffer zones covered by this project have yet to obtain any type of certification. Therefore, the baseline is zero	Sustainable livelihood interventions implemented by local communities in 132,352 ha and the process to obtain national or international environmental certification initiated. At least 20% of applications achieve certification during the lifetime of the project.
	<p>Increased investment in renewable energy technologies (Measured in number of RE systems installed, value and number of institutions making such investments)</p> <p>Tons of CO2 e mitigated</p>	Renewable energy investments in the Chaco region are very low, almost 0 in most Chaco localities. GIZ has invested approximately US\$216,000 in photovoltaic panels in the following locations: Villamontes (Chaco Tarijeño): 200 systems of PV panels Muyupampa (Chaco Chuquisaqueño): 250 systems of photovoltaic panels The baseline for Tons of CO2 e mitigated is zero	Renewable energy investments increased by at least 100% with contributions from at least 3 entities other than GIZ. 25,000 t/CO2 e avoided in 4 years through RE applications in the Chaco area
	<p>Carbon stocks maintained in the Chaco area through good forest management practices in forest and non-forest lands including reforestation and natural regeneration.</p> <p>Tons of CO2 e mitigated</p>	There are 11,585,590 ha of forest in the Chaco. Deforestation rates for the period 1993 – 2000 in the municipalities of the Chaco area varied between a low 0.1 and a high 7.8 per cent. The overall deforestation rate during the same period for the 11 municipalities in the Chaco for which information is available (Bolfor) is 2%, which is equivalent to 231,754 ha of forests.	Carbon stocks maintained or enhanced in 100,014 ha through avoided deforestation, reforestation, and natural regeneration. 22,503,132 t/CO2 e mitigated (see Annex

¹ NAIM/CLO is the acronym for Natural Area for Integrated Management/Community Land of Origin.

		The baseline for Tons of CO ₂ e mitigated is zero	6 for data used in calculations)
<p>Avoided land degradation and increased resilience of agro-ecosystems to climate change</p> <p>(Measured as a proxy by the number of hectares of community land under SLM practices and with increased vegetation cover, and by the percentage of community land with increased productivity measured in tons per hectare)</p>	<p>To be determined once specific community projects are approved.</p> <p>National statistics on land degradation are: 41% of the national territory has some degree of land degradation, i.e., more than 45 million has, including a large part of the departments of Oruro, Potosí, Chuquisaca and Tarija, 32% of the department of La Paz, 46% of Cochabamba and 33% of Santa Cruz. There is no specific data for the Chaco eco-region, however, it is known that there are serious degradation and desertification problems, a deficit of water resources, unsustainable use of natural resources, and low diversification of agricultural production causing degradation and biodiversity loss</p>	<p>320 ha of community lands with sustainable land management practices that reduce land degradation including increased vegetation cover: 200 ha with sustainable agro-ecological/agro-forestry management practices; 100 ha with improved vegetation cover through reforestation and natural regeneration; 20 ha with soil erosion control.</p> <p>At least 30% of the land of SGP supported communities shows increased productivity</p>	
<p>Improved gender equity as a result of increased income generation opportunities for women from sustainable livelihood activities within the buffer zones of four PAs.</p> <p>(Measured as a proxy by the percentage of increase in women's income)</p>	<p>75% of the Chaco population live in poverty Very few projects financed in the Chaco region consider gender equity. Baseline data will be obtained for specific communities once SGP grants are approved</p>	<p>At least 20% of initiatives supported by SGP are managed by women groups and generate income from sustainable use of non-timber forest products and sustainable production practices in production landscapes around PAs (e.g., handicraft production, organic apiculture, medicinal plants, etc.) All SGP projects involve both men and women in their design and implementation</p>	
<p>Increased capacity of SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems, and to develop local solutions</p>	<p>Capacity of local communities to understand global environmental issues is very low in the Chaco eco-region because SGP has had very few interventions and activities with local NGOs and CBOs (only 8 projects implemented in the Chaco since SGP inception)</p>	<p>70% of participating community members (both men and women) will be able to describe the relation between the SGP-supported intervention and the global environmental benefits it generates At least 80% of projects will be rated satisfactory or above with respect to meeting their objectives</p>	
<p>Enhanced public awareness of communities' contributions towards addressing global environmental challenges</p>	<p>Awareness continues to be low among the general public in spite of previous SGP efforts and those of other NGOs</p>	<p>30% of SGP-funded interventions will be featured by the national and local media</p>	
<p>Increased capacity of SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects according to GEF policies, strategies, objectives and indicators; increased capacity of grantees to monitor local environmental trends</p>	<p>Only a handful of local communities in the Chaco have implemented projects funded by international donors or institutions with complex monitoring and evaluation systems, therefore, capacities for M&E are extremely low There is no information in community activities that contribute to monitoring local environmental trends</p>	<p>At least 80% of SGP grantees demonstrate application of adaptive management to their projects as a result of M&E activities, gather and maintain relevant data (social, economic and environmental), and their reports meet GEF/SGP standards</p>	

<p><u>Outcome 1:</u> Improved management effectiveness of four protected areas with dual category, and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed in the production landscape of PA buffer zones through community initiatives and actions.</p>	<p>Increased number of Protected Area management plans with input from local communities developed, approved and under implementation.</p>	<p>The following is the status of PA management plans: <u>El Palmar</u>: Draft management plan formulated and revised but not yet approved (1st Version in 2005 and 2nd version in 2006) “Strategic Plan for the Integral Development of the <u>Aguaragüe</u> and the Ancestral Territory of the Guaraní People” in preparation. Management plan for the <u>Aguaragüe</u> PA as well as an Indigenous Territory Management Plan for the Weenhayek indigenous people, at early stages of preparation. The <u>Kaa-lyá</u> management plan was developed and approved in 2001. The <u>Iñao</u> management plan is being reviewed for approval</p>	<p>The project target concerning development and approval of PA management plans includes two areas: Management plan for <u>El Palmar</u> updated and approved. Management Plan for the <u>Aguaragüe</u> formulated within the framework of the “Strategic Plan for the Integral Development of the <u>Aguaragüe</u> and the Ancestral Territory of the Guaraní People”, harmonized with the Indigenous Territorial Management Plan of the CLO Weenhayek. It is expected that the Plan will be reviewed, approved and under implementation by the end of the project.</p>
	<p>Improved governance mechanisms of PAs that enable informed and effective local community participation.</p>	<p>The status of the Management Committee (MC)² in each selected PA is as follows: Kaa-lyá: The MC was established in 1996 and is functional El Palmar: The MC was established on 15 November 2008 and is operating but requires strengthening Iñao: The MC was established in 2008 and operates, but it does not have by-laws or Internal Regulations and requires strengthening. Aguaragüe: It does not yet have an MC. A co-management agreement between SERNAP and 3 Guaraní communities (Yacuiba, Carapari and Villamontes) was signed on 9 December 2008. In this agreement it is stipulated that the MC should be established. Indigenous peoples leaders and members of the MC in the 4 Pas have not been trained on legal aspects related to protected area management.</p>	<p>Concerning PA management plan implementation the targets are: 15 initiatives with 30 communities supported by SGP within the Indigenous Territory of <u>Kaa-lyá</u> and <u>Aguaragüe</u> PAs contributing to the implementation of the management plans.</p>

² The Management Committee (MC) is a body representative of the local population for its participation in the planning of PA management and for contributing to the oversight of the management of the PA.

	<p>Increased number of community members able to contribute to applied research, and number of community-based initiatives on applied research for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in partnership with relevant government and non-government entities</p>	<p>Education standards in the Chaco are low and people with secondary education (about 50% of the population) are mostly concentrated in urban areas. Therefore, the capacities of local rural communities to contribute to applied research are low, although communities contribute their traditional knowledge to research initiatives. There is no inventory of research initiatives in PAs and their buffer zones that integrate community members. A few research activities with participation of local communities and indigenous peoples' organizations in the Kaa-lyá PA have been identified.</p>	<p>At least 60 community members trained in species management, data collection and interpretation, monitoring and other technical issues with SGP support. At least 6 of community research initiatives supported by SGP and partner organizations generate information for sustainable management of species and other biodiversity conservation and environmental management issues.</p>
	<p>Increased number of community-based initiatives conserving and sustainably using threatened and near threatened plant and animal species,</p>	<p>Threatened and near threatened plants and animal species of the Chaco are identified in the Red Book of vertebrates and Red List Book of CWRs. Two animal species in the Kaa-lyá PA, i.e., Taitetu (<i>Tayassu tajacu</i>) and Peni (<i>Tupinanbis rufescens</i>) have management plans. There are initiatives to promote sustainable use of a few plants in El Palmar PA such as <i>Euterpe Precatoria</i> and <i>Bactris Gassipae</i> There is no consolidated baseline on initiatives conserving threatened and near threatened species in these PAs.</p>	<p>At least 8 animal and plant species (see list in Annex 3 for potential species and their status) sustainably managed and conserved through the development of management plans and the implementation of 20 community-based initiatives</p>
	<p>Number of ecotourism ventures established with local communities within the Natural Areas for Integrated Management zones of the PAs as a conservation strategy</p>	<p>An Ecotourism Strategy for the National System of Protected Areas was approved to guide tourism activities within the PAs. There are no ecotourism facilities within the NAIM zones of the PAs.</p>	<p>3 sustainable tourism activities involving 9 communities established and under implementation</p>
	<p>Improved capacity of communities to mainstream biodiversity in land use planning, and to consider environmental sustainability in livestock management and agricultural production within 132,352 ha of production landscapes</p>	<p>There are no community land use plans in the PA buffer zones. There are some initiatives on sustainable livestock management and agricultural production in the buffer zones of the Iñaño PA.</p>	<p>Guidelines for the preparation of community land use plans developed at project inception At least eight land-use plans in PA buffer zones developed by communities and their partners using information from a variety of sources and following the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Approach, and considering as much as possible all ecosystem services. Additional initiatives on sustainable livestock management and agricultural production in PA buffer zones reducing negative impacts on BD from these economic activities: (Kaa-lyá: 4 initiatives; Aguaragüe: 4 initiatives; El Palmar: 4 initiatives; and El Iñaño: 3 initiatives) Sustainable use of non-timber forest products and sustainable production practices in production landscapes around PAs. At least 20 initiatives.</p>

