

-
- PROJECT NAME SUPPORTED BY UNDP AND FUNDED BY GEF:

CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY THROUGH SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT BY THE
LOCAL COMMUNITIES

- NUMBER PIMS OF UNDP: 4197 GEF ID: 3971
-

- MID TERM ASSESSMENT AND EXECUTION PERIOD AND REPORT DATE: JUNE 2015 TO JANUARY
2016
-

- REGION AND COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE REPORT: LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN:
BOLIVIA
-

- ACTION AREA OF GEF / STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BIODIVERSITY: BIODIVERSITY, MFS-SO2; BD-SP4 /
SP 5
-

- EXECUTING AGENCY / EXECUTION PARTNER AND OTHER PROJECT PARTNERS: VICE MINISTRY OF
BIODIVERSITY, FOREST RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, DIRECTORATE OF FOREST RESOURCES

APPRAISING: MARIA Onestini

JANUARY 10, 2016

INDEX

Index.....	1
Acronyms.....	3
1. Executive Summary.....	4
Project information chart.....	7
Assessment Rating Chart.....	8
2. Introduction	9
Purpose and objectives of the EMT.	9
Scope and Methodology: principles of design and implementation of the EMT, approach and collection data methods, limitations of EMT	9
Structure of the EMT report.....	11
3. Project description and context.....	12
Development context: relevant environmental, socio-economic, institutional and political factors for the project objective and scope.....	12
Problems the project tried to approach: threats and barriers.....	12
Description and project strategy: Objective, expected output and outcomes, description of field sites.....	13
Mechanisms of project implementation: brief description of the Project Board	16
Project execution deadlines.....	16
Key stakeholders: Summary List.....	16
4. Outcomes.....	18
Project Strategy.....	19
Project design.....	19
Outcomes Framework.....	22
Project Indicators.....	23
Progress in achieving outcomes.....	27
Analysis of progress in achieving outcomes.....	27
Management mechanisms.....	42
Work planning.....	42
Monitoring and evaluation systems at the project level	44

Stakeholders' involvement:	45
Remaining barriers for the Project Objectives achievement.....	47
Project implementation and adaptive management.....	47
Financing.....	47
Sustainability	47
Financial risks to the sustainability	48
Socio-economic risks to the sustainability.....	48
Sustainability risks related to the institutional framework and governance.....	49
Environmental risks to the sustainability.....	49
Request for Extension.....	50
5. Conclusions and recommendations.....	52
Conclusions.....	52
Recommendations.....	54
Recommendations to design level	54
Recommendations regarding the extension request.....	54
Recommendations at implementation level.....	56
Recommendations at expected outcomes and thematic recommendations level.....	58
Annexes	

ACRONYMS

ABT Forests and Land Authority

AP Protected Areas

BD Biodiversity

CIPTA Indigenous Council of Takana People

EMT Midterm Evaluation

FMAM Global fund for environment

FSC Forest Stewardship Council

GEF Global Environmental Facility

NIM National Implementation Modality

NGO Nongovernmental organization

PILCOL Indigenous Peoples and Origin communities of Larecaja

PIR Project Implementation Review

UNDP United Nations Development Programme

PPG Project Preparation Grant

PRODOCs Project Document

TCO Community Territories of Origin

IUCN International Union for Conservation of Nature

VMA Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change, Management and Forestry development

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bolivia (despite being a country with a wide biodiversity) finds that this biodiversity (including for forestry sector) faces threats of deforestation and environmental degradation. The Bolivian government directly controls 43 percent of the forest areas of the country, covering production forests and protected areas (PAs). Forests outside protected areas under state control account for the largest proportion of forest cover in the country. In addition, protected areas (PAs) are fragmented with little protection and management. It is valued in the period 1990-2000 some 161,000 hectares of forest per year have been dismantled. According more recently appreciations, this figure has increased since it is estimated that in the period 2000 to 2010, the country lost 1,820.000 hectares of forests due to deforestation.

Recognizing forestry problems in the country, as well as barriers and inherent challenges in this issue, *the Project Biodiversity Conservation through Sustainable Forest Management by Local Communities (known as GEF Forest Project)* was designed with the aim to *"improve protection and conservation of biodiversity in the Amboró Madidi corridor, through sustainable forest management, based on promoting markets for certified forest products and to increase local revenue."* It aims to:

- (I) train local forestry operations to obtain and maintain certifications;
- (II) increase demand for certified tropical hardwood; and
- (III) improve operational competitiveness of community forestry to enhance access to market (generating an income increase to compensate local businesses for incurred costs in putting in practice certification and conservation of biological diversity).

To achieve the objective, the project seeks to address and overcome several key barriers. These would, in particular:

- I) Institutional Barriers: given the limited institutional capacity to implement sustainable forest management, certification and practices of sustainable management of biodiversity in forests;
- (li) Forest management Barriers: Due to limited knowledge and ability of community organizations to implement sustainable forest management and certification and implementing certification and sustainable practices of biodiversity management; as well as,
- (lii) Financial and market barriers: because the capacity of communities to participate in the growing market for certified sustainable products is limited.

In order to address these barriers and get the expected goals Project begins in April 2012 with an expected duration of four years, projected to conclude in 2016.

To assessment date the project progress in terms of obtaining products, effects and expected results has been weak. The project has faced a series of policy changes around the issues facing the forestry sector in the country, staff turnover (inside and outside the project at the national level and their implementation in pilot areas). All these rotations and changes have been accompanied by reformulations that delay the implementation process. Some processes have begun to be generated, however, and some technical products or perception of problem have begun to occur. Despite these changes, it distinguishes the project is still relevant because the problems not only continue, but worsen in some objective areas of the project.

To help expedite the implementation of this intervention, evaluation has generated a series of recommendations broadly summarized here (which are entirely in the final section of this report). The summary salient recommendations are listed below:

- It is recommended that, if requested, to give rise to no cost extension request so that the project can be extended several times and thus achieve the main objectives proposed and several of the proposed results. That said, however, the extension should be linked to certain components, and the granting of this possible extension is based on the achievement of the components. Among them it is suggested to carry out a concrete and realistic strategic formulation and prioritization; and tied a clear timetable for action with deadlines regarding the activities the project intends to implement in relation to obtaining goals and results-based management. Emphasize and restore activities, processes, products of national nature original of GEF Forest Project. Review the work with local stakeholders and beneficiaries so that viable mechanisms for collaboration are generated to generate planned activities, taking into account that activities the Project should develop are leading to the goal, goals and expected results.
- To encourage agile operation, the project should be strengthened around various aspects of implementation, including strengthening decision making within their system of governance (management committees, etc.).
- Giving account changes in environmental policies in the country, it must rethink the project strategy by establishing a clear relationship with state actors, establishing work plans with each of them attached to the results and expected outputs of the project emphasizing the leadership the government should take over through the counterparty (ie Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change, Forest Management and Development).
- It is recommended that there are greater capabilities implemented in terms of monitoring and follow-up, particularly when implementation problems arise as those the project already had. For example, when clear implementation problems are looming, should be flexibility for articulate monitoring and agile follow-up that can generate rapid channeling of the project when necessary and not wait until times run out and there is little chance of re addressing.
- Agile administrative mechanism should be created or strengthened in correspondence to the dynamics of the project, protecting the internal control mechanisms to ensure the proper administrative and financial management.
- It is recommended that the materials and products generated by the project reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of the actors with whom we work (including the generation of materials in the various local languages).
- It is recommended that the GEF Forest Project generates now a clear exit strategy in order to contribute to the sustainability of efforts made or to achieve. The strategy should include aspects of risk analysis (financial, institutional, socioeconomic or environmental) that could affect to sustain the project results in the medium and long term.
- It is recommended that the planning work would be redirected through the strengthening of some themes, products, and highly relevant issues that the project had in its design and inception and have been left out substantially in the first stage of implementation, looking incorporate the themes of the project in the country's institutions and taking special consideration for new threats to sustainable forest management in the areas of influence

of the project, such as forest certification; productivity as a key role in the conservation of forest resources; and the mechanism of institutional support to promote biodiversity conservation through sustainable forestry management.

PROJECT INFORMATION CHART

Project Title:	Conservation of Biodiversity through the Sustainable Forest Management by local communities		
Identification of GEF Project:	3971		<u>At approval time</u>
Identification of UNDP Project:	4197	GEF financing:	5 500 000 US Dollars
Country:	Bolivia		
Region:	LAC	Government:	10 885 000 US Dollars
Ares of interest:	Biodiversity		
Operative Program:	GEF: 4; MFS-SO2; BD-SP4/SP 5		
Executing Organism	Vice Ministry of Biodiversity, Forest resources and Environment / General Directorate of Forest Resources	Total Cost of the Project:	16 385 000 US Dollars
		Signature of the project document (Project start-up date):	April 2012
		Closing date (operative):	Proposed: June 2016

EVALUATION RATING TABLE

PROJECT PERFORMANCE RATINGS		
Monitoring and Evaluation		
General quality of M&E	AS	
<i>Design of M&E at the begging of the project</i>	S	
<i>M&E implementation Plan</i>	AI	
AI and AE Execution		
General Quality of Implementation / Project Execution	AI	
UNDP application quality	AS	
Execution Quality: Executing Organism	AI	
Outputs/Outcomes		
General Quality of the project outcomes	I	
<i>Relevance</i>	R	
<i>Effectiveness</i>	I	
<i>Efficiency</i>	I	
Sustainability		
General probability of risks to sustainability	AP	
<i>Financial Resources</i>	AI	
<i>Socioeconomic</i>	AP	
<i>Institutional Framework and Governance</i>	AI	
<i>Environmental</i>	AP	
<p>Qualification of outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency, M&E and execution of A&E</p> <p>6: Very satisfactory (MS): no deficiencies were presented 5: Satisfactory (S): minor deficiencies 4: Something satisfactory (AS) 3: Something unsatisfactory (AI) important deficiencies 2: Unsatisfactory (I): important deficiencies 1. Very Unsatisfactory: Serious deficiencies</p>	<p>Sustainability Qualifications</p> <p>4. Probable (P): Insignificant risks for sustainability 3: Something Probable (AP) moderate risks 2. Something Improbable (AI) significant risks 1. Improbable (I). Serious risks</p>	<p>Relevance Qualifications</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1. Not Relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact qualifications</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimum (M) 1. Insignificant (I)</p>
<p>Additional qualifications where appropriate: Not applicable (N/A) Cannot be assessed (N/V)</p>		

2. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE EMT AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this evaluation process was to obtain an independent evaluation of the Project "*Biodiversity Conservation through Sustainable Forest Management by Local Communities (known as GEF Forest Project)*". Being this a mid-term evaluation, it has been proactive in the sense that it can be useful to rechanneling the project (if necessary) and / or strengthen the good practices that are captured as part of the evaluation.

Overall, the objective of this process has been lead to:

- Assess project status and challenges faced to achieve the expected results.
- Identify corrective actions to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the expected effects and impact expected.

Therefore, in summary, this is a summative evaluation as it tries to determine to what extent expected results are being produced up to date and at the same time is a formative assessment in the sense that one of its objects is trying to improve project performance through the development of recommendations.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY: PRINCIPLES OF DESIGN AND EXECUTIUON OF THE EMT, FOCUS AND METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION, EMT RESTRICTIONS

The scope of this assessment follow the guidelines defined in the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Exam in Projects Supported by UNDP and funded by GEF. It was evaluated according to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability potential. The criteria have been qualified according to the guidelines of the Guide since in evaluations of GEF projects, a number of qualifications is promoted (in relation to issues such as monitoring and evaluation, implementation, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, among others). This assessment, therefore, assigned ratings to the criteria designated by the GEF and following the fixed scales.

The unit of analysis or object of study of this midterm evaluation is the project itself. It is understood that the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and management model detailed in the project document and related modifications and changes made during implementation. Temporary basis for evaluation covers the period April 2012 (start of the project) mission to date.

First, as a method for the preparation of the evaluation process, an evaluation matrix was developed. This tool allowed, from the pre-established criteria address key evaluation questions, group and view questions and specific sub-questions, data sources and information and methods and tools for data collection. This tool was used also as a guide for collection and systematization of information (including field work and site visits of this project).

As for specific methodologies for collecting evaluative information, the following tools were used:

- Document analysis.
- Key informant interviews.

- Focus groups.
- Direct observation.