	Improved local capacity for valuation of ecosystem services and for integrated watershed management	There are no ecosystem services valuation studies for watersheds in the area and no watershed management plans developed	At least 2 watersheds with ecosystem services valued and plans for integrated watershed management developed in buffer zones of PAs
<p><u>Outcome 2:</u> Climate change mitigation through promoting investments in renewable energy technologies and through land use, land use change and forestry in community lands.</p>	Increased adoption of renewable energy technologies in target areas measured by the number of RE technologies adopted and the number of households and communities using RE	There isn't a full inventory of existing renewable energy installations in the project areas. Known RE installations are: PV panels: 450 Micro-hydro: 2 Communities targeted by SGP currently use generators to meet energy needs. There is some cooperation, between private and public entities to promote RE initiatives in the project area (GIZ, the Chaco Foundation, FEGACHACO, and NGOs such as ENERGETICA and Pro Leña), for the promotion of photovoltaic technology at household level and for other uses such as electric fences around pastures	At least 3 RE technologies adopted through at least 10 initiatives: PV panels: 500 Micro-hydro: 3 Solar dryers: 50 MoUs with 2 or more entities to support and contribute additional investments in RE resulting in at least: PV panels: 250 Micro-hydro: 3 Solar dryers: 25
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of hectares of community lands with agro-forestry systems established and tons of CO₂ e mitigated Number of hectares of forestlands with increased vegetation cover and tons of CO₂ e mitigated Number of hectares of forestland previously devoid of trees with forest cover and tons of CO₂ e mitigated 	<p>The baseline for these activities is 0 because agroforestry and silviculture are seldom practiced by communities in the project area</p> <p>The estimated baseline for existing degraded forests were natural regeneration and enrichment activities will take place is 8,835,159 t/CO₂ e</p>	14 community-based initiatives with 30 communities implement: 5,000 hectares with agro-forestry systems mitigating 194,563 t/CO ₂ e 90,014 hectares with natural regeneration mitigating 21,776,274 t/CO ₂ e 5,000 hectares reforested mitigating 532,295 t/CO ₂ e
	Baseline data established and monitoring system adopted for measuring carbon stocks at local level in target areas to contribute to the national forest database, and to land use and land use change monitoring.	Baseline data on carbon stocks in the project area is not available There is no monitoring system available for measuring carbon stocks in the project area The Forestry Directorate (Direccion Forestal) under the Vice-Ministry of Environment in cooperation with the Authority for Forests and Lands (Autoridad de Bosques y Tierras) plan to monitor REDD+ pilot sites with support from UN-REDD. However, none of these sites are in the Chaco.	Monitoring system for carbon stocks designed and operational by end of first year. Training to communities (men and women of indigenous peoples and community members) and supporting organizations (NGOs and staff of municipalities) at local level within second year of project along with validation of protocols and method. Community carbon monitoring system designed with SGP support transferred to the PNCC-VMA at the end of the project for maintenance and administration

<p><u>Outcome 3:</u> Land degradation reduced by maintaining or improving the flow of agro-ecosystem services in community lands for sustainability and improved livelihoods.</p>	<p>Increased number of communities applying sustainable land management techniques in agro-ecosystems</p>	<p>There are no interventions on sustainable land management (SLM) in the project area, except for some soil management initiatives in the buffer zone of El Palmar PA</p>	<p>At least 8 community-based initiatives on sustainable land management (e.g., techniques such as 0 tillage, water management and conservation, crop diversification, conservation of crop genetic diversity, sustainable fodder production, fire control, etc.). Selection of SLM techniques to be determined with communities.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased amount of food available to each family throughout the year • Increased yield per hectare • Improved income from agricultural products 	<p>To be determined for each project at approval stage</p>	<p>An average of 10% increase in food availability per household To be determined at project inception per crop 15% increased income</p>
	<p>Reduced soil erosion in community lands</p>	<p>Extent of degraded area in community lands to be determined during 1st semester of 1st year of project</p>	<p>Soil erosion reduction of at least 30% in project areas</p>
<p><u>Outcome 4:</u> Community capacity to address global environmental challenges developed & knowledge acquired through project implementation documented, shared and applied.</p>	<p>Increased number of eligible projects demonstrating community understanding of global environmental issues and with viable local solutions</p>	<p>The share of SGP eligible projects from the Chaco region in the past was 6% of the total portfolio in Bolivia Stakeholders from the Chaco region are not aware of global environmental challenges and cannot identify local actions to address them</p>	<p>At least 50% of project proposals received from CBOs are eligible for SGP financing.</p>
	<p>Enhanced capacity of SGP Grantees to monitor and evaluate projects according to GEF policies, strategies, objectives and indicators.</p>	<p>Current capacity is very low because local communities have not had the opportunity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate sustainable development projects, nor have they received training</p>	<p>Some 200 community members trained on project M&E At least 20% of community members demonstrate a good understanding of M&E and contribute to data collection and project monitoring activities. At least 80% of projects achieve adequate monitoring and reporting standards, and apply an adaptive management approach to project implementation</p>
	<p>Increased number of contributions from SGP Bolivia to local and national publications and media, as well as to knowledge products of the Global SGP and UNDP</p>	<p>SGP-Bolivia project results have been disseminated through the national media and experiences and lessons from project implementation have been highlighted in global SGP publications. However, SGP projects implemented in the Chaco have never been featured.</p>	<p>At least 6 SGP projects picked-up by the media. Six knowledge products available in SGP's website and disseminated in hard copy At least 4 projects in Bolivia selected as best practice by the Global SGP or UNDP</p>

3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements

The SGP in Bolivia is executed by UNDP and implemented by UNOPS, through a small country program team.

UNDP provides overall program oversight and takes responsibility for standard GEF project cycle management services beyond assistance and oversight of project design and negotiation, including project monitoring, periodic evaluations, troubleshooting, and reporting to the GEF.

The SGP Country Program in Bolivia is guided by a National Steering Committee (NSC) integrated by governmental and non-governmental organizations with a non-governmental majority, a UNDP representative and representatives from different sectors and organizations and individuals with expertise in the GEF Focal Areas. In OP5, because of the strategic focusing on specific Protected Areas of the Chaco Region, the Directors of the Protected Areas prioritized by SGP were incorporated into the NSC. The NSC is responsible for grant approval and for determining the overall strategy of the SGP in the country. The proposed members of the NSC are appointed formally by the UNDP Resident Representative after clearance by the Global Technical Advisor.

The National Coordination (Country Team) is composed of a National Coordinator and a Program Assistant. The National Coordination is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the program.

The Project works on the basis of annual calls for proposals from the four prioritized Protected Areas in the Chaco Region and focused on the GEF focal operational areas addressed by Bolivia SGP (Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation). These proposals are reviewed for fulfillment of requirements by the National Coordination and handed to the NSC that analyzes them and decides which ones will receive funding from SGP.

In the Bolivia SGP Country Program the grants are usually on the order of US\$ 50,000. During this period each project is visited by members of the National Coordination Team. The grantee organizations should submit regular reports that are reviewed (and returned with comments when necessary) by the National Coordination.

3.5 Project timing and milestones

The Bolivia SGP Country Program began its Fifth Operational Phase (OP5) in July 2012 with the CEO Endorsement of the full-size project (FSP). Immediately after that the process to put the Project to work began and in late 2012 the first call for grant proposals was made and the first group of grants was allocated; their implementation began in 2013. In 2013 there were two calls for proposals in the same year and a fourth one is planned for last quarter of 2014.

The project is expected to end in December 31, 2015. The initial Project termination date was July 31, 2014, but it is already agreed to extend the Project for 6 months to ensure that its effective implementation period remains close to the planned four years.

3.6 Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders of the project are local communities, and in particular indigenous peoples, that live within the 4 protected areas and their buffer zones. Ethnic groups that will benefit from SGP support are Izoceño-Guarani, Chiquitano, Ayoreo, and Weenhayek. Communities of “mestizo” farmers who live within the buffer zones of the PA will also be involved. SGP will partner with national NGOs with technical and financial management skills that are present in the project areas. Their role is essential as they will mentor community groups and will contribute to SGP capacity building efforts and monitoring on the ground.

In order to improve the likelihood of sustainability of community actions, and in accordance with the Autonomy Law of Bolivia, SGP will invite local municipal authorities and indigenous peoples organizations to participate in all activities and will partner with national Government institutions relevant to the objectives of the three focal areas to ensure policy feedback. These include, among others, the Ministry of Environment and Water and its Vice-ministries and specialized departments and branches; the National Service of Protected Areas; the National Authority on Forest and Lands; the Ministry of Rural Development and Lands and its specialized departments and branches; and the Ministry of Energy and Hydrocarbons, among others.

Research and academic institutions will be invited to initiate relevant basic and applied research projects directly involving local communities to improve the knowledge on biodiversity and further develop sustainable use techniques and practices building on traditional knowledge, and that could be replicated with SGP support.

Institutions and private entities working on renewable energy will be invited to provide technical assistance to local communities and to invest in promoting renewable energy technologies in the project focus areas.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Project Strategy

Project Design

Conceptually, the project is well designed and the PRODOC is clear and provides a good framework for implementation.

The interesting aspects of the design are its concentration in a few and well defined areas as the four Protected Areas of the Chaco region (El Palmar, Iñao, Aguaragüe and Kaa Iya). In a large country, with a large variety of different ecological regions and ecosystems and numerous different cultural and ethnic groups focalization is essential if impact is sought.

In this aspect there is a discussion between two different approaches within the SGP Bolivia, its NSC and probably other levels. This discussion is about whether the SGP in Bolivia should emphasize “impact” or “fairness” within the overall SGP strategy.

To achieve impact it is necessary to focus the SGP activities on a limited number of areas and to extend these activities over a number of years exceeding the time limits of a single GEF OP period. The rationale for pursuing impact is how to generate sustainable results that can persist along time and also that can be replicated and maintained without SGP assistance.

To achieve fairness it is necessary to ensure that all regions and groups can access SGP activities and grants on a more or less equal way. Therefore, the achievement of this purpose demands the SGP actins to be scattered all over the country or to rotate them more or less systematically across GEF Ops in order to provide all national groups similar opportunities to access SGP benefits. The rationale for pursuing fairness is rooted in the cultural diversity of the country and the need to ensure that all different groups have equitable access to the existing opportunities.

The second approach (fairness) seems to be better aligned with the traditional SGP operation before becoming an upgrading program. The shift of the Bolivia SGP to an upgrading program and the fact that this program now has resources for a 4-year period allowing for longer term planning and implementation is bringing this discussion between impact and fairness back to the SGP NSC table.

This discussion will probably become stronger when developing the SGP proposal for GEF OP6 because there will be a tension between staying in the current geographical areas where processes are not yet sustainable and shifting to other areas to give them an opportunity.

The MTR is not the best opportunity to solve this discussion but it is a significant aspect to be highlighted in order to request a thorough discussion and agreement about this issue before OP6.

Another relevant process influencing the SGP design for OP5 in Bolivia is its “upgrading” to a full-GEF project within the national GEF STAR allocation. This “upgrading” process meant evolving from an operation centrally coordinated and supervised by the SGP-CPMT in UNDP HQ and receiving annual budgets through CPMT to become a GEF full-size project, with a 4-year implementation period and pre-assigned funds for the entire period based on a budget coming from the Bolivia GEF STAR allocation.

In terms of project strategy shifting from variable annual allocations of funds to secure funds for a 4-year period is a significant change in terms of project strategy. It is not completely evident that the SGP Bolivia made full use of this strategic difference during OP5 as its basic operations continued around annual calls for small grants that cannot be repeated and the latent idea that it may shift to another region in the next GEF pahse. In other words, it is the perception of the MTR that the advantages of the Bolivia SGP being an upgrading program still have plenty of opportunities to be better used, particularly if impact is pursued.

Obviously, under the new framework it will be necessary for the SGP to define more precisely what “impact” (or “fairness”) means, and what kind of processes (with their indicators) should be implemented to ensure that they are properly achieves.

Finally, as reported before, the SGP project is well aligned with global and national priorities. Bolivia is also a signatory of the different global Conventions that make it an eligible country for GEF funding in these areas.

In terms of gender issues, the Bolivia SGO PRODOC has specific indicators for gender and the field visits showed active presence of women in the activities and that the concerns about key women issues are well considered and achieved in the field projects.

Summarizing, from the MTR perspective there are no major or significant concerns about the design of this project for GEF OP5.

Results Framework/Logframe

The Project Results Framework is good. Its different components are well defined and articulated and there is basic logic can be easily identified across the different vertical layers (Project Objective, Outcome, Outputs) and horizontal components (Objective/Outcomes, Indicators, Baseline situation, End of Project Target, Source of verification and Assumptions).

The Bolivia SGP was able to make the links between this clear logical structure with the SGP implementation mechanism, particularly at the level of the indicators and targets of the Project Objectives and Outcomes. In turn, these elements are incorporated into the M&E system that is also able to provide the required information to assess the achievement of these different indicators.

Summarizing, there are no major MTR concerns in this area of project design linked specifically to the Project Results Framework.

4.2 Progress Towards Results

Progress towards outcomes analysis

The analysis of progress towards outcomes based on the results of the project information regarding partial progress achieved by projects under implementation and the field visits to several grant projects demonstrate that the SGP project is going very well as several of the agreed indicators are already achieved at the time of MTR and the remaining ones are on-target; therefore it can be expected that the SGP will achieve all the agreed products and results by the end of the OP5.

The following table shows progress by outcome and indicators as reported in the 2014 PIR completed at the MTR time. The following Table presents the information about progress towards project objective indicators including the pertinent MTR ratings and their justification.

Progress Towards Project Outcomes

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
<p><u>Outcome 1:</u> Improved management effectiveness of four protected areas with dual category, and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed in the production landscape of PA buffer zones through community initiatives and actions.</p>	<p>Increased number of Protected Area management plans with input from local communities developed, approved and under implementation.</p>	<p>The following is the status of PA management plans: <u>El Palmar</u>: Draft management plan formulated and revised but not yet approved (1st Version in 2005 and 2nd version in 2006) "Strategic Plan for the Integral Development of the <u>Aguaragüe</u> and the Ancestral Territory of the Guaraní People" in preparation. Management plan for the <u>Aguaragüe</u> PA as well as an Indigenous Territory Management Plan for the Weenhayek indigenous people, at early stages of preparation. The <u>Kaa-lya</u> management plan was developed and approved in 2001. The <u>Iñao</u> management plan is being reviewed for approval</p>	<p>The project target concerning development and approval of PA management plans includes two areas: Management plan for <u>El Palmar</u> updated and approved. Management Plan for the <u>Aguaragüe</u> formulated within the framework of the "Strategic Plan for the Integral Development of the <u>Aguaragüe</u> and the Ancestral Territory of the Guaraní People", harmonized with the Indigenous Territorial Management Plan of the CLO Weenhayek. It is expected that the Plan will be reviewed, approved and under implementation by the end of the project.</p>	<p>HS - 1 Management Plan for IMNA El Palmar is updated and approved - Administrative Resolution issued by competent authority (SERNAP). 2. Two key offices were strengthened during the development of the PLAN (PA Co-Administration Council and Management Committee). Development of the Management Plan will be funded by another entity (YPFB) (*) Support was given to updating IYA KAA and IÑAO management plans.</p>	On-target	<p>One of the Plans (EL Palmar) is approved. The other is in process and two extra ones are in updating.</p> <p>The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets.</p>
			<p>Concerning PA management plan implementation the targets are: 15 initiatives with 30 communities supported by SGP within the Indigenous Territory of <u>Kaa-lya</u> and <u>Aguaragüe</u> PAs contributing to the implementation of the management plans.</p>	<p>17 initiatives in 69 communities have developed activities in the framework of the management and strategic plans for integrated development. (KAA IYA and AGUARAGÜE)</p> <p>16 initiatives in 50 communities have developed activities in the framework of the management and strategic plans for integrated development. (PALMAR and IÑAO)</p>	Achieved	<p>Surpassed. More initiatives and communities than targeted were already achieved.</p>

Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
Improved governance mechanisms of PAs that enable informed and effective local community participation.	<p>The status of the Management Committee (MC)³ in each selected PA is as follows:</p> <p>Kaa-lya: The MC was established in 1996 and is functional</p> <p>El Palmar: The MC was established on 15 November 2008 and is operating but requires strengthening</p> <p>Iñaao: The MC was established in 2008 and operates, but it does not have by-laws or Internal Regulations and requires strengthening.</p> <p>Aguaragüe: It does not yet have an MC. A co-management agreement between SERNAP and 3 Guarani communities (Yacuiba, Carapari and Villamontes) was signed on 9 December 2008. In this agreement it is stipulated that the MC should be established.</p> <p>Indigenous peoples leaders and members of the MC in the 4 Pas have not been trained on legal aspects related to protected area management.</p>	<p>MC (participatory Management Committee) for Aguaragüe established and functioning in a participatory manner; MCs for Iñaao, El Palmar and Kaa-lya with strengthened capacities for the participatory management of the PAs</p> <p>Capacities of at least 20 community leaders, men and women from indigenous peoples and other communities, as well as other members of the MC, on legal issues developed (i.e., constitutional mandates on protected areas, legislation on protected areas, and legislation on land tenure and rights, among others).</p> <p>Leaders trained transfer these capacities to other community members (at least 10 people per community)</p>	<p>Five specific initiatives have contributed to better management and governance of the two Protected Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is ongoing support to the establishment of Aguaragüe MC - El Palmar, KAA IYA, and INAO MCs have strengthened capacities, renewed boards, and improved and updated by-laws and regulations. <p>33 community leaders and members of the CGs have developed their skills in legal, management affairs, knowledge of legislation on protected areas, land tenure, etc. (FAENA, SAVIA, PRODAMA Y JAINA, TIERRA)</p> <p>Transfer of skills to community members is under development.</p>	On-target	<p>All targets in terms of Management Committees are achieved. The only reaming aspect is the establishment of the MC for Aguaragüe</p> <p>More communities leaders than planned were trained on several issues</p> <p>The transfer of skills is taking place but it has not been quantified yet.</p> <p>The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets.</p>

³ The Management Committee (MC) is a body representative of the local population for its participation in the planning of PA management and for contributing to the oversight of the management of the PA.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	Increased number of community members able to contribute to applied research, and number of community-based initiatives on applied research for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in partnership with relevant government and non-government entities	Education standards in the Chaco are low and people with secondary education (about 50% of the population) are mostly concentrated in urban areas. Therefore, the capacities of local rural communities to contribute to applied research are low, although communities contribute their traditional knowledge to research initiatives. There is no inventory of research initiatives in PAs and their buffer zones that integrate community members. A few research activities with participation of local communities and indigenous peoples' organizations in the Kaa-lya PA have been identified.	At least 60 community members trained in species management, data collection and interpretation, monitoring and other technical issues with SGP support. At least 6 of community research initiatives supported by SGP and partner organizations generate information for sustainable management of species and other biodiversity conservation and environmental management issues.	44 community members are trained in species management, data collection, and monitoring. The indicator is under development. (ESAF, BIORENA, IVI IYAMBAE, COM. VIVA) Four community initiatives have been supported by SGP; the indicator is under development (Ongoing research studies: COMUNIDAD VIVA [1] ESAF [1], BIORENA [5] y HUSALMUT [1]).	On-target	75% of the community members training is achieved. 2/3 of the targeted communities initiatives were supported. The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets.
	Increased number of community-based initiatives conserving and sustainably using threatened and near threatened plant and animal species,	Threatened and near threatened plants and animal species of the Chaco are identified in the Red Book of vertebrates and Red List Book of CWRs. Two animal species in the Kaa-lya PA, i.e., Taitetu (<i>Tayassu tajacu</i>) and Peni (<i>Tupinanbis rufescens</i>) have management plans. There are initiatives to promote sustainable use of a few plants in El Palmar PA such us <i>Euterpe Precatoria</i> and <i>Bactris Gassipae</i> There is no consolidated baseline on initiatives conserving threatened and near threatened species in these PAs.	At least 8 animal and plant species (see list in Annex 3 for potential species and their status) sustainably managed and conserved through the development of management plans and the implementation of 20 community-based initiatives	6 animal and vegetal species (collared peccary, peni, and melipona; janchicoco, algarrobo, and caraguata) have actions for their conservation and sustainable use through the development of management plans, diagnostic surveys, and studies on relative abundance of the species in 5 community initiatives. Indicators are being developed.	On-target	75% of the targeted number of species already under management plans. The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	Number of ecotourism ventures established with local communities within the Natural Areas for Integrated Management zones of the PAs as a conservation strategy	An Ecotourism Strategy for the National System of Protected Areas was approved to guide tourism activities within the PAs. There are no ecotourism facilities within the NAIM zones of the PAs.	3 sustainable tourism activities involving 9 communities established and under implementation	2 sustainable tourism initiatives identifying the tourism product to be offered, and progressing in involving an training local groups to provide basic services to tourists.	On target	The achieved progress and the remaining time allows the MTR to stay optimist about achieving the PRODOC targets.
	Improved capacity of communities to mainstream biodiversity in land use planning, and to consider environmental sustainability in livestock management and agricultural production within 132,352 ha of production landscapes	There are no community land use plans in the PA buffer zones. There are some initiatives on sustainable livestock management and agricultural production in the buffer zones of the Iñaño PA.	Guidelines for the preparation of community land use plans developed at project inception At least eight land-use plans in PA buffer zones developed by communities and their partners using information from a variety of sources and following the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Approach, and considering as much as possible all ecosystem services. Additional initiatives on sustainable livestock management and agricultural production in PA buffer zones reducing negative impacts on BD from these economic activities: (Kaa-lya: 4 initiatives; Aguaragüe: 4 initiatives; El Palmar: 4 initiatives; and El Iñaño: 3 initiatives) Sustainable use of non-timber forest products and sustainable production practices in production landscapes around PAs. At least 20 initiatives.	1 study on property rights and conflicts over land use (FUNDACION TIERRA) 5 Land Use Plans in ZA of 2 PA (CABI, FTDA CHACO y FCBC) - 11 initiatives for sustainable management of agricultural production are developed, including: diversified production, integrated farms, soil management and conservation, sustainable agricultural practices, source water protection, and sustainable management of livestock (ASMUDES, F. PASOS, FUNPADESH, NOR SUD, CEPAC, LIDER, TURUBO, ASOCIO, CERDET, FTDA CHACO, COSV). - Nine initiatives on sustainable use of non-timber forest products and sustainable practices in production landscapes are developed, including: five forest deferral initiatives (CEPAC, CERDET, CIMCI, AGRO XXI, COSV); 4 initiatives for the use of non-timber species (ACLO, SUBCENTRALIA RODEO EL PALMAR, CIMCI, and COMUNIDAD VIVA).	On-target	This indicator has several targets. There is good progress on all targets, with achievement levels ranging from 60% to 100%. The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets, therefore it is assessed as on-target

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	Improved local capacity for valuation of ecosystem services and for integrated watershed management	There are no ecosystem services valuation studies for watersheds in the area and no watershed management plans developed	At least 2 watersheds with ecosystem services valued and plans for integrated watershed management developed in buffer zones of PAs	2 watershed assessments with ecosystem services and development of plans for integrated watershed management: Aguayrenda (FTDA CHACO) Chimeo (JOVENES CONSTRUYENDO)	Achieved	Number of targeted watersheds achieved
<u>Outcome 2:</u> Climate change mitigation through promoting investments in renewable energy technologies and through land use, land use change and forestry in community lands.	Increased adoption of renewable energy technologies in target areas measured by the number of RE technologies adopted and the number of households and communities using RE	There isn't a full inventory of existing renewable energy installations in the project areas. Known RE installations are: PV panels: 450 Micro-hydro: 2 Communities targeted by SGP currently use generators to meet energy needs. There is some cooperation, between private and public entities to promote RE initiatives in the project area (GIZ, the Chaco Foundation, FEGACHACO, and NGOs such as ENERGETICA and Pro Leña), for the promotion of photovoltaic technology at household level and for other uses such as electric fences around pastures	At least 3 RE technologies adopted through at least 10 initiatives: PV panels: 500 Micro-hydro: 3 Solar dryers: 50 MoUs with 2 or more entities to support and contribute additional investments in RE resulting in at least: PV panels: 250 Micro-hydro: 3 Solar dryers: 25	We performed a study on renewable energy and efficiency energy in 4 protected areas and buffer zones of the Bolivian Chaco ecosystem. This evaluation covered both electrical energy infrastructure and existing fossil fuels in the region and protected areas; This information took the form of an energetic diagnosis enabling the region to establish a baseline on the energy situation in the 4 protected areas of the Bolivian Chaco, information that will serve as a tool for designing and proposing future projects. Deployment of technologies began through several projects in different areas.	Cannot be assessed by MTR	At MTR time the field information required to calculate the aggregated progress were under implementation. No aggregated results were available