In sum, therefore, the used methodology was focused on identifying progress in the expected products and contributions to the expected effects while strengths and limiting factors are identified. The methodology also focused on evaluating the implementation and management of adaptation to achieve the expected results. Methodologies used and the analysis of data collected realized the three levels of analysis of the evaluation: at design level, at implementation level and at results level.

As for the selection of people to interview, it is mentioned that key informants were selected and interviewed from different groups and different social actors (stakeholders). That is, key actors in government agencies were selected and interviewed, implementing agency, executing agency, and other actors at the national level. Within the framework of this assessment a mission to Bolivia was developed between June 4 and 11 2015. In addition to interviews and concretized meetings in La Paz, during the mission meetings two days of field visits were carried out to two pilot implementation zones. At local level, two out of the three sites where interventions are carried out (Community of Carmen Pecha - Ixiamas Municipality and Community Tumupasa, CIPTA - Municipality of Ixiamas) where key local actors were interviewed in both cases. Could not make a field visit to the Town Center Guanay, PILCOL - Municipality of Guanay because once the mission was underway logistical problems arose. In this case, therefore, telephone interviews with key players in that locality were performed. In all cases semi open interviews were conducted with relevant actors / key informants (when collecting and analyzing their responses) assessment met its objectives and main purposes.

Foreseen limitations were the features in this type of evaluation exercise (such as limited time). No serious limitations were evident, only the aforementioned minor limitation in relation to the difficulties in access to one of the pilot sites, or access to interview people who collaborated with the project in its early stages. These limitations were overcome to some extent by conducting telephone interviews or online when they could not have access interviews in person, and the triangle of information.

STRUCTURE OF THE EMT INFORMANT

First, in this report, after an executive summary, it is this section that outlines the purpose, scope and methodology of this review and report on the mission developed in La Paz, Bolivia. In a second section the concept and design of the project is evaluated aiming to establish the problems and the positive aspects of these stages and as a basis for lessons learned. Then it evaluates, among other things, the mode of implementation of the project, including relevant aspects to the participation of executing institutions, financial planning and routing. This report continues with an assessment of the project's success in achieving objectives and results. Finally, after these findings, the report enters a treatment purposing future in relation to the Project, including an analysis of lessons learned and proposed corrective actions to project itself and strengthening of future similar projects. Valuations are included according to the scales indicated in the GEF evaluation guides.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT CONTEXT

DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT: ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIO-ECONOMIC, INSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL FACTORS RELEVANT TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

As stated in the Project Document, Bolivia (despite being a country with a wide biodiversity) finds that this biodiversity (including for forestry sector) faces threats of deforestation and environmental degradation. The Bolivian government directly controls 43 percent of the forest areas of the country, covering production forests and protected areas (PAs). Forests outside protected areas under state control account for the largest proportion of forest cover in the country. In addition, protected areas (PAs) are fragmented with little protection and management.

It is valued in the period 1990-2000 some 161,000 hectares of forest per year have been dismantled. According to more recent findings, this figure has increased since it is estimated that in the period 2000 to 2010, the country lost 1.82 million hectares of forests due to deforestation.

The threats are especially intense in the Amboró-Madidi corridor (objective zone of this project). There have been identified 2038 animals and 110 plants between categories "critically endangered" and "least concern" according to the categories of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). The underlying reasons for this deforestation are varied, including the advance of the agricultural frontier resulting in the conversion of forests to agricultural production, excessive cultivation of target species (timber and non-timber), mining and infrastructure construction. Other newly identified threats are those derived from exploration and oil exploitation pertaining directly and indirectly to the project's target area. Obviously, this deforestation accompanies the general degradation of biodiversity and, in turn, generates social-environmental situations of vulnerability for the population associated in one way or another to forests.

PROBLEMS THE PROJECT TRIED TO APPROACH: THREATS AND BARRIERS

To achieve the objective, the project seeks to address and overcome several key barriers. These would, in particular:

- (i) Institutional Barriers: given the limited institutional capacity to implement sustainable forest management, certification and practices of sustainable management of biodiversity in forests;
- (ii) Barriers of forest management: Due to the limited knowledge and ability of community organizations to implement sustainable forest management and certification and implementing sustainable practices of biodiversity management; as well as,
- (iii) Financial barriers and market: because the capacity of communities to participate in the growing market for certified sustainable products is limited.

Threats facing the project within a context of analysis of sustainable management of biodiversity in forests are varied. Some of them present at the project design stage, other more recent. **As mentioned in the previous section, the advance of the agricultural frontier, monoculture or cultivation of target species (timber and non-timber), mining, exploration and oil exploitation and infrastructure construction are threats to the sustainable and equitable management of forest resources in Bolivia.** Obviously, this situation accompanies the general degradation of biodiversity and, in turn, generates social-environmental situations of vulnerability for the population associated

in one way or another to forests. Therefore, the project becomes more important and its potential (in monitoring and in the search for sustainable forms of forest resource management) are intensified against these new risks.

It should also be noted that the aim of the project areas are under the jurisdiction of two types of legally recognized entities. These are the indigenous, native and peasant communities and indigenous community territories (TCOs). They not only depend on forest resources to meet a subsistence needs, but also address the use of forest resources to productive activities of different types. Also, most of the forests under community tenure do not have forest management plans. This implies that these areas are not subject to management and systematic monitoring by the Authority of Supervision and Social Control of Forests and Lands. Consequently, this situation (turn) implies that the areas are extremely vulnerable to illegal logging and deforestation. When there are forest management plans, lack of technical and financial capacity of local actors is an obstacle to its implementation.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY: OBJECTIVE, OUTPUTS AND EXPECTED OUTCOME, DESCRIPTION OF THE FIELD SITES

The proposed solution, through Project GEF Forest, to contain the underlying causes of biodiversity loss at long term and to strengthen management of biodiversity in the forests of Bolivia is to support communities to become more competitive in the market. It is estimated that this would lead to investment in biodiversity conservation, therefore, the BOL / 79912 project was designed with the objective of *"improving the protection and conservation of biodiversity in the corridor Amboró Madidi, through forest sustainable management, based on promoting markets for certified forest products and to increase local revenue."*

The project's strategy is aimed at improving the protection and conservation of biodiversity in the corridor Amboró-Madidi through sustainable forest management, based on the promotion of markets to achieve certified forest products and an increase in local revenues. To that end it is foreseen obtaining the following expected overall outcomes:

1. Mechanisms for institutional support are generated to promote the conservation of biodiversity are generated through sustainable management and forest certification.
2. Communities with strengthened capabilities in Integral Forest Management and to obtain and maintain certification and management of forests in a sustainable and respectful manner to biodiversity
3. Economic incentives exist to attract and keep community forestry operations committed to sustainable forestry and practices of management of biodiversity.
4. Project management, monitoring and evaluation.

The specific expected outcomes and outputs through which aims to reach them are presented below, according to the Project Document:

EXPECTED RESULTS	EXPECTED RESULTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Municipal actors endowed with technical and operational capabilities to support, monitor and follow step by step the local activities of forest management and conservation of BD ❖ Planning at the landscape level applied to incorporate BD needs (e.g., wildlife corridors) and follow the large-scale impacts of forest management ❖ Technical capacity within the Directorate General of Forest Resources to promote and implement forest certification processes on the basis of principles and innocuous criteria for BD and FSC ❖ Departmental and municipal procurement policies for certified or verified forest products. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Forest stakeholders at the municipal level apply technical tools to support, monitor and follow step by step the local activities of forest management and conservation of BD ❖ System designed and implemented to plan, manage and follow step by step the impacts of forest management on BD at landscape-scale. ❖ Integration and adoption of BD management through certification in national programs ❖ National technical and operational capacity to extend certification and conservation of BD in production forests ❖ Decrease illegal trade in timber and non-timber ❖ New connections with state buyers and market sales for certified producers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Increase of 48,000 ha (30% more than the starting point of 160,000 ha) within the protected forest area through a management plan of certified forest harmless for BD (Forest Stewardship Council) ❖ At least 41,600 ha (20% of all certified forests) of sections of BD established and applying strict protection plans and safeguard measures for the conservation of BD, reducing pressure on an important area of a vital biological corridor ❖ BD indicators remain stable or improve in at least 10 communities * of the Amboró-Madidi Corridor (starting points to be established during the PPG stage) ❖ Integrated Systems of fire decrease the frequency and severity of fires (starting points to be established during the PPG) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Best local capacity to obtain and maintain certification ❖ Quite Largest Area of forest production subjected to systematic external audit to ensure compliance with conservation criteria of BD ❖ Best local capacity to manage and follow step by step the impacts on BD in the production forest ❖ Application of criteria and indicators to monitor BD in production forests (emphasizing the global importance BD) ❖ Fire decrease reduces fire hazards BD of production forests in the biological corridor ❖ Lessons and experiences of projects inform the development of models to be transferred to other areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Increase of 30% (90,000 m3 more than a supposed starting point of 270,000 m3 †) of certified or verified sold wood in domestic and international markets. ❖ Increase of the competitiveness of local forest operations in the market as a result of certified forest exploitation and improvement of business skills, enabling better practices of BD management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Local forest operations obtain more increase through certified forest exploitation ❖ Producers managed to reduce production costs, increase product quality, improve marketing activities and access to favorite markets

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ forest stakeholders at the municipal level apply technical tools to support, monitor and follow step by step the local activities of forest management and conservation of BD ❖ 10 new partnerships established between producers and national and international buyers with purchase commitments ❖ 10 new certifications of custody chain (starting point of 28 certifications to 31 Dec. 08) ❖ Increased investment in local operations to improve forest management practices that contribute to achieving the objectives of BD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Increased demand for certified timber products by domestic and international buyers ❖ Increased capacity of the demand and offer chain to process and trade certified timber ❖ Implementation of a mechanism for channeling resources of FONABOSQUE and other services to the safe management for BD and forest certification.
--	--

Like many projects funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP, GEF Forest Project includes activities, products, and processes of national scope and activities, as well as products and processes to be implemented at field sites. The Project field sites are located in the corridor area Madidi-Amboró, emplaced through several municipalities in the northern department of La Paz. These are the municipalities of Ixiamas, San Buenaventura, Guanay, Teoponte, Mapiri, Palos Blancos and Alto Beni.

PROJECT MECHANISM AND IMPLEMENTATION: BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT BOARD

The project follows a national implementation mechanism (NEX or NIM for its acronym in English) being the Vice Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change, Forest Management and Development of the Ministry of Environment and Water the executing agency. UNDP is the executing agency for the project.

The organizational and governance structures of the Project are as follows. At senior level a project directory is formed. At advisory level a technical Committee is formed. At the operational level there is a General Coordination Unit (operator) with two regional offices in the pilot areas.

PROJECT DEADLINES

The project got its start in April 2012 with a planned implementation of four-year projected completion in 2016.

MAIN STAKEHOLDERS: SUMMARY LIST

Stakeholders are varied, starting from the ministerial level of the Plurinational State of Bolivia to communities and local actors, producers, municipalities. The short list, at design level that realizes in the Project Document, is below:

- Vice Ministry of Biodiversity, Forest Resources and Environment, Department of Forest Resources, Directorate General of Biodiversity
- Audit Authority and Social Control of Forests and Land – ABT

- Municipalities located north of the City of La Paz:
 - Ixiamas
 - San Buenaventura
 - Guanay
 - Teoponte
 - Mapiri
 - Palos Blancos
 - Alto Beni.
- Communal Land¹ (TCO) PILCOL
- Communal Land (TCO) TACANA
- Groupings of organizations of processors, producers, and of forest products (timber and non-timber)².

¹ According to Bolivian regulations, TCO (Community Lands of Homeland) are territories owned by indigenous population through a collective title.

² Important to highlight, however, several of the identified for the strategy of alliance of the project document, especially NGOs, are no more operating and there is the need to re propose a new strategy to this end.

4. OUTCOMES

As indicated in the relevant sectors, the evaluation not only sought to analyze the fulfillment and achievement of outcomes, but these were also analyzed from various evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The guidelines UNDP / GEF outlined them as follows.

Evaluation criteria PNUD ³
1. Relevance
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ The extent to which an activity is tailored to the priorities of local and national development and of organizational policies, including changes over time.❖ The extent to which the project is consistent with operational programs of FMAM or with strategic priorities on which the project was funded.❖ Note: In retrospect, the question of relevance often becomes a question of whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given the changing circumstances.
2. Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ The extent to which an objective was achieved or likely to be achieved.
3. Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ The extent to which the outcomes with less costly resources possible were delivered; also called profitability or cost effectiveness.
4. Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes and the effects produced by a development intervention. In terms of GEF outcomes include direct project performance at short- to medium-term and the impact at longer-term including global environmental benefits, effects of repetition and other local effects.
5. Sustainability
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ The likely ability of an intervention continue providing benefits for a period after completion.❖ The project must be sustainable both environmentally, financially and socially.

Then Project valuations are in terms of outcomes, as well as in terms of these evaluation criteria.

³ From "GUIDE FOR FINAL EVALUATIONS OF PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY UNDP AND FUNDED BY FMAM."

PROJECT STRATEGY

Recognizing the forestry problem in the country, as well as the barriers and challenges inherent to this issue, the strategy of the Project GEF Forest (explicit from its design level) manifests itself in:

- (I) train local forest operations to obtain and maintain certifications;
- (II) increase demand for certified tropical hardwood; and
- (III) improve operational competitiveness of community forestry to strengthen market access (generating an income increase to compensate local businesses for costs incurred in putting certification and conservation of biological diversity in practice).

The project also includes in its strategy indications that will seek to strengthen institutional capacity at multiple scales in order to support, implement and follow step by step certification practices, forest management and conservation / sustainable use of biodiversity.

At design level, likewise, indicated and warns that this project would not completely exceed all the threats and risks currently facing biodiversity in community forests of Bolivia. But it expected to change the dynamics of management and development path in a critical area of forest biodiversity by generating economic incentives for biodiversity conservation and enhance the capacity of the community to participate in a consolidated market for producers from forests. On the other hand, it is contemplated that the Project will complement government initiatives and other donors focused on improving social, environmental and economic sustainability of forestry.

PROJECT DESIGN

From the perspective of the problem to be addressed by the project and applied hypotheses, as stated in the design, formulation was adequate. This is, in general terms can be established that the project, in its formulation, followed by a suitable logic, not only in formal (ie, following the format of the general objective, indicators baseline, target indicators, outcomes) but also in identifying a correct hypothesis regarding the identified barriers and how to overcome them. **Notably certification proposed was consistent with logic, philosophy and government regulations at the time of project design.**

As context, the design of Project GEF Forest, are properly identified not only barriers but the dominant dynamic at the time of design in relation to the lack of sustainable management of forests in Bolivia. However, it should be emphasized that, between the time of approval and this midterm evaluation, social, political and economic context (as well as many of the threats and barriers identified have changed). First, from the institutional to national level, with changing national policies on topics related to sustainable development (Including management and sustainable use of biodiversity), the project has faced deep⁴ institutional changes. These changes have not only been administrative, but also conceptual.

⁴ For example, regarding institutional changes we had the Authority for Mother Earth, and now replaced by the Vice Ministry of Environment, the Joint Mechanism for Mitigation and Adaptation for the comprehensive and sustainable management of forests Mother Earth which is operated by the Plurinational Authority of Mother Earth. The mechanism aims to promote integrated management and sustainable use of forests and the livelihoods of Mother Earth, conservation, protection and restoration of living systems, biodiversity and environmental functions, facilitating more optimal uses of soil through the development of

Also, the intervention areas have experienced changes in the production structure (and similar changes in the near future are expected). This does not mean that threats, risks and barriers identified at design level have been discharged, but have been identified new threats and risks as well exacerbation of existing threats and risks. For example, the area of influence of the pilots of the project is threatened by new extractive activities (such as mining), by infrastructure with a high environmental impact (such as building roads and lanes or the damming of rivers). Also threats in new forms of exploitation of the zones of influence are identified (such as mass production of sugarcane, after deforestation to implement monoculture and the construction of large-scale sugar mills).

As indicated by the assessment GEF and UNDP guidelines⁵, *"In retrospect, the question of relevance often becomes a question of whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given the changing circumstances."* Such is the case in this assessment. Changes (in threats, socio - economic dynamics and exploitation of natural resources as well as changes in vision and public policy at the State level) make the project even more *relevant* given the prevailing conditions in this implementation period. The relevance of the project at design level are adequate since the project gathered the development priorities of the national sector, plans to relevant country level and international commitments. For example, concerning the latter, it is noted that Bolivia is part of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other international conventions related to biodiversity conservation (such as the International Convention on Trade of Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna—CITIES, the International Agreement on Tropical Timber). The project is in line with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, Strategy of Forests and Climate Change. With regard to development issues, the project states it will support government priorities set out in its National Development Plan and will support the objectives of the 2008 National Plan for Comprehensive Management of Forest. Therefore, it is considered that the design collected and incorporated the existing development priorities at national level in the relevant period. The project in its design level does not incorporate issues of mainstreaming relevant gender thematic. Yes it incorporates an expected outcome indicator of women participation in certification activities (Indicator: Level of participation of women and men in operations of CFEs in project impact study sites). Despite this indicator does not contain a baseline (TBD once the gender indicators are Agreed upon Participants) but states that (once outlined the baseline would increase by 30 percent average the participation of women (30 % average increase participation of women in CFE operations). Therefore, it is affirmed that there is an expected outcome in increasing the participation of women, but also concludes that the expected outcome is not fully an outcome that confers the mainstreaming of the gender issue.

However, although the design is adequate in the above terms to the temporality of the design and approval period, it looms some flaws that impact transcendently in implementing and obtaining outcomes to the date of this assessment, which go beyond changes exercised in the country. First,

more sustainable production systems, including agricultural and forestry, to address the causes and reduce deforestation and forest degradation, in the context of mitigation and adaptation to climate change.

⁵ GUIDE FOR FINAL EVALUATIONS OF PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY THE UNDP AND FUNDED BY FMAM. Evaluation Office, 2012. United Nations Development Programme

it is considered that the project is too widespread. To be indicated that would deal with the geographic areas of the seven North La Paz Bolivian Municipalities, is not given a full account of:

- (I) the area extension;
- (II) the diversity of ecosystems (Yungas and Amazonia);
- (III) the diversity of productive activities that may be related to sustainable forest management (including timber and non-timber in its diversity and complexity);
- (IV) the ethnic and social diversity of the communities associated with the forestry sector (indigenous communities, peasant sectors, and intercultural⁶ communities, for example) and their use of different biodiversity associated with the forestry sector.

Therefore, can be stated that the project was not designed with proper focus for effectiveness. It also contains other gaps. For example, it does not include that municipalities have little or no interference or jurisdiction in issues relating to forests and sustainable management of biodiversity linked to them. At project design level design arises as if these political entities have full jurisdiction over the issues relating to forests and their sustainable management or certification.

Finally, the project design has weaknesses between linking the problem definition with the expected outcome. In addition, it looms at the same time a lack of logical connection between some assumptions and some of the expected outcomes. This design flaw is also transferred to a failure in implementation. It is not clear, for example, in the project documents (or implementation in situ) which is the connection between some planned interventions and the sustainable management of forest resources.

The link between problem and expected results are not clearly discernible in the design and therefore this has a clear impact on the process of implementation of the Project (as discussed in the relevant sections). This is, despite having a relatively correct analysis of threats, objectives, goals, etc., there is no explicit theory of change about how to proceed from outputs to outcomes/effects. Not being explicit the theory of change does not reveal the sequential logic of the initiative in terms of identifying how outputs would lead to the expected change.

Note:

This section of the assessment relates to the design, but as mentioned above, although it is relevant because it incorporates and rescues plans and policies in effect at the time of design, the Plurinational State of Bolivia has generated a series of changes of public policy regarding sustainable development policies and sustainable management of biodiversity subsequent approval of Project GEF Forest. As mentioned above, for example, it is currently in effect the Law of Mother Earth and Law No. 300 which prescribes another vision that effect at the time of design about the comprehensive development in harmony with Mother Earth. These changes in approaches also involve administrative changes such as the creation of a Plurinational Authority of Mother Earth (APMT). These changes (vision and administrative), in turn, have had an impact on the implementation of the Project GEF Forest, as discussed in the relevant sections of this report.

⁶ Intercultural communities in Bolivia are considered to ethnic groups (mainly aimara and quechua) those through a process of internal migration within the country- are ethnically indigenous settlers in areas where they do not originate.

It also stresses that despite the Project Document emphasizes certification, the country is not part of international agreements on international certification of timber products. However, in relief of this, the country has proposed that forest areas have a mandatory national certification. Legislation that would regulate this type of certification however is still pending of establishment, approval and implementation of national certification regulations. From the Project GEF Forest, this is perceived as a barrier. However, from this assessment is not this issue completely as such (as discussed in the section of conclusions and recommendations) this juncture may well be an opportunity for the project to accomplish concrete and lasting outcomes on this issue.

OUTCOME FRAMEWORK

The objectives and expected outcomes of the project (and its components) have been relatively clear and practical at design level. However, they are not feasible to perform during the time allotted for the project since it covers a very large economic, social, environmental and political complexity and given the changes in public policy on issues that directly and indirectly affect the outcomes and expected effects. To this also adds, the implementation problems faced by the project, which have also affected the feasibility of objectives, goals and outcomes as expected and/or designed.

So far, a number of products or processes were generated (documents, training, etc.). However, up to now no effects are glimpsed. Also, so far it has not generate effects of beneficial development or catalizable in the future in terms of income generation, promotion of gender equity and empowerment of women, or improvements in governance in relation to the subject (s) in which the Project GEF Forest focuses.

The following sections Project indicators analysis are detailed, progress in achieving outcomes, work planning and an analysis of the progress in relation to obtaining outcomes.

PROJECT INDICATORS

In order to undertake a critical analysis of the indicators and targets of the logical framework of the project, assesses the extent to which middle and end of the project goals achieve the "SMART" criteria. It is highlighted in projects funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP in relation to the formulation of the project (and is asked to analyze in assessments) than in assessment processes should consider whether the planned outcomes were "SMART", for its acronym in English. That is, if the indicators are S (specific: outcomes must use the language of change: they must describe a specific future condition); M (measurable or Quantifiable outcomes, whether quantitative or qualitative, must have measurable indicators to make it possible to assess whether they were achieved or not), A (available or obtainable: Outcomes should be available to what partners can achieve); R (Pertaining or relevant: Outcomes should contribute to selected priorities of the national development framework); and T (limited by time or time-bound. Outcomes are never indefinite, there must be a planned date for achieving outcomes). Indicators (basic and goal-with divisions for half project goals and in its conclusion are in the chart.

It is evident that in general the indicators are specific (S) as a language of change in the sense that describe a specific future condition is used. For example, when stated that "20 Communities apply the BD monitoring system in their managed forest areas" or "6000 ha (20% of the total certified

forestland) apply set-asides and protection plans and strict safeguard Measures for the protection of biodiversity With support from GEF and 3000 with support of partners. "

However, many of the indicators do not refer to outcome indicators but outputs. For example, "40 Communities are trained to apply the monitoring system BD that has-been prepared and approved by the government."

Furthermore, indicators are measurable (M) and expressed, either quantitatively or qualitatively that way, and thus facilitate the valuation of whether met or not. These are expressed in quantifiable. For example, "Increase of 15% in revenues of Communities that work with timber and 20% in those that work with NTFP over traditional market" or "30% reduction in illegal deforestation in the project intervention area".

However, it states that, in terms of target indicators (also called objective indicators to the project in the Outcome Framework), several of them are not indicators of outcome but output. For example, when indicated that the project mid-term "40 Communities are trained to apply the BD monitoring system that has-been prepared and approved by the government"; or at the end of the project it would have "Proposal of an operating plan for the Comprehensive Forest Management plan Including adopted by the government" and "15 technical audits to support CFEs in the process of obtaining certification" is discerned that these are output indicators the project would elaborate; not being these outcome indicators.

Another problem in terms of indicators is they are too ambitious or unlikely to be feasible in the four years of the planned project life. For example, it states that as a consequence and outcome of the project, in the mid-term the control effectiveness would increase by 40 percent (*By the mid-term effectiveness of operations Against Illegal wood has Increased 40%*).

In addition to these issues, as indicated above changes in public policies and operating dynamics around environmental themes (and also specifically in terms of public policies related to forestry and certification) make some indicators not relevant. Indicators such as "Simplified FSC certification standard approved by the FSC" are not relevant in the present context in Bolivia ".