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of hectares of community lands with agro-forestry systems established and tons of CO2 e mitigated Number of hectares of forestlands with increased vegetation cover and tons of CO2 e mitigated Number of hectares of forestland previously devoid of trees with forest cover and tons of CO2 e mitigated 	<p>The baseline for these activities is 0 because agroforestry and silviculture are seldom practiced by communities in the project area</p> <p>The estimated baseline for existing degraded forests were natural regeneration and enrichment activities will take place is 8,835,159 t/CO2 e</p>	<p>14 community-based initiatives with 30 communities implement: 5,000 hectares with agro-forestry systems mitigating 194,563 t/CO2 e 90,014 hectares with natural regeneration mitigating 21,776,274 t/CO2 e 5,000 hectares reforested mitigating 532,295 t/CO2 e</p>	<p>12 initiatives (PASOS, LIDER, COSV, NOR SUD, CEPAC, CERDET, FUNPADESH, CIMCI, AGRO XXI, INTIKILLAY, YANGAREKO, F. JOVENES CONSTRUYENDO) in 37 communities implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 820 ha with agroforestry - 3,848 ha with natural regeneration - 89 reforested hectares <p>(* The areas to be covered with agroforestry and reforestation systems will be increased gradually because at present the production of plants is in process (9 plant nurseries in production).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reforestation 13017,366 t CO2 • Natural Regeneration 2166961,932 t CO2 • Agroforestry System 119558,5964 t CO2 	On-target	<p>The number of initiatives is almost achieved (85%)</p> <p>The areas of different systems and the mitigation targets are low because most of the grant projects are still under implementation.</p> <p>The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets.</p>
	Baseline data established and monitoring system adopted for measuring carbon stocks at local level in target areas to contribute to the national forest database, and to land use and land use change monitoring.	Baseline data on carbon stocks in the project area is not available There is no monitoring system available for measuring carbon stocks in the project area The Forestry Directorate (Direccion Forestal) under the Vice-Ministry of Environment in cooperation with the Authority for Forests and Lands (Autoridad de Bosques y Tierras) plan to monitor REDD+ pilot sites with support from UN-REDD. However, none of these sites are in the Chaco.	Monitoring system for carbon stocks designed and operational by end of first year. Training to communities (men and women of indigenous peoples and community members) and supporting organizations (NGOs and staff of municipalities) at local level within second year of project along with validation of protocols and method. Community carbon monitoring system designed with SGP support transferred to the PNCC-VMA at the end of the project for maintenance and administration	To be reported in the next period. Information is being generated by a consultant	Cannot be assessed by MTR	At MTR time the field measurements required to calculate progress were under implementation. No aggregated results were available

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
Outcome 3: Land degradation reduced by maintaining or improving the flow of agro-ecosystem services in community lands for sustainability and improved livelihoods.	Increased number of communities applying sustainable land management techniques in agro-ecosystems	There are no interventions on sustainable land management (SLM) in the project area, except for some soil management initiatives in the buffer zone of El Palmar PA	At least 8 community-based initiatives on sustainable land management (e.g., techniques such as 0 tillage, water management and conservation, crop diversification, conservation of crop genetic diversity, sustainable fodder production, fire control, etc.). Selection of SLM techniques to be determined with communities.	<p>16 community initiatives implement techniques for sustainable land management (ASMUDES, PASOS, FUNPADESH, NOR SUD, LIDER, CCICH TURUBO, ASOCIO, F. CHARCAS, INTIKILLAY, COM PORORO, AGRO XXI, FTDA CHACO, CERDET, CEPAC, F. JOVENES CONSTRUYENDO, COSV) in 50 communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainable farming practices: natural pest control, use of organic fertilizers, minimum tillage (4 Communities and 128 families.) - Soil management and conservation: coronation trenches, infiltration trenches, contour curves, slow formation terraces, stone bunds, gabions, gully control (6 Communities and 237 families.) - Integrated farms: Agricultural production, livestock, feed production, fruit growing, wild forest, management beekeeping, water management. (7 Communities and 80 families). - Bio-intensive production: successional horticultural crops, home gardens for organic production (10 communities and 158 families). - Protection of water sources – fish farming: conservation and protection of aquifer recharge areas, local regulations, reforestation practices, construction of ponds for fish production (25 communities and 597 families). - Sustainable feed production: deferred mount management, protection of areas for planting grass and legumes, forage conservation (hay and silage) (23 communities and 510 families). 	Achieved	<p>The number of targeted communities with SLM implementation doubles the target number.</p> <p>This indicator was not only achieved but significantly surpassed.</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased amount of food available to each family throughout the year Increased yield per hectare Improved income from agricultural products 	To be determined for each project at approval stage	<p>An average of 10% increase in food availability per household</p> <p>To be determined at project inception per crop</p> <p>15% increased income</p>	<p>39 communities and 576 families have diversified and improved their diet, contributing to food security for each household through initiatives such as: horticulture, fish farming, beekeeping, fruit production, and organic farming.</p> <p>With the establishment of the Association of Honey Collectors and Traders marketing of honey products started, thus resulting in the generation of a new source for family income. (USD 580/year/household), which is benefiting 70 families in 6 communities.</p> <p>By means of group production in home gardens of CCICH- TURUBO an income between Bs.67 and Bs.280 has been generated per family/production cycle, which is benefiting 21 families in 5 communities.</p> <p>Other economic/productive initiatives that generate income are receiving support, such as ACLO (12 communities and 217 families) for production and marketing of honey from native bees; AGRO XXI (one community and 20 families) for production and marketing of dehydrated cattle meat; CIMCI (one community and 37 families) for the production and marketing of carob flour; and the Association of Collectors and Transformers of Janchicoco (one community and 87 families) for the production and processing of cookies and other products.</p>	Cannot be assessed by MTR	This indicator was planned to assess at the end of the project in terms of comparison of final status against baseline. There was not information at MTR to assess it.
	Reduced soil erosion in community lands	Extent of degraded area in community lands to be determined during 1 st semester of 1 st year of project	Soil erosion reduction of at least 30% in project areas	By developing a series of practices and actions of management and soil conservation, afforestation, areas with natural regeneration, sustainable agricultural practices, physical and mechanical conservation, protection of areas of recharge, the activities have contributed to control and reduce erosion in an area of 4,023 hectares located in areas of project intervention.	On-target	The indicator was interpreted in terms of soil erosion reduction <u>practices</u> , as actual soil erosion was not measured

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
Outcome 4: Community capacity to address global environmental challenges developed & knowledge acquired through project implement-ation documented, shared and applied.	Increased number of eligible projects demonstrating community understanding of global environmental issues and with viable local solutions	The share of SGP eligible projects from the Chaco region in the past was 6% of the total portfolio in Bolivia Stakeholders from the Chaco region are not aware of global environmental challenges and cannot identify local actions to address them	At least 50% of project proposals received from CBOs are eligible for SGP financing.	Out of 16 proposals submitted by OCB's, 5 eligible proposals receive funding from SGP, representing 31% of the initiatives received as of June 2014.	On-target	The level of target achievement is low because most of the grant projects are still under implementation. The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets
	Enhanced capacity of SGP Grantees to monitor and evaluate projects according to GEF policies, strategies, objectives and indicators.	Current capacity is very low because local communities have not had the opportunity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate sustainable development projects, nor have they received training	Some 200 community members trained on project M&E At least 20% of community members demonstrate a good understanding of M&E and contribute to data collection and project monitoring activities. At least 80% of projects achieve adequate monitoring and reporting standards, and apply an adaptive management approach to project implementation	- 294 community members including men and women leaders, authorities, local representatives, promoters, members of the PA and CG, and chiefs of families have developed capabilities to carry out M&E of projects. - 28% of beneficiary families participate in field visits for M&E under SGP. - 94% of the projects show adequate levels of monitoring and reporting on project implementation and a significant degree of ownership of proposed initiatives.	Achieved	This indicator has 3 targets. All were already achieved and surpassed.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	Increased number of contributions from SGP Bolivia to local and national publications and media, as well as to knowledge products of the Global SGP and UNDP	SGP-Bolivia project results have been disseminated through the national media and experiences and lessons from project implementation have been highlighted in global SGP publications. However, SGP projects implemented in the Chaco have never been featured.	At least 6 SGP projects picked-up by the media. Six knowledge products available in SGP's website and disseminated in hard copy At least 4 projects in Bolivia selected as best practice by the Global SGP or UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 IEA Newsletters - Industria, Energía & Ambiente (N° 19 y 20) generated by Energética on renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency. - Management Plans (Executive Summary) for IÑAO, PALMAR, and KAA IYA. - 1 Video on recovery of knowledge and traditional knowledge on natural resources, KAA IYA (SAVIA) - 10 publications (FAENA, CEPAC, PRODAMA, ESAF, SAVIA, FTDA CHACO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ 2 Systematization efforts on silvopastures ▫ 4 Technical Booklets ▫ 4 Radio Programs - Development Indicator. - The projects suggested as best practices are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ CEPAC, silvopastures, pasture management, livestock, forage conservation and native forest ▫ SAVIA, strengthening and capacity building for management committees ▫ FTDA, Comprehensive approach to watershed management, diversification with local participation ▫ CIMCI: Recuperation of knowledge on biodiversity and livelihoods by a group of indigenous women (Guarani) ▫ FUNDACION IVI IYAMBAE, conservation and utilization of wildlife resources by an association of indigenous hunters ▫ CCICH TURUBO: Organic production of vegetables and contribution to food security and income generation for vulnerable indigenous groups ▫ SUB CENTRALIA RODEO, production, storage and marketing of honey by a producers' association in partnership with the Municipal Government to provide honey to the school breakfast program 	On-target	<p>This indicator has several targets.</p> <p>Most of them were achieved, with the exception of number of projects selected as best practice by the Global SGP. This process is under way and it should be finished before end of project. Bolivia SGP has submitted 7 projects to this contest.</p>

Progress towards Project Objectives

The progress of the Bolivia SGP to achieve its Project Objectives is highly satisfactory as the project as achieved several of the Objectives indicators and the remaining ones are on target as shown in the table below.