Figure 1: Indicators Project (according ProDoc)

	Indicators	Baseline	Target
			Mid/End of Project
Project objective:	Increase in Community Forestry Enterprises (CFEs) dedicating resources to biodiversity conservation and implementing specific measures related to specific biodiversity, measured	There are at Least 3 experiences in biodiversity monitoring (FAN, WCS and Institute of Ecology). None adopted to the context of the Communities	Mid-term:
Improve protection and conservation of	a. # Of Communities	a. 0 monitor biodiversity	a. 40 Communities are trained to apply the

biodiversity in the Amboró Madidi corridor through sustainable forest management, based on fostering markets for certified forest products and Increase in local revenues.	that apply the biodiversity monitoring system		BD monitoring system that has-been prepared and approved by the government
	b. # Has under forest management plans	b. Has 160,000	End of Project:
	c. # of indicator species that maintain their populations at landscape level	c. Decreasing numbers in Populations	a. 20 Communities apply the BD monitoring system in their managed forest areas
	d. Rate of change in forest floral diversity (proxy for overall BD) in project impact study site	d. TBD eleven the BD monitoring system is finalized	b. 25,000 additional ha under timber forest management plans mainly in Ixiamas, and 5,000 ha under non-timber forest management plans mainly in Guanay
	d. Rate of deforestation and degradation in project impact study sites	d. TBD once the local team are equipped, functional and able to monitor effectively deforestation	c. BD monitoring system shows that populations of jaguar (<i>Phantera onca</i>), white lipped peccary (<i>Tajasu, tajaco</i>) and spider money (<i>ateles paniscus</i>) are stable.
	f. Areas set-aside and under strict protection measures.	f. 32.000 ha	d. <10% of Plots with declining forest floral diversity in certified sites.
			e. 0% deforestation in certified sites.
			f. 6,000 ha (20% of the total certified forestland) apply set-asides and apply protection plans and strict safeguard Measures for the protection of biodiversity with

			support from GEF and 3000 with support of partners.
	Increase in competitiveness of communities enabling greater investments in BD conservation, measured through	a) US \$ 8,000 to 20,000 annual income	a) Increase of 15% in revenues of communities That work with timber and 20% In those that work with NTFP over traditional market
	a) Increase in communities revenues	b) 0% of income invested in BD monitoring	b) 25% of communities invest 5% of their incomes in BD
	b) Increased investment allocated to BD monitoring		
	Level of participation of women and men in operations of CFEs in project impact study sites	TBD once the gender indicators agreed upon Participants	30% average increase participation of women in CFE operations
Outcome 1 Institutional support mechanisms are generated to foster conservation of biodiversity through sustainable forest management and certification	Indicators	Baseline	Target
			Mid/End of Project
	Legal, regulatory and operational frameworks facilitate BD protection in the AMC area	a) There is a national Comprehensive Forest Management plan, no operational plan	Mid-term:
	a) Protection of BD is incorporated as a requirement of Comprehensive Forest Management	b) There are at least 3 examples of BD monitoring systems but not adapted for use in communities	a) Proposal of an operating plan for the Comprehensive Forest Management plan including adopted by the government
	b) BD monitoring tool is developed, validated and	c) There is no national policy prioritizing	b) Simplified FSC certification standard approved by the FSC

	included as a requirement in the operation plan of Comprehensive Forest Management.	purchase of certified products	
	c) National policy to promote procurement of certified forest products	d) There are two standards for NTFP (Brazil nut and Acai Palm)	
	d) # NTFP management plan standards		End of project
			c) Operating plan for comprehensive Forest Management effectively integrates guidelines of BD protection and the implementation of a BD monitoring tool
			d) A national policy that prioritizes purchase of certified products is approved and implemented in at least two municipalities.
			e) At least two standards for management plans approved for other NTFP
	Reduce illegal logging in the project intervention area	a) 100% of deforestation is illegal (2007)	a) 30% reduction in illegal deforestation in the project intervention area
	a) Rate of illegal deforestation in the project zone	b) 160 seizures of wood in the project area implementation region in 2009	b) By mid-term the effectiveness of operations against illegal wood has increased 40%
	b) # of seizures of wood in the project zone	c) 0 mobile teams in the project region	c) Two mobile inspection teams established, trained and operational
	c) # Mobile teams operating		

	Technical support team for forest certification operational	a) 0 municipal forest management and development plans formulated and tied to the PDM (MFUs with low budget allocation and isolated projects)	a) Three municipal forest management and development plans formulated and tied to the PDM
	a) # of municipal forest management and development plans formulated and tied to the municipal plans (PDM)	b) 0 municipal plans (PDM) that include chapters and elements on BD monitoring	b) Municipal Plans (PDM) include chapters and elements on BD monitoring
	b) # of PDMs that include chapters and elements on BD monitoring	c) There are no internal auditing services in the CFEs, ASLs or TCOs	c) An internal technical auditing team (forestry) in operation for the Ixiamas area (ABT, UFM, NGOs)
	c) # of internal technical audit teams (forestry) in operation for the Ixiamas area (ABT, MFUs, NGOs)	d) 0 technical audits to support CFEs in certification processes (absence of knowledge about certification processes)	d) 15 technical audits to support CFEs in the process of obtaining certification
	d) # of technical audits to support CFEs in the process of obtaining certification		

PROGRESS IN THE OUTCOMES ACHIEVEMENT

ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS IN THE OUTCOMES ACHIEVEMENT

The analysis of progress in achieving outcomes reviews the logical framework indicators and compares with the progress in the goals set through the Matrix Progress in Achieving Outcomes and according the *"Guidelines to Conduct the Mid-Term review in Projects Supported by UNDP and funded by GEF "*. This matrix is below. After this table, observations of the progress in achieving outcomes according assessment criteria and other relevant analysis is presented.

Figure 2 Matrix of progress in achieving outcomes

Objective/Outcome Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at mid-term and at end of project	Level in PIR Auto reported	Level And Evaluation At mid-term ⁷	Value Of the Achievements ⁸	Rationale of the value ⁹
Objective: Improve protection and conservation of Biodiversity in the Amobó Madidi corridor through sustainable forest management, based on fostering markets for certified forest products and increase in local revenues	Increase in community forestry Enterprises (CFEs) dedicating resources to Biodiversity conservation and implementation specific measures as a. Nbr of communities that apply the biodiversity monitoring system b. Nbr ha under forest management plans c. Nbr of indicator species that maintain their populations at landscape level d. Rate of change in	There are at least 3 experiences in biodiversity monitoring (FAN WCS and instituto de Ecologia). None adapted to the context of the communities a, 0 communities monitor biodiversity b. 160.000 ha c. Decreasing numbers in population d. TBD once the BD monitoring system is finalized e. TBD once the local team are equipped, functional and	Mid-term: a. 40 communities are trained to apply the BD monitoring system that has been prepared and approved by the government. End of Project a. 20 communities apply the BD monitoring system in their managed forest area b. 25.000 additional ha under timber orest management plans mainly in Ixiamas, and 5,000 ha under	The design of the BD monitoring system is concluded. The criteria for implementation are being developed through consensus processes with the Municipality, the Regional Government, Vice Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change and Management and Forest Development. – Complemented to Monitoring Biodiversity, Project has Completed the life system of the		MI	Mid-term goal – 40 communities were trained in monitoring biodiversity was not implemented. Some trainings were carried out, but it is not distinguished they discussed these topics but others. Monitoring systems have not started implementing Some relevant documents for this indicator have been developed.

⁷ Coding according to "Guidance for Conducting Midterm assessment in projects Supported by UNDP and funded by the GEF" (a) has already been achieved: green; b) has been partially achieved or is on track to be achieved to project completion: yellow; c) there is a high risk that is not achieved before the end of the project and needs attention (red).

Green – Achieved	Yellow – On track to achieve	Red – Not on track to achieve
------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------

⁸ The scale of assessment of progress in achieving outcomes in their 6 points is used: AS, S, MS, MI, I, AI, according to guidelines of the "Guidelines to Conduct Midterm assessment of projects supported by UNDP and funded by the GEF" This scale is governed by the following valuations: Highly satisfactory (AS) It is expected to achieve or exceed the objectives/outcomes set for the end of the project without major shortcomings; Satisfactory (S) is expected to achieve most of the objectives/outcomes set for the end of the project with only minor deficiencies. Moderately Satisfactory (MS) is expected to achieve most of the objectives / outcomes set for the end of the project, but with significant shortcomings. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MI) is expected to achieve most of the objectives/outcomes set for the end of the project with significant gaps. Unsatisfactory (I) is not expected to achieve most of the objectives / outcomes se for the end of the project. Highly unsatisfactory (AI) have not achieved the objectives/outcomes for midterm and is not expected to achieve any of the set for the end of the project.

⁹ Valuations are the result of analysis of the achieved outcomes or not. The justifications for these Valuations are clearly outlined in the matrix. Valuations are based not only on what here stated but in the explicated indicated in all the report in general.

	<p>forest floral diversity (proxy for overall BD) in project impact study site e. Rate of deforestation and degradation in project impact study sites f. Areas set aside and under strict protection measures.</p>	<p>able to monitor effectively Deforestation f. 32.000ha</p>	<p>non-timber forest management plans mainly in Guanay c. BD monitoring system shows that populations of jaguar (Panthera onca), white lipped peccary (Tajasu tajaco) and spider monkey (Ateles paniscus) are stable. d. <10% of plots with declining forest floral diversity in certified sites <10--><10-->><10--><10-->e. 0% Deforestation in certified sites. f. 6,000 ha (20% of total certified forestland) apply set-asides and protection plans and strict safeguard measures for the protection of biodiversity with support from GEF and 3,000 with support of partners</p>	<p>Tacana people (CIPTA) to through a consultancy, and is in Process the Life System of the Lecos Larecaja (PILCOL) developed by the project BOL 79912 all under Law 300. - Both project direct beneficiaries (Lecos LARECAJAS and TACANAS), have an Instrument of Territorial management to ascribe to Joint machinery of Mitigation and Adaptation in Forests and in system of incentives.</p> <p>The project is working with 10 Community Forestry organizations covering a territory forest of timber and non timber greater than 120,000 ha.</p> <p>Training, follow up and implementation of National Certification are developed, as required element in Bolivia, in coordination with the representation of Tacana people (CIPTA), the board of Voluntary Forest certification (CFV), the Council of Indigenous Peoples of Bolivia (CEPILAB) and Municipalities of San Buenaventura and Ixiamas.</p>		<p>Little or no appropriation of Developed documents to foreseen implementation.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				<p>Community Carmen Pecha was trained on the utilization of palm fruit Açai (Euterpe precatoria) with the Support of the indigenous people of TCO Porvenir.</p> <p>There is an area under a forest management plan timber and non-timber of 12,800 ha.</p> <p>300 ha of palms Asaí already has a Forest management plan endorsed by Competent authority (ABT).</p> <p>Leco people (PILOCL) is being trained in community Pajonal Vilaque so that they can develop their Majo palms (Oenocarpus bataua) management plan In an area of 400 Ha, area that has a PGMF not approved which the project is updating.</p> <p>Training activities for the use of natural rubber (Hevea brasiliensis) are being developed in three communities of Leco Larecajas people.</p> <p>Support activities to entrepreneurships of the intercultural Women Network And indigenous of the Municipalities of Palos Blancos and Alto Beni are developed.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>The project supports five productive entrepreneurs for transforming fruits of the forests and from agroforestry systems in school breakfast.</p> <p>Four of these entrepreneurship are intercultural women (N = 1000 women), and one is of the Mosesten indigenous people (N = 200 females). – The project will promote the conservation Management with meetings of indigenous and intercultural women.</p>		
	<p>increase in competitiveness of communities enabling greater investments in BD conservation, measured through a) Increase in communities revenues b) Increased investment allocated to BD monitoring</p>	<p>a) US\$8,000 to 20,000 annual income b) 0% of incomes invested in BD monitoring</p>	<p>a) Increase of 15% in revenues of communities that work with timber and 20% in those that work with NTFP over traditional market b) 25% of communities invest 5% of their incomes in BD</p>	<p>- From seven municipalities the project covers, 5 confirm the need to work with project BOL 79912, work plans are developed for incorporating issues of Biodiversity conservation and comprehensive forest management in their economic development instruments. The project has started training to municipal authorities to undertake mechanism of conservation management of forests and biodiversity.</p> <p>National authorities are being articulated with: Plurinational Authority of Mother Earth, Forestry Department</p>		<p>I</p> <p>Any indication that communities revenue was increased (15 and 20% expected increase) directly and/or indirectly attributable to the project; nor 25% of the communities is investing 5% of its income above the baseline, in biodiversity management.</p>

				<p>(DGGDF) National Fund of Management and Forestry Development (FONABOSQUES), Authority of supervision and social control of Forests and Land (ABT) for developing activities of forest and biodiversity conservation through work plans- The Vice Ministry of Environment, biodiversity, Climate changes, Management and Forestry Development fully supports the project.</p> <p>Of the six co-founders, four ratified and reprogrammed the work with the project (FONABOSQUE, ABT, APMT, INIAF).</p>			
	Level of participation of women and men in operations of CFEs in project impact study sites	TBD once the gender indicators are agreed upon participants	30% average increase participation of women in CFE operations	<p>Processing Plants will be equipped for the sustainable use of the forest and Biodiversity conservation: or five women entrepreneurship Or a XX processing center in Ixiamas, or a majo processing center in Guanay, or a natural rubber collection center in Guanay, or a timber processing center in Tumupasa. -</p> <p>Mosetenes indigenous group was incorporated to the project to support entrepreneurship women' group women</p>		MS	There are working processes in this line with women groups.

				Strategic Alliances with institutions are developed to promote marketing Products of North La Paz and of Lecos, Tacana and Mosetenes people			
Outcome 1 Institutional support mechanisms are generated to foster conservation of biodiversity through sustainable forest management and certification.	Legal, regulatory and operational frameworks facilitate BD protection in the AMC area: a) Protection of BD is incorporated as a requirement of comprehensive forest management b) BD monitoring tool is developed, validated and included as requirement in the operational plan of comprehensive forest management c) National policy to promote procurement of certified forest products d) # NTFP management plan standards	a) There is a national Comprehensive Forest Management plan, no operational plan. b) There are at least 3 examples of BD monitoring systems but not adapted for use in communities. c) There is no national policy prioritizing purchase of certified products. d) There are two standards for NTFP (Brazil nut and AñfAi Palm)	Mid-term: a) Proposal of an operating plan for the Comprehensive Forest Management plan including a proposal adopted by the government b) Simplified FSC certification standard approved by the FSC End of project: c) Operating plan for Comprehensive Forest Management effectively integrates guidelines for BD protection and the implementation of a BD monitoring tool. d) A national policy that prioritizes purchase of certified products is approved and implemented in at least two municipalities e) At least two standards for management plans approved for other NTFP	- The forestry Department is being supported for the formulation of an Integral Forest Management Sector Plan, as a tool of the state to be applied in the northern region of La Paz with national projection. - A plan of activities has been developed with the Bolivian Council of Forest certification Volunteer (CFV-FSC) for training and simplification of the Standard FSC with Standard ABT of Bolivia. – A process of internalizing has been developed and training to 9 community forest organizations of TACANA people. The micro-zoning of TACANA people was developed for the construction of the Life System based on Law 300 (Law of Mother Earth). A monitoring system with baseline and indicators exists to be applied in 6 productive chains the project promotes and supports. Agreements with institutions were established for the promotion and conservation and the		MI	The Mid-term goal has not been accomplished regarding a comprehensive forest management plan, and evidently this has not been a tool adopted by the State. No progress has been made regarding the simplification of the certification system and standards, as mid-term indicators state. There is a risk that these project working lines are not executed, allegedly because of changes in the public policies' contexts in the theme. Short vision of adaptive management to adapt to essential themes, but at the same time to influence and / or propel taking certification taking into account the current context in Bolivia.

				<p>northern La Paz development under schemes of mitigation of the threats produced by the San Buenaventura road, Ixiamas, El Puente, San Buenaventura, Rurrenabaque and the sugar company San Buenaventura (EASBA).</p> <p>A work plan with the Pulrinationl authority Mother Earth exists to incorporate joint mechanisms of mitigation and adaptation to Climate Change in forests, entrepreneurships for the integral forest management and the Conservation of Biodiversity in Northern La Paz.</p> <p>It is approved a timber Forest plan of 12,000 ha and a non-timber Forest Management plan of Fruits of Asaí (Euterpe precatoria) Carmen Pecha of Tacana people.</p> <p>Workshops were carried out in 20 of the 33 communities the Leco Larecaja people has to build its Life System in line to Law 300 in Bolivia.</p> <p>- The project is working to update the management plan of 200 has For harvesting fruits of majo (Oenocarpus bataua) in the community Pajonal Vilaque of</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				Leco Larecaja people. Likewise it is in proposal to expand 600 has of management of this initiative for next year.		
	Reduced illegal logging in the project intervention area: a) Rate of illegal deforestation in the project zone b) # of seizures of wood in the project zone c) # mobile teams operating	a) 100% of deforestation is illegal (2007) b) 160 seizures of wood in the project implementation region in 2009 c) 0 mobile teams in the project region	a) 30% reduction in illegal deforestation in the project intervention area b) By mid-term the effectiveness of operations against illegal wood has increased 40% c) Two mobile inspection teams established, trained and operational	- ToR were advertised for the elaboration of 4 comprehensive Forest Management of the Lecos Larecajas People for an extensión of 2500 has for developing management and use of non-timber, as a reduction strategy of the border agriculture and livestock advance. With the support to 4 entrepreneurship of intercultural women in Palos Blancos and Alto Beni, to give added value to forest products and agroforestry system, the conservation of biodiversity through the comprehensive forest management would be promoted. Entrepreneurships of MoseTENES (OMIN) women of the region of Palos Blancos and Alto Beni are being supported with the support of their spouses (OPIN) to manage and conserve forests and biodiversity through the added value to timber and non-timber products within its TCO. With this, the project seeks to reduce deforestation and forest loss coverage		I The mid-term goal to increase effectiveness of operations against illegal timber has not been achieved, as evidenced not only in the collected information but in the last PIR (Column 4 of the chart). Management plans reported in the PIR 2015 by the Project, which have only reached the level of Staff search (ToRs). Support to women productive entrepreneurship is quoted in another section and it is not part of this indicator. That is, it is not associated with reducing illegal logging.

				for this territory to biodiversity conservation.			
	<p>Technical support team for forest certification operational a) # of municipal forest management and development plans formulated and tied to the municipal plans (PDM) b) # of PDMs that include chapters and elements on BD monitoring c) # of internal technical audit teams (forestry) in operation for the Ixiamas area (ABT, MFUs, NGOs) d) # of technical audits to support CFEs in the process of obtaining certification</p>	<p>a) 0 municipal forest management and development plans formulated and tied to the PDM (MFUs with low budget allocations and isolated projects) b) 0 municipal plans (PDM) that include chapters and elements on BD monitoring c) There are no internal auditing services in the CFES, ASLs or TCOs. d) 0 technical audits to support CFES in certification processes (absence of knowledge about certification processes)</p>	<p>a) Three municipal forest management and development plans formulated and tied to the PDM b) Municipal plans (PDM) include chapters and elements on BD monitoring. c) An internal technical auditing team (forestry) in operation for the Ixiamas area (ABT, UFM, NGOs) d) 15 technical audits to support CFES in the process of obtaining certification</p>	<p>Municipality of Guanay, Teoponte and Mapiri, along with municipalities of Ixiamas and San Buenaventura are Promoting Integral forest management Forest through the territorial arrangement planning.</p> <p>Project has the Request from the Municipality of Guanay to develop their Municipal Life system, which is in analysis of viability. The Municipality of Guanay requested to the project the reformulating of its PDM Municipal Development Plan to incorporate biodiversity and Gender contents, before the observations the project made.</p> <p>- The project will form Working Groups for the Comprehensive Forest Management And the biodiversity conservation with ABT, municipalities of TCOs, being these the impeller mechanisms and of social control of each of the two intervention areas.</p> <p>The working groups The project is forming are developing the strategies of control and supervision for Northern La Paz and reduce timber traffic and illegal</p>		MI	<p>Perceptions start about the Project would start working in this line and some outputs were developed which can be inputs for the outputs to be developed and the expected outcomes.</p>

				<p>deforestation. The proyecto supports the ABT with four forest technicians in northern La Paz, with 3 motorcycles and computers to improve their Capacities of forest management.</p> <p>-ABT northern La Paz staff is being continuously, to develop strategies Of national forest certification.</p> <p>ToR were advertised for the Identification of the productive potential of Lecos Larecaja people territory.</p>		
<p>Outcome 2 Communities with strengthened capacities to obtain and keep certification and manage forests in a sustainable and biodiversity friendly way</p>	<p>Increase in number of forest communities receiving support to apply the forest management plans, prevent and reduce fires, increase control over their territory and move towards certification: a) Number of communities with forest management plans b) Number of communities with forest certification c) #of TCO and extension with indigenous territory management plans</p>	<p>a) 14 communities with management plans or with POAF. Two communities have management plans for NTFP (Majo and inciense) in Ixiamas and Madidi. b) To date there is a single community in the process of FSC certification under the regency scheme but it is outside AMC. 2 ASLs in AMC have FSC Certification under regency with Ecolegno. Zero Communities with NTFP certified in AMC. c) One TCO has indigenous territory management plans finalized</p>	<p>a) 8 additional CFEs with forest management plans and 5 additional CFEs have NTFP management plans. b) 5 communities in AMC (joint communities of CIPTA) with FSC certification for wood products. 5 communities with another type of certification for NTFP. c) 20 communities participate in preparing the strategy of territorial protection against illegal logging activities and apply it on 100,000 ha.</p>	<p>- Comprehensive Forest and Land Management plans (PGIBT) are developed in the northern La Paz with ABT for intercultural groups' area at the Municipalities of Palos Blancos, Alto Beni and Guanay. - 9 Communities will access to the national forest certification ABT and they will have option to access the FSC certification with the accompaniment the project is developing to the communities of TACANA people</p>		<p>Very little work has been developed in the specific subject related to the expected outcome (this is, strengthening capacities to obtain and maintain certification).</p> <p>Therefore, the lack of instruments and generation of capacities to date in certification, prevent outcomes to be achieved on a sustainable manner.</p>

		and one has remained half done. Implementation is partial. There is no territorial control strategy					
	Forest area conserved through biodiversity friendly forest management certified follow in a stepwise approach, including participation in a) Forest management plan b) Forest management plan and/or FSC simplified certification c) Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification d) NTFP certification	a) 74,705 hectares under forest management plans, mostly private companies b) Integral forest certification does not exist yet c) 0 ha managed by communities under FSC certification 10.000 has of community forests certified with FSC standards d) At least 50% of 5,000 hectares under management receive international NTFP certification	a) 30,000 new hectares with management plans at community level b) At least 5 pilot communities (15,000 has) with management plans c) At least	- From the 300,000 ha projected in the first semester of 2016, 50% will be accomplished under forest management schemes timber and non-timber. - 9 communities of the Tacana people, 2 communities of Lecos Larecacha people and over 10 intercultural communities develop activities of integrated forest management timber and non-timber.		I	See the column up
	Number of communities participating in the project, and trained in BD management to apply safeguard measures in accordance with BD protection best practices (defined in the management plan guidelines)	a. 0 Communities participating in project b. 0 monitoring record sheets filled out autonomously by the communities	a. 20 CFEs applying the BD monitoring system b. 20 monitoring record sheets per year filled out autonomously by the communities in three years (up to year 4)	- The implementation of different planning systems is allowing the development of long-term monitoring areas. The project will develop training activities and technical assistance to the Municipalities for developing activities of Integral forest management and biodiversity monitoring. With the Development of the productive potential in the area of Lecos Larecacha and the OFC of Tacana People, plots for monitoring will be		MI	There are some early activities and outputs whose goal is to promote sustainable management of forests, such as monitoring activities, training and technical assistance with the Municipality. However, progress to date is not indicative to achieve expected outcomes and meeting indicators (for example, 20 CFEs applying the BD monitoring system)

				established for the integral forest management and Biodiversity conservation.			
Outcome 3 Economic incentives are in place to attract and keep community forestry operations committed to sustainable forestry and B management practices	Increase in communities competitiveness via: a) Change in unit production costs of communities per m ³ b) Change in recovery rates CFEs incomes c) Increase in percentage of final sale price that reaches the primary producer	a. To be established in case study baselines b. 0 investment in B Management practices c. T primary producing the wood chain receives 5 to 8% of the final pricing La Paz.	a) 10% average decrease in production costs b) 5% average increase in recovery rates c) Percent of revenues increases at least 5 points (10 to 13%)			I	The project does not report any activity in this item. There is no concrete work that may result in 10% production cost reduction, or increases revenue attributable to the Project.
	Increase in demand for certified products, measured via a) % of certified communities sales to certified buyers b) # of chain-of-custody certifications involving communities c) # of alliances resulting in sales contracts between communities and international or national buyers specifically demanding certified forest products d) # of national markets for products sourced from certified forests (including Government demand) e) Certified volumes sold	a) 32% of certified sales certified buyers b) 0 chain of custody certification involving communities 0 new alliance facilitated by project d) 0 national market for products sourced from certified forests (there is no law to foster the purchase of certified products) e) 3,172 M3 of certified wood custody) sold to the national market	a) 50% of certified communities sales to certified buyers b) Two new chains of custody established in the intervention area c) Six alliances between communities and the next links in the chain consolidated allowing for better revenues to communities d) 4 new markets opened for NTFP with value-added e) At least 50,000 M3 of certified or verified wood sold in the national or international market	In 2013 N/A of this indicator was specified. However, efforts were developed to achieve national certification ABT, international certification FSC or Flegt through the development of courses, workshops crosscutting with different communities. In the certification processes the fulfillment of: a) Original source, b) transport certification, c) Certification of the processing centers, that in total is the custody chain. A sawmill will be implemented in the TAcana people territory to solve the transformation and added value of timber from clearings under legal schemes, for growing sugar to feed EASBA in more than 45,000 ha.		MI	Efforts on this issue are taken into account, and Activities developed. However, as Indicated in other sections, there is very little concrete work to date in certification and in items displayed here (value chain / promotion of sale to certified buyers; alliances of communities 'up' of the chain, opening of new markets) as to hope objectives and outcome indicators to be accomplished without raising the level implementation.