This information is enough to complete the report to the GEF Tracking Tools in at least two areas (Biodiversity and Land Degradation). The same problems mentioned in the previous section about indicators of Climate change also affect this section. It is expected that the Bolivia SGP will complete its Report to the GEF TT during the remaining time of OP5.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
Project Objective: Global environmental benefits secured through strategic and integrated community-based actions in biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management in the Chaco eco-region of Bolivia.	Improved BD conservation and sustainable use in four existing PAs inhabited by indigenous communities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAA-IYA National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management (NAIM). • EL PALMAR Natural Area for Integrated Management. • SERRANIA DEL AGUARAGÜE National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management. • SERRANIA DEL IÑAO National Park and Natural Area for Integrated Management. 	51,696 ha under sustainable management by communities in the geographic area of the project:	666,760 ha of PAs and community lands with biodiversity conservation practices and under sustainable management:	666.760 Ha of the 4 PAs and community-based lands have strategic guidelines for the implementation of conservation practices and sustainable management of BD by means of improvement and strengthening initiatives for management in PA. 148.154 Ha have actions that directly contribute to BD conservation.	Achieved	The situation of the targeted area is stable and improving through several SGP supported actions
		Kaa-lya: 41,901 ha in the NAIM/CLO4 Isoso area of the NP.	Kaa-lya: 446,369 ha in the NAIM of the PA which include areas in the CLO Isoso.	KAA IYA: 141.923 Ha corresponding to TCO ISOSO through traditional practices of subsistence hunting (F. IVI IYAMBAE); 600.000 Ha in ZA of the area by means of territorial planning and BD conservation actions to protect the Parapeti River and Bañados del Isoso basin (FCBC); 446.369 Ha have an initiative for PA management (SAVIA)	Achieved	The situation of the targeted area is stable and improving through several SGP supported actions
		Aguaragüe: 4,468 ha in the NAIM/CLO “Weenhayek” and “Guarani Peoples Assembly-Yacuiba” areas of the NP.	Aguaragüe: 108,307 ha, i.e 100% of the total area of the PA which is both National Park and NAIM and that includes the CLOs of Weenhayek and Guarani People Assembly (APG) Yacuiba.	AGUARAGÜE: 6 Ha have research plots on native flora, whose outcome is projected onto the entire PA zone (ESAF); 2 Ha for conservation and management of native plant species (COM. VIVA); 108.307 Ha have a PA management initiative (JAINA).	Achieved	The situation of the targeted area is stable and improving through several SGP supported actions

⁴ NAIM/CLO is the acronym for Natural Area for Integrated Management/Community Land of Origin.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
		El Palmar: 2,973 ha which corresponds to 5% of the total target area.	El Palmar: 59,848 ha which correspond to the total area that is NAIM	PALMAR: 3913 Ha (PASOS, ASMUDES, SUB CENTRALIA RODEO EL PALMAR, HUSALMUT) have actions that directly contribute to BD conservation and management and 59. 848 Ha have initiatives for management and research (FAENA, BIORENA).	Achieved	The situation of the targeted area is stable and improving through several SGP supported actions
		Iñao: 2,354 ha which corresponds to 4% of the total target area	Iñao: 52,600 ha which correspond to 20% of the total area under National Park and NAIM categories	IÑAO: 2310 Ha have actions that contribute to conservation and management of BD resources (ACLO, LIDER, NOR SUD, INTIKILLAY). 52.600 Ha have a PA management initiative (PRODAMA)	Achieved	The situation of the targeted area is stable and improving through several SGP supported actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity mainstreamed in the production landscape in the Buffer zones of the 4 PAs (hectares certified for sustainable management) 	While there are several national and international certification mechanisms that have been applied in different parts of Bolivia, communities in the PAs and buffer zones covered by this project have yet to obtain any type of certification. Therefore, the baseline is zero	Sustainable livelihood interventions implemented by local communities in 132,352 ha and the process to obtain national or international environmental certification initiated. At least 20% of applications achieve certification during the lifetime of the project.	In 148.154 Ha initiatives have been implemented to contribute to improve the livelihood of the population in local communities. There is no policy, regulatory, or procedural framework in the country to obtain certification.	Achieved	The targeted area was already surpassed by 12%.
	<p>Increased investment in renewable energy technologies (Measured in number of RE systems installed, value and number of institutions making such investments)</p> <p>Tons of CO2 e mitigated</p>	Renewable energy investments in the Chaco region are very low, almost 0 in most Chaco localities. GIZ has invested approximately US\$216,000 in photovoltaic panels in the following locations: Villamontes (Chaco Tarijeño): 200 systems of PV panels Muyupampa (Chaco Chuquisaqueño): 250 systems of photovoltaic panels The baseline for Tons of CO2 e mitigated is zero	Renewable energy investments increased by at least 100% with contributions from at least 3 entities other than GIZ. 25,000 t/CO2 e avoided in 4 years through RE applications in the Chaco area	Indicator in process	Cannot be assessed by MTR	At MTR time the field measurement required to calculate progress were under implementation. No aggregated results were available

Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
Carbon stocks maintained in the Chaco area through good forest management practices in forest and non-forest lands including reforestation and natural regeneration. Tons of CO2 e mitigated	There are 11,585,590 ha of forest in the Chaco. Deforestation rates for the period 1993 – 2000 in the municipalities of the Chaco area varied between a low 0.1 and a high 7.8 per cent. The overall deforestation rate during the same period for the 11 municipalities in the Chaco for which information is available (Bolfor) is 2%, which is equivalent to 231,754 ha of forests. The baseline for Tons of CO2 e mitigated is zero	Carbon stocks maintained or enhanced in 100,014 ha through avoided deforestation, reforestation, and natural regeneration. 22,503,132 t/CO2 e mitigated (see Annex 6 for data used in calculations)	Indicator in process	Cannot be assessed by MTR	At MTR time the field measurement required to calculate progress were under implementation. No aggregated results were available
Avoided land degradation and increased resilience of agro-ecosystems to climate change (Measured as a proxy by the number of hectares of community land under SLM practices and with increased vegetation cover, and by the percentage of community land with increased productivity measured in tons per hectare)	To be determined once specific community projects are approved. National statistics on land degradation are: 41% of the national territory has some degree of land degradation, i.e., more than 45 million has, including a large part of the departments of Oruro, Potosí, Chuquisaca and Tarija, 32% of the department of La Paz, 46% of Cochabamba and 33% of Santa Cruz. There is no specific data for the Chaco eco-region, however, it is known that there are serious degradation and desertification problems, a deficit of water resources, unsustainable use of natural resources, and low diversification of agricultural production causing degradation and biodiversity loss	320 ha of community lands with sustainable land management practices that reduce land degradation including increased vegetation cover: 200 ha with sustainable agro-ecological/agro-forestry management practices; 100 ha with improved vegetation cover through reforestation and natural regeneration; 20 ha with soil erosion control. At least 30% of the land of SGP supported communities shows increased productivity	587 Ha of community lands have sustainable management practices that reduce land degradation: 1. 240 Ha of Sustainable Agricultural Practices: Integrated Farms, Agroforestry and silvopasture systems. ASMUDES, FUNPADESH, NOR SUD, CEPAC, LIDER, CCICH, COSV, F. JOVENES CONSTRUYENDO). 2. 305 Ha have improved vegetal cover: Construction of fences and forest plantations (FUNPADESH, CEPAC, CERDET, CIMCI, YANGAREKO, AGRO XXI, ASMUDES, LIDER, F. JOVENES CONSTRUYENDO). 3. 42 Ha have erosion control measures (FTDA CHACO and F. PASOS) 18% of all communities (108) located in the Natural Areas of Integrated Management in PAs perform different practices of sustainable land management, thus contributing to improve productivity in their fields	Achieved	This indicator has several targets. All of them were widely surpassed in proportions ranging from 20 to 300%. It is necessary to define more precisely the progress level of the percentage of land showing increased productivity.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	<p>Improved gender equity as a result of increased income generation opportunities for women from sustainable livelihood activities within the buffer zones of four PAs.</p> <p>(Measured as a proxy by the percentage of increase in women's income)</p>	<p>75% of the Chaco population live in poverty</p> <p>Very few projects financed in the Chaco region consider gender equity.</p> <p>Baseline data will be obtained for specific communities once SGP grants are approved</p>	<p>At least 20% of initiatives supported by SGP are managed by women groups and generate income from sustainable use of non-timber forest products and sustainable production practices in production landscapes around PAs (e.g., handicraft production, organic apiculture, medicinal plants, etc.)</p> <p>All SGP projects involve both men and women in their design and implementation</p>	<p>In 4 initiatives (PRODAMA, SAP, CIMSI, ASMUDES) 8 women are involved directly or indirectly in the project management.</p> <p>In 6 initiatives (SUMAJ PUNCHAY, NOR SUD, PRODAMA, ASOCIO, SAVIA, COMUNIDAD VIVA) 22 women have developed leadership and management skills on the productive activities they are conducting.</p> <p>10 of 31 initiatives implemented by NGOs are run by women.</p> <p>All projects include the participation of women and men at all stages of implementation.</p>	On-target	<p>More than 30% of the initiatives are run by women, who are also active in their other initiatives.</p> <p>That surpassed the target.</p> <p>As there are new initiatives to be allocated after MTR this indicator can only be assessed as on target</p>
	<p>Increased capacity of SGP stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems, and to develop local solutions</p>	<p>Capacity of local communities to understand global environmental issues is very low in the Chaco eco-region because SGP has had very few interventions and activities with local NGOs and CBOs (only 8 projects implemented in the Chaco since SGP inception)</p>	<p>70% of participating community members (both men and women) will be able to describe the relation between the SGP-supported intervention and the global environmental benefits it generates</p> <p>At least 80% of projects will be rated satisfactory or above with respect to meeting their objectives</p>	<p>75% of the residents of the targeted communities (5,433 people) where projects are being implemented know about their scope and how the SGP works.</p> <p>87% of the projects considered in this period are rated satisfactory regarding compliance with their objectives, resulting from monitoring and evaluation carried out</p>	On-target	<p>This indicator has two targets</p> <p>Both are surpassed. As there are new initiatives to be allocated after MTR this indicator can only be assessed as on target</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Progress level at MTR (October 2014) based on 2014 PIR	Achvement Rating	Justification for rating
	Enhanced public awareness of communities' contributions towards addressing global environmental challenges	Awareness continues to be low among the general public in spite of previous SGP efforts and those of other NGOs	30% of SGP-funded interventions will be featured by the national and local media	16% of the initiatives supported by the SGP the results have been and/or are publicized in local and regional media.	On-target	The level of target achievement is low because most of the grant projects are still under implementation. The project still has 15 months to achieve the remaining parts of the targets
	Increased capacity of SGP grantees to monitor and evaluate their projects according to GEF policies, strategies, objectives and indicators; increased capacity of grantees to monitor local environmental trends	Only a handful of local communities in the Chaco have implemented projects funded by international donors or institutions with complex monitoring and evaluation systems, therefore, capacities for M&E are extremely low There is no information in community activities that contribute to monitoring local environmental trends	At least 80% of SGP grantees demonstrate application of adaptive management to their projects as a result of M&E activities, gather and maintain relevant data (social, economic and environmental), and their reports meet GEF/SGP standards	All projects supported by SGP in the reporting period comply with the submission of their technical and financial reports, according to the established schedule and recognized and quality standards required by the SGP.	On-target	The indicator was surpassed. As there are new initiatives to be allocated after MTR this indicator can only be assessed as on target

Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

Based on the information from the table in the previous section it is fairly evident that the project is well on-target to achieve most of the agreed end-of-project outcome targets and its Project objective target by the end of the project next December 2015.

Summarizing, the MTR did not identify significant remaining barriers constraining the achievement of the project results and objectives at the end of the GEF current phase (OP5)

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements

During this OP5, and with the SGP operating as an “upgrading” program, management arrangements and procedures worked well, according to all interviewed parties.

The coordination with the UNDP CO was good; the UNDP Program Officer is a member of the NSC and participates in most of the meetings and tasks and maintains a good idea of project activities, potential, problems, etc.

The Bolivia SGP is well recognized and respected within UNDP CO and there is a good working relationship with different units and projects. This situation is helped by the fact that the SGP National Coordination team is hosted by the UNDP CO.

The NSC meets regularly and contributes to the overall management of the SGP by participating in both the selection of proposals and also in the general orientation of the SGP Country Program. NSC members mentioned their interest in participating in some of the monitoring/follow-up visits to the grant projects in order to have a direct experience about the implementation of the grant projects.