				There is the request of the Ministry of Planning and from the Forestry Department to support the Bolivian Forest enterprise in northern La Paz, so the of the wood from this sawmill for the Tacana people is projected.		
	Increase in investment in communities to improve management and business practices that contribute to BD objectives, through various mechanisms: a) Number of government lines of credit adapted to forestry activities b) Number of alliances with financial entities c) Number of communities that access credits for comprehensive forest management d) Amounts allocated for comprehensive forest management	a) Zero government ine of credit direct and adapted to forestry activities b) Zero alliances with financial entities c) 5 communities access credit for comprehensive forest management d) Amount to be determined at the start of the project for comprehensive forest management	a) One government line of credit directed and adapted to forestry activities b) At least one alliance established with financial entities to leverage funds (relation 3 to 1 for forest management) c) 5 additional communities access credit for forestry operations d) Amount over US\$ 2,000,000	- 50% of advance of the implementation system of the revolving Fund of the project. To this end alliances with FONABOSQUES, APMT and ABT are developing , to create financing schemes of this incentives system, since above mentioned institutions have established mechanisms within their own institutions.		MS Progress is being made in the rotating funds implementation systems, with a level of advancing of half of the goal (see third column of this chart which reflects PIR reported, besides the information collected during the trip).

MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS

Efficiency or effectiveness is an evaluation criteria which analyzes how economically translate resources/contributions (funds, expertise, time, etc.) in outcome. The *effectiveness* of a project is the extent to which a goal was achieved or likely to be achieved. The overall effectiveness of the GEF Forest Management Project has been low so far and something unsatisfactory (ie this is, with important deficiencies) at the overall quality level of the project implementation and execution. Management mechanisms have been poor considering that (as seen in the Matrix of Progress of outcomes achievement and in the same PIR 2015 and virtually the date this Project should conclude) outcomes achievement has been low. Therefore, the project can be described as having significant shortcomings to this stage about the effectiveness and efficiency.

The quality of execution by the executing agency of the project (ie, the Vice Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change, Forest Management and Development -VMA) also had significant shortcomings in addressing the project and its management support. Due this, or perhaps partly because of this, the appropriation has been weak. Especially remembering that this is a project of the Bolivian government and that requires its leadership. Since the level of appropriation the country is low, consistent weaknesses in capacity building can be expected in the sustainability of the project and its impact, unless corrective steps take place in the second stage of the project. The institutionalization (mainstreaming) also appears weak. This is, the Project worked almost autonomously of the executing agency and therefore little institutionalization of activities, products and generation of changes that the project has developed or intends to develop is perceived.

Regarding the analysis of the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (in this case the UNDP), various aspects highlight, some positive and others deficient. A number of relevant actors state it would be desirable that UNDP accompany more the project management, explicating guidelines about a national execution project management like this.

The project has not benefited enough of the technical support (despite being included in the Project Document and budgets). It is considered from this evaluation that this technical support to the implementing agency and to the project team can result not only in innovation benefits and of capacity building, but it could also result positively in the progress and project management.

WORK PLANNING

Start-up and project implementation are highly delayed. The budget execution, clearly associated with delivery, is only 18 percent of the budget¹⁰. The causes of these delays are varied, intricate, and complex. These causes range from administrative issues, relevance in a changing national context, to conceptual issues about how the project expected outputs and outcomes interpreted.

¹⁰ This delay is other significant when considering the Project should be concluding according to the original plans.

First, we can state, in part, the arrears are high turnover (at coordination and national counterpart levels). At the time of this evaluation the GEF Forest Project has had three coordinators¹¹, with all other staff changes and addressing this involved. This has resulted within the framework of this project to "start over" three times. With the coordinator changes there has been changed in the project inception, reformulation of the implementation strategies and conceptualization of what it is and what it should do the Project. Contribute to these delays the staff changes, with a significant turn over at all levels: management, local offices¹², etc. That is, with each change of the coordinator is associated, to a large degree, with management changes and key project staff changes and even with conceptualization changes, new survey of baseline indicators, etc.

In addition, in several periods of the project implementation process there was little articulation between the Project implementation at the country level (executing unit) and the offices and implementation at pilot areas level. This realizes not only at the level and format of execution and administrative, but also at the level of perception of the project in general (ie around what output, processes and expected effects).

In addition, changes in public policy in Bolivia have had strong impacts in terms of the Project work planning. These changes have affected from Institutionalization issues (concerning the institutional ownership that - up to the evaluation date - had been incorporated in three different government areas) to the very core issues of conceptualization of the imminent problem surrounding sustainable forest management¹³.

Overall, therefore, it can be established that, in most cases, work planning processes have not been based on outcomes. Planning processes have relied to some point in the execution of outputs. However, here also within the project has been thwarted the implementation based on outputs that will lead to the goals and expected outcomes. In general, delivery or execution is not linked with a specific goal or outcome but simply haphazardly, with execution, such as the purchase of materials or support to organizations and institutions unattached delivery to the sustainable management of forest resources.

One of the most aligid problems, however, not only about Project work planning, but affecting all its edges, is its **deficiencies in conceptualization**. The Project up to the mid-term evaluation period does not follow closely what is planned as expressed in the Project Document. Although it is based on other several documents and this is due to the changes in national public policy related to the Project topics, it is considered that this justification is only valid in some Project cases or aspects but mostly not.

Even though in the most recent GEF Forestal Project it states this is a project of "conservation" rather than "development", stating the core of the project itself is not fully understood by its main

¹¹ In fact, during the process of analysis and drafting of this report the third coordinator also left that position, being four coordinators until the date of preparation of the mid-term evaluation

¹² Infrastructure and staff of the Project local offices had to be folded and relocated in the last six months by severe flooding. In fact, during field visits of the evaluation, it was realized one of them was not working after this circumstance.

¹³ This section includes issues concerning the implementation and execution processes themselves. Regarding conceptualizing of the project, although this is mentioned because it is relevant in relation to the work planning, this topic is taken up in other sections because as the project is conceptualized is relevant not only in this area of intervention but also in many others

actors and those who implement it. In addition, the project has acted as a financing fund at the request of various activities and for the purchase of various inputs without following a logic of output – effect without a full understanding of what the Project objective (s) / goals / expected outcomes are. Frequently, relevant actors (local and national) state they request support for thematic or products / services that are unrelated to the objectives and expected outcomes and since the GEF Forestry Project simply because it "has funds" and not because their activities or expectations are aligned to the intervention goals. The project is often not perceived (and often does not act) as an intervention at the national level with pilot sites, but the intervention is perceived as exclusively local nature. There is also a lack of general understanding about what it means strengthening and capacity building within the project framework. All these inaccuracies in the conceptualization (some hauled from design and other induced at different stages of implementation) make the planning work slow, incomplete delivery, and the prospects for lasting outcomes remote if the needed adjustments are not performed.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM AT PROJECT LEVEL

The framework for monitoring and evaluation in the design entry is standard and follows the basic criteria for monitoring this type of project. The objectives of the monitoring and evaluation plan of the project are the continuous follow up of the outcomes achievement and of the project objectives.

There has been no feedback from monitoring and evaluation activities used for adaptation management since there has not been a strong adaptive management to date. This is, it has not officially changed to date neither the design nor the expected outcomes, and therefore, no feedback has been between monitoring and evaluation activities and the adaptive management. The reports and other tracking mechanisms to date have not been implemented since as indicated there is no evidence of changes that result in adaptive management. What we do rescue is that in recent times from the GEF Forest Project have conducted internal exercises of reformulation and critical analysis of intervention thus improving its implementation. Despite this, it is not clear what were the steps followed in search for formal approval and incisive of these efforts, since no formal approval is perceived by the mechanisms of governance of the project and the execution remains low despite these reformulations. Therefore, many of the components of this 'rethinking' the Project remain hypothetical and not implemented. Likewise, these reformulations must be analyzed carefully before approving so that these changes do not adversely alter the pursuit of the Project objectives and expected outcomes.

The follow up and monitoring tool *Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Projects in GEF-3 GEF-4, and GEF-5* has been developed. However, although those reported in this monitoring tool reflects as reported in other documents (such as PIR, etc.) it is reflected this document contains some errors in some sectors (for example, concerning real implementation times), it lacks key data (for example, co-financing) or some sectors where information is rather mechanical without an analysis as reported. Also, some of the processes included as compliments or to meet in the coming months after having completed this tool are inaccuracies (for example, noted that "*In August 2015 the Integrated Forest Management and Monitoring System of Biodiversity will be well implemented*").

Regarding the plan implementation as it was designed, it is perceived that this assessment has not taken place as it was scheduled (ie at the Project mid-term). It is understood that in the midterm there are not activities nor outputs to discuss, and that was the main reason for the evaluation did not happen in time. It discerns that in the effective mid-term of the GEF forest project would have

been difficult to identify some recommendations or corrections to improve outcomes because at that time there was not a critical mass of outcomes. But nevertheless, in retrospect, it can be valued that, if some kind of revision at the mid-term of the project would have been carried out, perhaps possible and necessary programmatic corrections would have raised in a preliminary period to current and therefore with more scope for re channeling pertinent earlier. Some kind of previous review (maybe not a complete assessment, but at least partial) could have warned of the difficulties of programmatic implementation and also conceptual that have negatively affected the implementation process of the project.

Obviously the decision on the timing of the current mid-term evaluation is valid, but this is pointed out for future programs, saving that when a project experiences important delays, perhaps not so much desirable evaluating outcomes but evaluating possibilities of redirecting a project as needed when serious difficulties arise.

STAKEHOLDERS IMPLICATIONS

The GEF Forest Project is an intervention of national implementation (NEX or NIM). It also has a strong mark at objectives, outputs and expected outcomes at the local level. From its formal title *Formal (Biodiversity Conservation through Sustainable Forest Management by local communities)* and from the expected outputs and outcomes, it distinguishes the project should have a significant interconnected dynamics between national and local, and with efficient involvement of stakeholders.

From the analysis of project management, however, it is perceived that adequate and appropriate alliances were not developed or forged with the direct stakeholders, as well as other agents. From the Government of Bolivia, for example, little ownership of the project is seen in particular little ownership of activities, outputs, processes and macro outcomes the Project aims to achieve at country level. This reaches the point that is perceived from a number of highly relevant actors, that the project has no activities, processes or outputs to generate nationwide, reaching to state that it should only act locally without having a management unit nationwide in La Paz.

As for the local level, some partnerships have been forged with local actors (local government, indigenous authorities, local representatives of national government areas, as well as civil society associations acting in the territory, or even individuals). **However, these alliances have not been forged with clarity and transparency to the Project objectives.** There has been a generation of interests and expectations for local actors, where they await for funding, support, generation of activities that often do not lead to the objectives and expected outcomes of GEF Forest Project. For example, there are expectations from local stakeholders that intervention exists for funding local activities, often activities found Conceptually with the sustainable management of the forest activities or, at most, without much thematic connection with the objectives and expected outcomes. It should be noted, however, that several of the actors identified for partnership strategy of the project document, especially NGOs, are no longer in force and there is a need to rethink a new strategy for this purpose.

However, there are not alliances with other key actors who, although are not direct or indirect beneficiaries, can support or work with the project at some relevant levels. For example, there is no concrete alliances with universities or technical institutions working in the pilot areas in thematic related to the GEF Forestry Project.

It has been shown through this evaluation process that alliances have been forged in some instances, at the level of individuals and that the project does not create alliances with the communities themselves and that processes and outcomes will only remain (again in some cases) only with the leaderships. Moreover, due to the diversity of languages in the area, some language barriers have shown for the Project relationship with the communities. A lot of actors have expressed they 'expect more' than those already developed activities because they perceive that there has been great emphasis on workshops and training, local actors see as redundant, and also they are tired to participate in these activities without seeing concrete outcomes nor having specific tools to implement proposed in workshops and training.

The relationship with local actors in the framework of the project is complex itself. Especially taking into account environmental vulnerabilities but wide socio economic vulnerabilities exist in the area of influence of the local stakeholders, and therefore the needs of the local population are vast. In addition, institutions around sustainable use of natural resources by various local actors in the forest area is unclear or even in some cases controversial. The Project has failed to transmit and act in accordance with their goals that seek sustainable use, equating conservation with local communities' development. Likewise, it is appreciated that local actors have a degree of frustration with the project, as they have been involved with it for a long period of time without receiving concrete outcomes.

REMAINING BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

PROJECT EXECUTION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

As indicated in other sections of this report, the implementation of the Project GEF Forest is much delayed. As for adaptive management itself, from the project a series of plans were generated and are generating to adapt their management and adapt to the changes that have occurred in Bolivia since the approval of the Project GEF Forest. However, these are internal plans which have not yet fully implemented and is expected after this Midterm evaluation (and in connection with the no cost extension request) there would be a short step to adjust the design and consistent to the adaptive management. This ever since the organisms and partners approve the changes proposed by the project and / or extension without costs.

FINANCING

Below, the financing chart with planned co-financing data. Unfortunately, from this evaluation was not available with real co financing data. Likewise, these are not part of the monitoring tools such as Tracking Tools¹⁴.

FINANCING	FINANCING FROM GEF / UNDP (in USD millions)		Government (in USD millions)		Total (in USD million)	
	Planned	Real	Planned	Real	Planned	Real
Grant	5 500 000	5 500 000	10 885 000	N/D ¹⁵	16 385 000	N/D
Total	5 500 000	5 500 000	10 885 000	N/D	16 385 000	N/D

SUSTAINABILITY

Among projects funded by GEF and supported by the UNDP, sustainability is established as the probability the effects and outcomes of the project are maintained in time when the project ends. Therefore, it is evaluating the possibility that outcomes are sustainable in time or not. Since this is a mid-term evaluation and an appraisal of a project with delays in its implementation, it is somewhat difficult to determine the possibility of sustainability given at the time of this evaluation, a group of activities and outputs are generating, but concrete outputs of effects are yet observed.

The Project GEF Forest has certain aspects that induce to conceive some of the outcomes can last over time, while other aspects may even be strengthened to ensure or strengthen the possibility of durability of achievements and minimize risks of unsustainability. Sustainability (or likelihood of sustainability) is based on several components of a project and as indicated above, an assessment can only indicate if given the possible scenarios to sustain effects in the short, medium and long term. In a mid-term evaluation as here developed of a project with some serious delays regarding implementation, and therefore with few outcomes and visible effects to date, only can express some inferences and general deductions. Each of the components of sustainability are extended in the following sections.

¹⁴ The issue of real co-financing of the project is taken up in the recommendations and possible extension request sections.

¹⁵ Information not available (N/D)

FINANCIAL RISKS OF SUSTAINABILITY

The likelihood of sustainability when the availability of financial resources ends after completion of GEF and UNDP support to continue with the outputs and outcomes to be generated is relatively low for the reasons outlined below. First, so far the planned and expected co-financing of the project was not given. Therefore, this is not only an indicator of low ownership and support by counterparts but also an indicator that potential resources of the public sector may not materialize.

However, in the planning and design are included (from the project strategy) dynamics that can provide a basis for financial sustainability, especially by local actors, ever since this outcomes are achieved in the context of the Project GEF Forest. In seeking increasing the demand for certified tropical hardwood while trying to improve operational competitiveness of forestry community to strengthen market access, this would generate incentives (increase revenue) that would support and compensate the actors (companies, local beneficiaries, etc.) for costs incurred in putting certification and conservation of biological diversity in practice. Therefore, this strategy (given the effects and expected outcomes) would have a feasibility level of financial sustainability in the short, medium and long-term at local actors' level.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC RISK TOWARDS SUSTAINABILITY

For example, some of the conditions that must exist for the possibility to hold in the future the project effects are **installed institutional capacities** a project in the country "leaves". In this case, these conditions are in place to some extent because the project has a broader policy and regulatory framework that when it starts. This does not imply direct causation (this is not indicating here that the project generated the frame itself) but there is evidence the project helped generate some institutional capabilities and has helped develop some of the mandates of the Environment Law. This in turn creates opportunities for sustainability of effects in the future. Another positive and possibly leading to sustainability is that the Project supported the development of some capacities of some national partners in the mainstreaming of sustainable use of biodiversity in productive activities. Some of the outputs of these capabilities are developed materials for incorporating concepts of sustainable use in the proposed reform of laws related to forests and these are evident through the products themselves.

The low level of ownership of stakeholders and some partners during the implementation of the project is also a factor of uncertainty in relation to sustainability. If partners are not fully appropriated of the Project, then sustainability of outcomes is uncertain at best cases and political commitment to continue working on the project outcomes is uncertain.

RISKS TOWARDS SUSTAINABILITY RELATED TO THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE

Regarding sustainability related to the institutional framework and governance, in the case of Project GEF Forest conditions are given indicating that there are social or political risks that may endanger the sustainability of the project outcomes. Including risks associated with the level of ownership and involvement of stakeholders, including the national government and local relevant actors (TCO, municipalities, etc.). The low level of ownership of stakeholders and some partners during project implementation is also a factor of uncertainty as concerning sustainability. If

members do not fully appropriate of the project, then the sustainability of outcomes is dubious at best and political commitment to continue working on the project outcomes when they are obtained is uncertain.

So far there is no sign that the level of property / ownership and involvement is sufficient to sustain project outcomes / benefits, when they occur. This is observed at the local and national levels. Some of the conditions that must exist for the possibility to sustain future project effects, are institutional capacities installed a project 'Leaves' installed in the country. Around this theme, the project (in its design level) contained expected outcomes (with target indicators such as "BD monitoring system That has-been prepared and approved by the government "; or "Proposal of an operating plan for the Comprehensive Forest Management plan including adopted by the government") that taking them up again and channeling in line with current the conditions in Bolivia around forest issues, would generate opportunities of effects sustainability in the future.

ENVIRONMENTAL RISK TO SUSTAINABILITY

The most salient environmental risk that may endanger the maintenance of expected outcomes of the project is the vulnerability of the pilot areas of implementation for the purpose of climate change. The implementation area is an area with vulnerabilities to the effects of change climate¹⁶. These vulnerabilities not only present associated risks to the effects on ecosystems in the area of implementation (floods, mudslides, landslides) but also to the vulnerabilities that populations have facing negative impacts, and in these cases to the sustainable management of forest resources.

Regarding the valuation of sustainability in general we can rate the probability of sustainability as something likely. This is a general probability outlined and based on risks to sustainability presented earlier in this section (financial, socioeconomic, institutional, and environmental).

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

Although this is a mid-term evaluation, as scheduled the project should conclude in just a few months more. However, it is found it only has been executed to the assessment date 18 percent of the budget, approximately; that have developed a small amount of planned outputs; and expected outcomes to commit yet have largely manifested. The extended period at start-up and implementation, project staff changes (including changes of direction), changes of partners by the national state, and the deep changes in environmental policy have created a considerable backlog. Therefore, arises the possibility of requesting an extension at no additional cost.

From this assessment is considered that, if the project would be given an extension to the implementation in extended times for implementation, several of the main objectives and proposed/expected outcomes could be achieved. It is considered that the extension with and adequate temporary would be positive. However, temporality is highlighted, since it is being discussed within the Project to request an extension of four years. Which it is not at all feasible,

¹⁶ In fact, some of the delays of the field implementation of some project outputs are associated with the extraordinary flooding in Project offices. Although it is understood that the environmental risks to the project sustainability are broader than this aspects, this situation is even emblematic of the vulnerability of the area against the adverse effects climate change has in the direct area of project implementation.

among other reasons, because of the policies of the implementation agency implementation (UNDP) and the GEF. This assessment considers those times are too long and extension (if granted) should be less than four years being proposed.

It is important to mention that what it extends here refers to valuations arising from the midterm evaluation and that in fact the project extension is not guaranteed. This extension request is at the same time analyzed by relevant actors. Also, it is important to highlight that new rules regarding extensions exist and are generally not permitted, unless there is a full justification and is perceived to be achieved significant progress in the final period of project implementation. The Executive Coordinator UNDP-GEF must approve or reject all extensions.

However, having said that, the extension should have previous elements before being approved. Including a timeline, reviewing the logical framework in areas that are not relevant in the Bolivia's current context, with emphasis on planning goals to achieve, among other components. Extension should be contingent on this reprogramming, and meet the scheduled steps for the adaptive management. Among these steps to follow, it is recommended that reformulation is submitted to the management committees, UNDP and GEF to request their input and explicit approval to generate greater involvement and ownership by these actors (stakeholders).

First, several of the logical framework components should be reviewed so that they are more coherent in the extension step and mote into line with the social, economic, and political circumstances of the country. Second, a roadmap with a clear line time for action must be generated, (explaining when the outputs and processes would take place for the Project GEF Forest). Also, the planning tools of the Project (POAs, etc.) should be reviewed for outputs and processes to be implemented adapt to changes and deliverables and general outputs strictly align to what the project should generate and drive. A series of activities, processes, and outputs without attachment between the planned and actually executed is evident. For example, the work with communities on food or funding / purchase of inputs for distinct government organizations. In order to avoid the generation of unpremeditated and false expectations outputs (erroneous expectations that have been specially made for the local actors in the two and a half years of Project GEF Forest implementation), execution must adhere to programmed and planned¹⁷. Similarly, the extension request should be accompanied by a full report verifying the co - financing of the Project to the date of the extension request containing information about funds and grants received including disbursement rates and dates thereof. This would be necessary not only to give light on the differences between the planned and expected financing execution especially related to the co-financing but as an ownership indicator.

In short, an extension would be recommended as long as the project can meet the indicated recommendations. Not only recommendations regarding reformulation, management and monitoring but also the project demonstrates a robust and appropriate national ownership. If what mentioned here and in the recommendations section are not met before the extension request without cost, then the conditions are not be given to continue this intervention.

¹⁷ In the recommendations section extends over the recommended items that should be generated before granting an extension.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The Project GEF Project is an intervention that has been, generally speaking, properly formulated from the conceptual level when its objective at design level is established ["Improving protection and conservation of biodiversity in the Amboró Madidi Corridor through sustainable forest management, based on the promotion of markets for certified forest products and increased local revenue"] in relation to some of the barriers impeding the sustainable management of biodiversity by local actors. From this objective and the classification of barriers for the sustainable management of forest biodiversity, strategies are identified to overcome these barriers generating capacities (national and local) for the sustainable management of timber and no timber with special emphasis on the role of local actors. This is, at the macro level, the expected outcomes in effects degrees are commensurate with the identified threats and barriers. The expected outcomes (listed at the bottom) are consistent with the objective and identified barriers.¹⁸

However, various problems at design level are identified. First, some of the dynamics that are proposed do not take into account local institutional realities, for example, by failing to realize that the municipalities have little or no interference or jurisdiction in issues relating to forests and sustainable management of biodiversity linked to them. Thus at planning scheme it is planned to generate a number of activities / processes / outputs so they are irrelevant to the interference and local jurisdictions. Another problem revealed in the design analysis are related to some of the indicators. Several of them are too ambitious or unlikely to be feasible in the three years of life of the Project, while others are not outcome indicators but output indicators.