Despite the good and harmonious operation of the SGP Bolivia within UNDP Bolivia as an upgrading country program during OP5, a basic vacuum remains in terms of strategic management and decision making about the SGP itself. Hypothetically this vacuum may lead to conflicts (that are not currently taking place in Bolivia) and therefore it deserves some attention from the MTR and the following explanation.

During the previous Operational Phases, as a regular SGP participant in the SGP Global Program, the Bolivia SGP reported directly to the SGP CPMT (Central Program Management Team) at the SGP central office at UNDP HQ in New York.

With the “upgrading”, this reporting line was replaced by a coordination line and three simultaneous reporting lines were established in the PRODOC to the National Steering Committee, the UNDP Resident Representative and the CPMT in central SGP at the UNDP HQ in New York. As long as these three structures are in agreements there are no problems, but it is not well defined what to do if they don't. In other words, it is necessary to define who has the decision-making authority and what is the decision-making process to decide about the strategic orientation of the SGP Country Program (approach, priority areas, program scope and reach, NSC composition, NC staffing, etc.) if the hypothetical case arises in which different supervisors (UNDP CO, NSC and/or UNDP-GTA) have non-negotiable differences about these aspects. Currently this type of problems is not present in Bolivia.

Work planning

Work planning does not present major problems. The SGP develops and follows an Annual Workplan that is used to develop monthly workplans. All approved project proposals are based on the SGP logframe results and indicators, and there is a clear and visible connection between the project logframe and the proposals.

The MTR finds that work planning is well conducted and there are no MTR concerns in this regard.

Finance and co-finance

The project management costs have remained at similar levels to previous OPs. There are studies indicating that the efficiency of the SGP is comparable or better than the average of GEF projects; therefore it can be said that this good situation is maintained. No comments were recorded regarding the costs of project coordination by the authorities or other organizations involved in the project.

The Bolivia SGP keeps a good track of the co-financing reporting from the grantees and other co-financing sources identified in the PRODOC. The co-financing situation at the time of the MTR is summarized in the following table.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Pledged Amount (US\$)	Actually Accounted at MTR (Oct 2014) US\$	Actually Accounted at MTR (Oct 2014) %
National Government	Ministry of Environment	Grant	\$ 392,341		56%
	SERNAP	Cash		23.802,26	
		In Kind		194.527,17	
National Government	Ministry of Environment	In Kind	\$ 392,341		n.a.
GEF Agency	UNDP	In Kind	\$ 192,250		n.a.
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	\$ 1,000,000		n.a.
CSOs	Grantees	Grant	\$ 1,658,409		43%
	Communities - grantees	Cash		49.909,86	
		In Kind		653.080,00	
CSOs	Grantees	In Kind	\$ 1,658,409		38%
	Local NGO	Cash		234.894,07	
		In Kind		396.211,98	
Others	To be determined	Grant	\$ 706,250		108%
	Local Governments	Cash		102.807,99	
		In Kind		63.310,51	
	PROGRAMA DE BIOCULTURA, BILATERALES, OXFAM, OTHERS	Cash		262.889,00	
		In Kind		333.902,00	
Total:			\$ 6,000,000	\$ 2.315.334,84	39%

Regarding co-financing from grantees, the Bolivia SGP requires at least a level of co-financing equal to the amount received from the GEF (1: 1). This co-financing can be made in cash or in kind, at the discretion of the applicant organization.

The previous table shows that the general level of co-financing at MTR time was close to 40%. To assess the co-financing situation it is necessary to consider that the largest number of projects were allocated in 2013 (and most of them are still under implementation) and that there is still a final call in process with a budget of around US\$ 1,000,000.- to be allocated and at least a similar amount to be pledged as co-financing.

Moreover, commitments from other sources different than the grantees (National Government, UNDP, etc.) are usually accounted at the end of the project. Therefore, their contributions are just partially registered at MTR and some of them does not show any record yet despite the fact that they are already active contributing to SGP implementation in different ways.

Therefore, it is the opinion of the MTR that the SGP Bolivia is in a good track regarding co-financing and that the expected levels fo co-financing defined in the PRODOC will be achieves by the end of the Project.

One final issue to highlight is that, in all visited cases, the products resulting from the investments made by the SGP grants are visible (construction, materials, equipment, works of various kinds, home gardens, plantations, etc.) depending on the type of funded project.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

The monitoring and evaluation of the Bolivia SGP Country Program is very good for all its components (biodiversity, climate change and land degradation). In the climate change area there some indicators that require detailed field measurements and studies to be able to quantify both the baseline situation and the results generated by the SGP activities. These detailed measurements were under implementation at the MTR time and they are expected to be completed and available much earlier than the end of project date.

The already operational components (biodiversity and land degradation) are well conceptualized and they are in use since the beginning of the OP5. The system works through the coordinated work of two experts (a biologist and an agronomist) hired as consultants but working coordinately within the National Coordination team.

The M&E process starts from the approval of the grant project, leading to the preparation of project file and the implementation of regular visits (2 to 3 per project depending on complexity, constraints, need for closer follow-up and other issues). These visits are also used to maintain contact with local partners such as local Governments, partner NGOs, other institutions, etc. In this regard, it is important to remember that the Chaco region is very large, scarcely populated and long distances by rural roads should be used to reach distant grantee groups and associated / collaborating organizations and partners; therefore, these M&E visits, frequently made jointly with the National Coordination, are an essential component to maintain a close relationship with all grant project stakeholders.

The field visits are used to collect M&E information that is used to verify and complement the reports from the grantee organizations. All the collected information is then organized and

aggregated in order to be able to provide information at both detailed grant level and aggregated general-SGP country level.

The M&E component has also the task of developing a Project Summary Card summarizing the information and documents of each project, and to make an analysis of all projects per Focal area to extract lessons learned and good practice from the experience of the grant projects. These analyses are presented and discussed in participatory workshops per focal area (Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation) with the participation of the main stakeholders.

This system is very good and become a very important tool for decision-making for the NSC (National Steering Committee) and to supply information for reporting and for other organizations.

The climate change component of the system is developed according to the general process already described. At the time of MTR some of its indicators were measured and included in the overall system as presented before. Some others indicators, those related with biomass and carbon fixation require detailed studies that were under implementation at MTR time. These studies will be very useful not only for SGP but also for national authorities and for the design of other projects related with CO₂ and biomass/carbon aspects.

In summary, there are no significant MTR concerns about Project monitoring and evaluation.

Stakeholder engagement

The SGP in Bolivia has formed well established and long-standing relationships with national and community level initiatives and partners and has continued seeking synergies during OP5.

Local community groups located in the prioritized areas are the most important SGP partners, including a large proportion of indigenous organizations.

The Bolivia SGP Results Framework includes gender indicators that are properly tracked and reported on by the M&E system. Moreover, during the MTR visits and interviews it became evident that gender equity is an aspect that runs effectively across all project activities.

Based on the evidence provided by the field visits and interviews, it becomes clear that there is a close communication between the National Coordination and its partners at different levels, both local CBOs and NGOs and other partner organizations (civil, local Governments, etc.)

All these mechanisms contributed to develop an active and fluid relationship between the project and the local organizations providing a strong base for a better engagement of the stakeholders in all project activities.

Summarizing, there are no significant MTR concerns regarding stakeholder engagement in the Bolivia SGP Country Program.

Reporting

The reporting process in the SGP Bolivia Country program works well in general, particularly regarding the reporting from the National Coordination (NC) to the National Steering Committee. The regular NSC meetings are usually attended by all representatives and there is also a significant flow of information within the system through email and other digital means.

NSC members feel well informed and updated about project progress and well consulted by the National Coordination regarding critical issues. At the same time, the National Coordination perception is that the NSC provides good support to the project and a good space to address project problems, analyze new ideas, etc. The participation of some NSC members in grant monitoring and follow-up activities in the field is an aspect to be considered and raised by some NSC members.

GEF reporting is well performed in general. During OP5, PIR documents for 2013 were completed on schedule and the 2014 PIR was completed before the implementation of this MTR.

GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools

As mentioned before, the SGP Bolivia Country Program has not made yet its report to the GEF Tracking Tools in the different focal areas of SGP intervention (Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation). This is a minor issue considering that the required information for this GEF TT report is already available as part of the M&E system products.

Therefore, it is expected that this situation will be addressed in the short term in order to have this GEF requirement fulfilled.

Summarizing, there are no major MTR concerns regarding reporting with the Bolivia SGP Country Program besides the mentioned need to complete the report to the GEF Tracking Tools.

Communications

As presented above in the section on stakeholder engagement, SGP communications with stakeholders and partners are very good. No other comments are needed about this aspect.

In terms of public communications the SGP is in process to migrate from their current Website (<http://www.pnud.bo/ppd>) to a new one, also managed by UNDP Bolivia, but that will provide more flexibility, better capacity for direct content upload and a shared platform with other initiatives. As a consequence of this migration, the current Website is outdated. The launching of the new site is expected in early 2015.

An interesting aspect to remark is that the Bolivia SGP systematizes its experiences regularly through the operation of the M&E system described in a previous section and the preparation of Project Summary Cards and annual documents analyzing the experience of the projects of that year for each GEF Focal areas and the lessons learned through these projects experiences.

This richness of experience and lessons is one of the greatest legacies of the Bolivia SGP (in addition to its concrete field results) and the fact that these lessons and experiences are obtained, properly documented and easily accessible to the public is an important strength to highlight.

4.4 Sustainability

Financial risks to sustainability

The financial risks to the sustainability of the actions funded in OP5 do not seem important. In other words, the invested resources are there in the hands of the local organizations and well incorporated into their actions. Moreover, most of the actions are aimed to really basic aspects of the wellbeing of the local communities (energy, light, fuel, cash income and similar); therefore, the recipients and beneficiaries of these activities are the ones with the highest interest in keeping them active at the individual/family level.

Based on the presented aspects the MTR rates the financial sustainability as Likely.

Socio-economic risks to sustainability

Socio-economic risks are not significant because of the way in which SGP is implemented. SGP activities are not decided by the SGP National Coordination; they are decided, designed, justified and implemented by the local groups committing their own resources to the activities they propose.

As a consequence, what is perceived in the field visits and interviews with the local groups is that they are entirely committed to the success and continuity of the undertaken efforts.

Similarly, the engagement of national organizations, NGOs, local governments and other stakeholders in the field projects also contribute to create an enabling environment protecting the initiatives from the usual socio-economic problems.

In the case of activities at the community/community-group level, what is perceived from the field visits and interviews is that they are well involved in project implementation and they have strong organizations. Their main constraints are related to lack of communications, administrative skills, lobbying to get more attention from governmental organizations, stronger networking for joint processing, value addition, marketing, etc. All these issues are being developed through training by the different NGOs accompanying/mentoring the organizations.

The MTR perception is that this capacity building process will not be completed in all cases by the end of OP5 and that a continuation of activities during OP6 will be necessary in most cases. It is not clear at MTR time whether or not the Bolivia SPG in OP6 will be allowed to maintain activities in the current areas (even partially) or if it will be shifted to other parts of the country also in great need. A complete shift of activities to other parts of the country may imply a strong interruption in the process of the communities currently engaged and, probably, a risk to the sustainability of the achieved results.

Based on the presented considerations the MTR rates the socio-economic sustainability as Moderately Likely.

Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

The national institutional framework in Bolivia seems to be shifting to a clear commitment with the environment and participatory democracy mechanisms. The new Constitution of Bolivia and the National Development Plan emphasizes harmony with nature, which is based on traditional economic and cultural linkages of local communities to nature and natural resources.

Further political developments such as the Agenda 2025 and the establishment of the Plurinational Authority for the Mother Earth evidence that the mentioned political impulses are still strong and alive and provide the necessary political framework for the sustainability of SGP results.

Moreover, supporting the implementation mechanisms of the new Constitution on issues related to GEF goals is a basic element of the rationales for the proposal for SGP Bolivia for OP5; therefore, this alignment ensures, at least until and if there are changes policy, the institutional sustainability of SGP actions.

Because of this situation the MTR rating of sustainability in this aspect is Likely.

Environmental risks to sustainability

The most evident risk to the environmental sustainability of SGP actions is a long-term one: climate change. This is a relevant risk because of its scale and because it has the potential to affect the core component of the SGP (and GEF) approach: biodiversity conservation in protected areas, biological corridors and buffer zones. Everybody expects that the work in environmental connectivity carried out by GEF, SGP and many other agencies and organizations will be enough to reduce the risks that climate change poses for biodiversity conservation, but nobody knows for sure. Therefore, and despite the uncertainty, doing what is being done is still the best no-regrets bet.

Other short-term risks as deforestation, forest fires, overgrazing, environmental degradation (soil, water, etc.) can be significant in very specific parts of the region or to some very specific SGP-supported projects, but they do not imply a generalized risk for the entire set of project activities.

Based on the presented aspects the MTR rates the environmental sustainability as Likely.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

1. The current project full size corresponding to the 5th Operational Phase of the GEF SGP is relevant to the GEF and country objectives with which it must be consistent.
2. The progress made until the MTR time shows that the project is progressing towards its planned objectives and outcomes in a highly satisfactory way.
3. The project has operated within the historical average efficiency of SGP projects. Some previous studies have shown that this efficiency is good in relation to the general average of GEF funded projects.
4. The products of the SGP investments and activities are visible in the field in form of better practices in the farms, reforestations, silvopastoral systems, new productive sustainable alternatives, equipment, installations, plans, strengthened organizations, better water management, etc.
5. The SGP main partners such as CBOs, NGOs, involved Protected Areas, local Governments, etc, have a very high opinion about the SGP involvement and commitment.
6. The relationship with the UNDP Country Office is excellent. There is good knowledge of the activities, active involvement of the UNDP Program Officer in the NSC and cooperation between SGP and other UNDP and GEF projects.
7. The monitoring and evaluation system is very good and provides appropriate information for both decision-making and reporting. There is a delay in reporting to the GEF Tracking Tools than can be addressed easily because the required information was already generated by the M&E system.
8. Monitoring of co-financing commitments is strong. Actual progress in co-financing is close to 40%. Considering that the majority of the grant Projects are still under implementation and have not submitted their final reports, and there is still one major call for proposals in OP5 due after the MTR, the level of co-financing achieved is good.
9. There are a few key aspects to be addressed by the NSC and the National Coordination in order to prepare a new proposal for GEF OP6. Two of these aspects are: a) to develop an agreement about which one of the two principles (impact or fairness) will be the one guiding the SGP strategy in the future and what indicators and criteria will be used to decide that the expected results have been achieved in terms of the chosen principle . b) to define how the upgrading Bolivia SGP is going to make the best possible use of the strategic advantages of being an upgrading program. Both aspects complement each other and need to be addressed jointly.
10. The varied and numerous strengths and opportunities of the project and its innovative potential provide a strong basis for the development of an attractive proposal for the GEF OP6 aiming to continue and expand the SGP actions and impacts.

Recommendations

1. To complete the current phase of the SGP Bolivia maintaining the current ways operation that has proven effective and efficient to achieve the proposed results. Overall the SGP Bolivia is implementing this project in a very successful way and so the first recommendation is to maintain the good work until the end of OP5.
2. To complete the pending tasks of the SGP Monitoring and evaluation activities; that is the reporting to the GEF tracking Tools using the existing information and the completion of the quantitative assessment of biomass and carbon in different forestry and agroforestry systems.
3. Maintain the close follow-up on the co-financing commitments by grantees and other organizations to ensure that the overall commitment defined in the PRODOC is achieved by the end of the project.
4. To maintain the SGP focus on the four Protected Areas where it is currently active at least until obtaining adequate evidence that the expected results at both territorial and community levels are achieved. This task may imply a better identification about the sustainable results that the SGP is attempting to achieve in terms of territories, communities and organizational development of the local CBOs.
5. To start interacting with the UNDP-GEF Global Technical Advisor for SGP Upgrading Country Programs about the situation of multiple and simultaneous reporting lines that currently underlie the Bolivia SGP operations. As reported in the main text, this issue is not a problem in the SGP Bolivia today but, hypothetically, it may lead to conflicting views about the SGP eventually affecting its operations and performance; hence the need to open a conversation about it.
6. To make all efforts to achieve a project proposal for the next operational phase of the GEF that maximizes the chances of being incorporated into the national GEF portfolio under the GEF STAR allocation.

November 14, 2014

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference

Evaluations of the GEF-financed Full-Size Projects for the Fifth Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Kenya and México

The five projects listed here were approved in GEF OP5 as upgrading country Program projects financed by the GEF. Upgrading SGP Country Program projects are products of the policy approved by GEF Council at the November Council of 2008. Under this policy, countries were encouraged to finance their SGP Country Programs with a higher amount from their STAR allocations. The average GEF financing per upgrading country Program is USD 4.6 million.

Upgrading Country Programs follow SGP Operational Guidelines, in particular in regard to the composition of the National Steering Committee and the role of the National Coordinator. The four-year standard Country Program Strategies have been substituted by UNDP-GEF Project Documents in which a logical framework delineates the expected outputs and outcomes to be produced as a consequence of a focused grant making scheme. In the case of the five UCPs listed here, UNOPS remains the executing agency.

The evaluations of the five projects consist of one Terminal Evaluation (Mexico) and four Midterm Reviews (Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador and Kenya). UNDP-GEF supplies standard TORs for Terminal Evaluations (page 2-13) and Midterm Reviews (page 14-25), which can be found below. The project evaluations will require assessment, against the outcomes and outputs of each project, of the impacts achieved or in progress, identification of lessons learned, identification of bottlenecks and obstacles to further implementation and development of the Country Programs for the future. The evaluator will produce an individual written assessment report for each project, as well as an overall synthetic, comparative report across all projects which will identify trends and patterns in design and implementation as input to SGP Program analysis overall.

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference Template

Note: This template MTR ToR fits the formatting requirements of the UNDP Procurement website.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full or medium-sized* project titled *Project Title* (PIMS#) implemented through the *Executing Agency*, which is to be undertaken in *year*. The project started on the *project document signature date* and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated following the completion of the second Annual Project Review/ Project Implementation Report (APR/PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to: *(provide a brief introduction to the project including project goal, objective and key outcomes, its location, timeframe the justification for the project, total budget and planned co-financing. Briefly describe the institutional arrangements of the project and any other relevant partners and stakeholders).*

3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document (ProDoc), and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability and the project's preparation of a strategy for when UNDP-GEF project support ends (if they have one and if they don't, then assist them in preparing one at the midterm).

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including APR/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, other project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach⁵ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.⁶ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *(list)*; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to *(location)*, including the following project sites *(list)*.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

⁵ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

⁶ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

5.1 Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the project document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

5.2 Project Results

Progress Towards Results:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "High risk of not being achieved" (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

5.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been solved.

- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on project management.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Are project teams meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Monitoring Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and long-term investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express to the public the project progress and intended impact (is there a project website or a weekly e-bulletin, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

5.4 Long-term Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, APR/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Give particular attention to critical risks.
- Assess overall risk management to sustainability factors of the project in terms of risks to motivations, capacity, and resources. Does the project have sustainability benchmarks built into the project cycle?
- *Financial Sustainability*: What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
- *Socio-political Sustainability*: Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned are being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?
- *Institutional and Governance Sustainability*: Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.
- *Environmental Sustainability*: Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The MTR should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

6. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team will make recommendations by outcomes, as well as on Project Implementation and on Long-Term Sustainability/ Risk Mitigation strategy; they will make at least 5 key recommendations, and no more than 15 recommendations total.

7. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be (# of weeks) starting (date) according to the tentative MTR timeframe as follows:

DATE	ACTIVITY
(dates)	Desk review - 2 days
(date)	MTR Inception Workshop - 1 day
(dates)	Validation of MTR Inception Report - 1 day
(dates)	Stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits - 6-8 days, depending on number and distances
(dates)	Mission wrap-up & presentation of initial findings 3 days
(dates)	Preparing draft report 5 days
(dates)	Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of final report (off-site) 2

	<i>days</i>
<i>(dates)</i>	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
<i>(dates)</i>	Comments/ Feedback on the Management Response
<i>(date)</i>	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for field trips should be provided in the Inception Report.

8. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

- **MTR Inception Report:** MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review
 - Timing: No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission
 - Responsibilities: MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit
- **Presentation:** Initial Findings
 - Timing: End of MTR mission
 - Responsibilities: MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
- **Draft Final Report:** Full report (as template in Annex B) with annexes
 - Timing: Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission
 - Responsibilities: Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFP
- **Final Report:** Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report
 - Timing: Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft
 - Responsibilities: Sent to the Commissioning Unit
- **Comments on the Management Response:** Review the Management Response to the Final MTR report and provide comments
 - Timing: Within 1 week of receiving the Management Response
 - Responsibilities: Sent to the Commissioning Unit

9. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP-GEF GLECRDS under the responsibility of the UNDP-GEF global manager for the SGP Upgrading Country Programs.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

10. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to (*fill in GEF Focal Area*);
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in (*region of project*);
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and (*fill in GEF Focal Area*); experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

11. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Upon approval of final version of the Midterm Review report by the Commissioning Unit and the UNDP-GEF RTA/team, 80% of the payment will be disbursed. Upon receipt of comments/ feedback on the Management Response, the remaining 20% of the payment will be disbursed.

ANNEX 2. EVALUATIVE MATRIX

Evaluation question	Indicators	Sources	Methodology *
PROJECT STRATEGY: How appropriate is the strategy and project design?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How appropriate was the design of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence between the problems addressed by the project and underlying assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Documents SGP Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence between project strategy and most effective route to achieving goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Documents SGP Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of incorporating lessons from other projects in the design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Documents SGP Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of project alignment with national goals and priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP Documents National Planning Documents Project Documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of ownership of the project by national organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governmental staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of incorporation of perspectives of local, partners and other stakeholders in the project design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local stakeholders Governmental staff Representatives of organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How appropriate is the Project results framework / logframe? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequacy of the Project Goals and Indicators (SMART) to its strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC & Reports SGP Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I Evaluator's criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of clarity, practicality and feasibility of the Project objectives and results to the situation and time available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC & Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR Evaluator's criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of effects not considered to be included in the results framework and monitored regularly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC & Reports Local stakeholders Governmental staff Representatives of organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I + DO Evaluator's criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which aspects of gender equity and other of similar amplitude in terms of development are effectively monitored. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC & Reports SGP Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I Evaluator's criteria

PROJECT RESULTS: What is the degree of project progress towards expected results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿What are the achievements of the project until MTR? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Objectives and Results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieved Objectives and Results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC & Reports Partners and participants Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I + DO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of correspondence between progress and proposed in the GEF Tracking Tools for the Project Thematic area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC & Reports GEF Tracking Tools SGP Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I + DO Evaluator's criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of topics and areas in which the project can expand the benefits in terms of achievements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRODOC & Reports Local stakeholders Governmental staff Representatives of organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I + DO Evaluator's criteria
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: How appropriate was the implementation of the project so far and to what extent was necessary to implement adaptive management?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How appropriate is operational planning? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of startup and project implementation delays and measures to address them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which operational planning is guided by results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of use of the results matrix and adjustments made to it since the beginning of the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How adequate has been finance and co-finance management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiency in the management of project financial resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in the allocation of project funds and relevance and degree of ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of ownership of the financial controls of the project (including planning and reporting) and its flow of funds (to and from the project) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the co-financing is provided and its level of strategic use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Project Information Co-financing information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR + I

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How adequate is the monitoring of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring system in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation and inclusion of partners in monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with other (national GEF) systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Other systems information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of adequacy of funding for monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How suitable are the reports of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of Reporting of Project adjustments to the Project Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of documentation and dissemination of project settings to the partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How suitable are project communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of regularity, effectiveness and inclusiveness of Project communication efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of public communications of Project activities and achievements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + DO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How suitable are the management arrangements of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall effectiveness of the project management (responsibilities, lines of supervision, decision making) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of support provided by UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • UNDP information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I

LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY: To what extent there are financial, institutional, socio-economic and / or environmental risks to the project results long term sustainability?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How suitable are the project's strategies to address the different types of risks to the sustainability of project results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of relevance of the risks identified in the PRODOC, APR / PIR and ATLAS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners and participants perceptions • Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + DO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Degree of risk factors of sustainability in terms of motivation, capacity and resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners and participants perceptions • Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + DO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List, relevance and existence and implementation of prevention and mitigation of financial sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners and participants perceptions • Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + DO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List, relevance and existence and implementation of prevention and mitigation of socio-political sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners and participants perceptions • Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + DO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List, relevance and existence and implementation of prevention and mitigation of institutional and / or governance sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners and participants perceptions • Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + DO
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List, relevance and existence and implementation of prevention and mitigation of environmental sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGP Project Information • Partners and participants perceptions • Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DR + I + DO

* Methodology:

DR. Documents Review

I. Interviews

DO. Direct Observation

ANNEX 3. MTR RATINGS AND RATINGS SCALE

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	The Project strategy is sound. The Project LFA is well constructed and it is constantly used by the project (National Steering Committee and National Coordination).
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating <u>Project Objective:</u> <i>Global environmental benefits secured through strategic and integrated community-based actions in biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management in the Chaco eco-region of Bolivia.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory	The Achievement Rating is based on the Achievement of Project Indicators. As presented in the Summary Table of Progress Towards Objectives and the fully detailed table in section 4.2 Progress Towards Project Objectives. According to the Tables mentioned above, the SGP has already achieved 7 of the 14 indicators and targets of this Outcome. In another 4 indicators the SGP shows considerable progress and they are assessed as On-target. There are 2 remaining indicators that were not assessed by the MTR because in one case the achievement of the indicator is planned to be determined at the end of the project and in the other case the Carbon stocks and biomass were being measured at the MTR time and the final data were not available at that time.
	Outcome 1 <i>Improved management effectiveness of four protected areas with dual category, and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed in the production landscape of PA buffer zones through community initiatives and actions.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory	In this Outcome the SGP Bolivia has already achieved 2 indicators (8 in total), in another 6 the achieved progress shows is high and therefore they are assessed as on-target considering the achieved progress and that the project still have 15 months for implementation and one full call for proposals to be done after MTR.
	Outcome 2 <i>Climate change mitigation through promoting investments in renewable energy technologies and through land use, land use change and forestry in community lands.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory	According to the Tables mentioned above, this is an Outcome affected by the delay in measuring biomass and carbon fixation in several forestry and agroforestry systems under implementation. While the activities are on-target, the specific indicators related to biomass and carbon were not assessed because data were not yet available. The HS assessment of this Outcome is based on its similarity with other Outcomes and indicators who were similarly rated

	<p>Outcome 3 <i>Land degradation reduced by maintaining or improving the flow of agro-ecosystem services in community lands for sustainability and improved livelihoods.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory</p>	<p>According to the tables, one indicator was already achieved, another is on-target and the third was designed to be assessed at the end of the project but there are clear indications that it is progressing well. Therefore, having achieved one indicator by MTR and having the other two on-target means deserves to be rated as HS.</p>
	<p>Outcome 4 <i>Community capacity to address global environmental challenges developed & knowledge acquired through project implementation documented, shared and applied.</i> Achievement Rating: 6 Highly satisfactory</p>	<p>This Outcome has 3 indicators and some of them have many targets. One indicator is already achieved and surpassed and the other two are on-target.</p>
<p>Project Implementation & Adaptive Management</p>	<p>6 Highly Satisfactory</p>	<p>According to the results shown in Section 4.3 (Management Arrangements) regarding Work planning, Finance and co-finance, Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, Stakeholder engagement, Reporting and Communications, all these areas are managed adequately and the MTR did not identify any major concern about them.</p> <p>Minor issues as the delay in reporting to the GEF TT or in having the quantitative estimations of biomass and carbon in forestry and agroforestry systems finished (all of which are under process) are not significant enough to reduce the rating</p>
<p>Sustainability</p>	<p>4 Likely</p>	<p>According to the results shown in Section 4.4 Sustainability, the MTR did not identify any major concern about them and all different sustainability areas (financial, socioeconomic, institutional and environmental) were assessed as Likely.</p> <p>There is a minor concern about socio-economic risks caused by the eventual and complete shift of SGP to other regions in the country, but this issue is not beyond SGP control.</p>

MTR RATING SCALES

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

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

ANNEX 4. MTR MISSION ITINERARY

The field visit was conducted between October 19 to 25, 2014 in accordance with the following schedule agreed with the SGP National Coordination and with support from the UNDP Country Office

October 19, 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trip Costa Rica - Bolivia. Arrival and accommodation in Santa Cruz • Review of SGP documents
October 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air trip Santa Cruz - Sucre • Initial meeting in Sucre with the Bolivia SGP National Coordination team (Ruben Salas and Maria Ines Santos), the SGP consultant on M&E (Mario Tapia) and the SGP consultant on Climate Change (Jaime Quispe) • Meeting with the Director of the El Palmar NAIM Natural Area for Integrated Management (Juan Carlos Sanchez) and his team.
October 21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit the El Palmar Natural Area and communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Road trip to the area ○ Visit to the Central Campament of El Palmar NAIM in Presto ○ Visit to El Rodeo community and projects of the El Palmar Organic Beekeepers Association (AAOEP) ○ Visit to farmer families with photovoltaic (PV) projects ○ Visit to the Aramasi community and the project of water capture, storage and use for horticultural production with drip irrigation in the local school. Visit to the reforestation project. ○ Road trip and night in Villa Serrano
October 22
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit to the Serrania del Iñaño National Park and NAIM in Villa Serrano <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visit to the Pampas del Tigre community and the projects of Ecological Beekeepers Association (AEPSIMS): honey gathering, processing, packing and marketing and building of the gathering and processing center. ○ Visit to the Cieneguillas community and their silvopastoral projects, integrated farms and organic honey production. ○ Road trip and night in Monteagudo
October 23
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visit to the Zapallar community and their silvopastoral and silage projects to improve cattlle feeding in the dry season. ○ Visit to the Guarani natives community of Ity and their Project on wáter supply for 16 families to secure land rights of the comunal lands. ○ Road trip and night in Sucre
October 24
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief closing meeting with Bolivia SGP National Coordination Team • Air trip to Santa Cruz • Night in Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia
October 25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air trip from Santa Cruz de la Sierra to Costa Rica

ANNEX 5. LIST OF INTERVIEWED PERSONS

The list of persons interviewed during this MTR includes:

Organizations and persons at the community level

Rodeo del Palmar Community

1. Familia Víctor Arancibia, farmers
2. Familia Froilán y Toribia Martínez, farmers
3. Emiliano Flores, El Palmar Organic Beekeepers Association (AAOEP)
4. Don Víctor (AAOEP)
5. Anastasio Cros (AAOEP)
6. Cristóbal (AAOEP)
7. Emiliana Isco (AAOEP)
8. Osvaldo Yale (AAOEP)
9. Félix Cavas (AAOEP)
10. Florencio Flores (AAOEP)

Aramasi Community

1. Don Marcelino

Pampa del Tigre Community

1. César Nogales, AEPSIMS (Ecological Beekeepers Association from PN Serranía del Iñao, Municipio de Serrano)
2. Guido García (Director, del PN ANMI Serranía del Iñao) AEPSIMS
3. Pedro Cairoma, President, PN y ANMI Iñao Management Committee

Cieneguillas Community

1. Segundino Escobar
2. Ms. Dunia
3. Don Alejandro

Zapallar Community

1. Jorge González
2. Frida Gonzalez
3. Ariel Salazar

Ity Community

1. Isaac Real
2. Félix Flores

Organizaciones acompañantes de comunidades

1. Marta Leitón, LIDER
2. Gilber Céspedes, LIDER
3. Alfonso Herrera, LIDER
4. Marcelo Arze, HUELLAS
5. Federico López, WUAYNA WASI
6. Fortunato Huaylla, ASOPOAGRO
7. Max Cuba, CEPAC
8. Gerardo García, CEPAC
9. Mauro Hurtado, CIPCA
10. Juan Carlos Altamirano, CIPCA

Governmental Officers

1. Juan Carlos Sánchez, Director ANMI El Palmar
2. Isabel Orozco, ANMI El Palmar
3. Jimena Gómez, ANMI El Palmar
4. José Luis Conchari, ANMI El Palmar
5. Marilú Betancur, ANMI El Palmar
6. Roberto Aguilar, ANMI El Palmar
7. Bernardino, ANMI El Palmar
8. Beatriz Martínez, ANMI El Palmar
9. Guido García, Director PN y ANMI Serranía del Iñao
10. Carlos Vázquez, PN y ANMI Serranía del Iñao
11. Rosa Leny Cuellar, Directora del PN y ANMI Kaa Iya del Gran Chaco
12. Eduardo Durán, Director of Planning, SERNAP (Protected Areas National Service)

UNDP Bolivia Country Office

1. Rocío Chain, PNUD, Environment and Disasters Risk reduction Areas

Bolivia SGP National Coordination (NC)

1. Rubén Salas, National Coordinator
2. María Inés Santos, Program Assistant
3. Mario Tapia, M&E Consultant
4. Jaime Quispe, Climate Change Consultant

Bolivia SGP National Steering Committee (NSC)

1. Oscar Aguilar, President
2. Mario Baudoin
3. Beatriz Zapata
4. Eduardo Durán, Director of Planning, SERNAP (Protected Areas National Service)

Global Coordination of the GEF-UNDP Small Grants Program (SGP)

1. Nick Remple, UNDP Global Technical Advisor for SGP Upgrading Programs

ANNEX 6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Bolivia SGP Project Document (PRODOC)
2. 2014 Project Implementation Report (PIR)
3. Bolivia SGP Project Summary Cards from all Projects approved in OP5 in the first 3 calls
4. Project proposals
5. Project Reports
6. M&E aggregation instruments
7. Summary of Projects and Lessons Learned from SGP Projects in OP5 - Year 1
8. Co-financing tracking tools
9. Kaa Iya del Gran Chaco National Park-NAIM Management Plan 2013-2022
10. United Nations Development Assistance Framework Bolivia (UNDAF)
11. UNDP Country Program Document Bolivia (CPD)
12. UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects
13. UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results
14. GEF Evaluation Office. The ROTI Handbook: Towards enhancing the Impacts of Environmental Projects
15. UNEG. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

ANNEX 7. UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATORS/MIDTERM REVIEW CONSULTANTS

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____ Alejandro Carlos IMBACH _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____ n.a. _____

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

Signed at _____ *Turrialba, Costa Rica* _____ (Place) on _____ *October 1st, 2014* _____ (Date)

Signature: _____  _____

ANNEX 8. MTR REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____