Other issues at design level are discerned by analyzing the area where the intervention pilots develop. First, it does not realize the wide diversity in the area of influence: of ecosystems; of productive activities related to sustainable forest management, and the ethnic and social of the communities associated with the forestry sector as well as the diverse use made of the biodiversity associated with the forestry sector. Therefore, as the design has so much variety it is not focused adequately to be implemented properly in relation to the expected outcomes, the planned timing of the project and the funds available.

This geographical, ecological, and socio - environment extension has given rise to a conception apparently wrong, that the Project GEF Forest, in its implementation stage, should cover the entire area. This is, from the Project is perceived (and is working), in the Amboró-Madidi corridor, largely in all municipalities and community administration zones in this area. The concept does not appear in the Project implementation should focus on pilot schemes (within the Corridor and municipalities to the north of La Paz) and generating a connection between them and national components of the Project GEF Forest. It does not realize that is perceived from the Project these are show sites that through the demonstration of achievement of strengthened communities to obtain and maintain certification of forest products, and to manage forests in a sustainable manner and friendly to biodiversity with established economic incentives as inducements to maintain sustainable

¹⁸ (1) institutional support mechanisms to support the conservation of biodiversity are built through certificate management community forests; 2) The capacity of the community is strengthened to achieve and maintain certification, and to manage forests in a sustainable and friendly way with biodiversity; and 3) economic incentives have been established to attract and maintain the commitment of Community operations to conserve practices of sustainable management of biodiversity]

biodiversity management, can promote and ensure the highest potential for replicability, local, regional and national.

The project has to date a very low level of delivery (with only 18 percent of budget execution). This is associated with serious problems that may be related to several dynamics: lack of execution due to inefficiency from the project in the implementation (particularly in the first execution times); lack of execution associated with multiple and repeated rotation of the Project Direction and Project staff, counterparts of the Bolivian State; failure in the implementation locally and in pilot areas due to the generation of false expectations to the communities and local actors on what the Project GEF Forest should and can support; and, finally, a indisputably profound change in speech, vision and policies regarding the relationship natural resources - sustainable development at the national level.

Despite these variations and delays, the Project GEF Forest is still highly relevant in the Plurinational State of Bolivia. In itself, threats to the sustainable management of forest biodiversity continue or worsen in some dimensions; vulnerabilities of local actors against unsustainable management of forest resources is perceptible; and changing political context and conceptual give a new framework and a plurality of opportunities for the project in its next stage can generate outcomes, effects and processes for sustainable and equitable management of resources associated with the forests in the country.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS AT DESIGN LEVEL

5. Should be procured to have the information and suitable components from the stage of project design (indicators, current policies, genuine information of direct actors/beneficiaries, replicability and connection potential between pilot and national experiences, exit strategy, etc.) and from this stage, mechanisms of interaction and joint management with the potential project partners are generated.

6. Should be procured that interventions design not disperse inordinately given the planned times, processes and expected outcomes, as well as project resources. Projects cannot 'do everything', and a realistic focus (thematic, geographical, social) can generate better and more lasting outcomes.

7. The execution times set in the project design should be a reflection of the execution complexity. This is, projects need adequate temporality for what they intend to accomplish. In particular sustainable development projects that need an important deployment to achieve outcomes and effects settling time.

8. It is recommended that local project interventions (in pilot areas, interventions in municipalities, work with direct beneficiaries) should not be oversized, or try to work with a wide variety of ecosystems and land, or work with a wide variety of ethnic and cultural groups, or be extremely ambitious). It should keep a realistic correlation with an intervention of the type and scheduled magnitude and not generating false expectations, especially with local communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE REQUEST OF EXTENSION

9. It is recommended that, if requested, the request for extension without cost, be given so that the Project may have extended times and thus achieving several of the main planned objectives and several of the proposed outcomes. It is recommended that the extension period is not more than two years so activities and outputs ruled thus executing the project properly and also have a project closure and the generation of an appropriate exit strategy, without further dilatations.

10. That said, however, the extension should be linked to certain components, and the granting of this possible extension is based on the achievement of the components. Among them it is suggested to carry out a concrete and realistic formulation and strategic prioritization; tied a clear timetable for action with deadlines regarding activities the project aims to implement in relation to obtaining objectives and results based management, Similarly, information should be transparent as part of the request, such as financial information and co - financing of the Project reporting on funds and contributions received as co-financing and including disbursement rates and dates thereof. The reformulation should make explicit the underlying theory of change of the project, building how outputs and interventions would lead to the desired changes and making explicit the intervention logic.

Some more specific recommendations for this line of reformulation and components to determine before granting the extension would be:

11. Emphasize and restore activities, processes, original national outputs of the Project GEF Forest (such as supporting the development of tolls and supporting policies and context to the goals and objectives of the Project; goals such as processes of certification, monitoring of biodiversity and sustainable use by local actors).

12. Review the work with stakeholders and local beneficiaries so that viable mechanisms of cooperation are generated to develop planned activities, taking into account that activities should develop the Project are leading the objectives, goals and expected outcomes.

13. This stage of reformulation should clarify which outputs would support or generate the project, reaching outputs reformulation understanding these are outputs and processes directly linked to the objectives. It is recommended the reformulation is made at the outputs and processes levels, but not at expected outcomes /effects levels since these remain relevant. It also emphasizes the reformulation must realize that Project funds cannot be used for purposes strictly charitable or to directly finance inputs or own activities in certain areas of the state or the government.

14. Reformulation should be developed understanding that outputs the Project implements and supports must be linked to sustainable forest management and the capacity building for this.

15. Follow the appropriate steps for approval of the reformulation with the governance and direction of the Project.

16. Once the exercise of re prioritization and rationalization takes place, and to support the Project implementation in a second stage, it is recommended to carry out a re -launch workshop to shore up the second stage with the participation of all key stakeholders possible, clearly outlining what the objectives, expected outcomes are and what activities and processes that will be developed within the context of the Project GEF Forest.

17. Outline what is the role of each institution (Implementing Partner, UNDP, GEF) within the Project and what their responsibilities are, looking – as well - to insert the project within the country's institutions and generate national ownership.

RECOMMENDATIONS AT IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL

18. To encourage agile operation, the project should be strengthened around several implementation aspects, including decision making to within its governance system (management committees, etc.).

19. Taking account of the country environmental policies, the project strategy should be rethink by establishing a clear relationship with the state actors, setting work plans with each of them attached to the expected outputs and outcomes, emphasizing the leadership the government should take through the counterparty (ie Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Changes and Forest Management and Development). It is recommended to delineate the definition of work plans based on results with each of the actors of the project (such as the Direction of Biodiversity of the VMA, Direction of Forest Management and Development, ABT, CIPTA, PILCOL and municipalities).

20. Thus, it also requires overcoming project isolation, relating more strongly to the executing agency (Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change and Forest Management and

Development) through various coordination mechanisms, such as executive meetings to socialize relevant progress and difficulties.

21. Leading and monitoring mechanism should resume. One of these is the Board proposed in the original project document, incorporating again representatives of relevant strategic actors in this new stage. This way, the functionality of this instance could accelerate, that would validate and / or correct implementation actions, giving legitimacy and transparency to the project development, as well as generating feedback when catalyze governance processes. It is recommended strengthening coordination and articulation mechanisms among the different involved actors. For example, by strengthening the management committees in a comprehensively way and in direct relation to the Project management level. Also, the continuity of the technical committee should be guaranteed as part of the counseling, feedback and connection with the Project.

22. The project accompanying should be strengthened with the adequate generation of right skills and the operational and technical support from the executing agency and from the counterparts UNDP and GEF. It is recommended that within the project partner institutions (agencies, institutions, team itself, etc.) capacities concerning the implementation issues such as Results Based Management should be generated, procedures and goals of the projects implemented by UNDP and funded by GEF as well as the national implementation guidelines in a context such as the Plurinational State of Bolivia where this type of project must also comply with regulations and national guidelines, among others.

23. Related to the above, it is recommended strengthening the role of UNDP and GEF in the Project direction and/or strengthen the existing direction as appropriate. That is, it is recommended that the role of UNDP and GEF are already developing strengthens to strengthen their proactive role in issues of implementation, execution, monitoring and operation of the Project. But not only that, it is also recommended major mechanisms of technical support are articulated from the GEF and UNDP. All this should take place in a context of feedback to the Ministry, Deputy Minister and UNDP Country Office.

24. The project should follow standard guidelines for implementation, and continue the schedules as are led by the committee (s) (following the standard procedures: plans generation in line with planned, approval of these plans by Project governance mechanisms, implementing POAs, by monitoring the implementation by the project and by the governance mechanisms). It is strongly suggested that from this point forward the project complies with the mechanisms and standards for planning and monitoring to ensure that work is fulfilled according to plans, outputs and expected outcomes and that only these are implemented.

25. It is recommended that there are greater implemented capabilities in terms of monitoring and follow up, particularly when implementation problems arise as those already this project had. For example, when clear problems are emerging with the implementation, should be flexibility for joint monitoring and agile tracking that can generate rapid channeling of the project when necessary and not waiting until times run out and there is little chance of re addressing.

26. Strengthen mechanisms for monitoring and project planning, so that adaptive management in the implementation is activated and feedback, thus sheltering from uncertainty of context changes, authorities and technical staff.

27. It should strengthen or create mechanisms of agile administration in correspondence to the Project dynamic, protecting internal control mechanisms, to ensure the correct financial administrative management. For example, the project must generate its own internal administrative regulations urgently.

28. It is recommended that the materials and products generated by the project reflect the cultural and ethnic diversity of actors the project work with (including production of materials in various local languages).

29. As several of the actors identified for a strategic alliance, especially NGOs are no longer in force, there is a need to rethink a new strategy for this end.

30. The Project GEF Forest should generate concrete partnerships with universities or technical institutions working on similar themes, creating synergies to promote the goals of the project.

31. Avoid a paternalistic vision with local stakeholders, and generate initiatives that go beyond training, building the capacity of communities and the specific technical support in the search for the generation of incentives for conservation and sustainable use of forestry.

32. It is recommended that exchanges and articulations with other projects are generated (For example, the other GEF projects - UNDP in Bolivia) dealing with similar issues, seeking to benefit the assimilation of lessons learned, outcomes and processes.

33. It is recommended that the Project GEF Forest generates now on a clear exit strategy to contribute to the sustainability of efforts made or to achieve. The strategy should include risks analysis aspects (financial, institutional, socioeconomic or environmental) that may affect to sustain project outcomes in the medium and long term. Based on this information, this strategy should contain guidelines to shore up the achievements and results to generate sustainability. Preventions and actions should be taken when generating the exit strategy, to promote sustainability and institutionalization of the project's impact at the institutional level, especially considering the institutional weaknesses in some areas of the government, the high turnover of staff, and other similar forces operating in Bolivia.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO LEVEL OF EXPECTED RESULTS AND THEME RECOMMENDATIONS

34. It is recommended that the planning work would be redirected through the strengthening of some highly relevant themes, products, and issues that the project had in its design and inception which have substantially left aside in the first stage of implementation, seeking to incorporate the themes of the project in the country institutions and taking special consideration to the new threats to sustainable forest management in the areas of influence of the Project. These are:

35. *Forest certification.* Understanding that, although the country is not part of the international agreements on international certification of timber products, there are other proposals at the national level in generating voluntary or mandatory schemes of certification (national compulsory certification, special certifications for areas of community domain, etc.). Therefore, the project could (and would pertain) having an important role in generating and promoting this topic supporting the creation, approval and implementation of regulations on suitable certification for the country context.

36. *Productivity as a key role in the conservation of forest resources.* Generate concrete institutional instruments and provide technical support on this theme to improve competitiveness of forestry operations (especially community). Seek alliances with sectors related to productivity, marketing, and production development at the state level to promote this issue.

37. *Institutional mechanisms support to promote biodiversity conservation through sustainable forest management.* Support the generation and implementation of instruments that create conditions and capacities to promote the conservation of biodiversity in relation to forest resources. Especially, retaking the components of the expected outcome already formulated for a proposal of an integral forest management (including a strategy for its adoption by the government) that incorporates changes in current public policy in Bolivia on the topic.

6. ANNEXES

- **ToR EMT**

PROPOSAL REQUEST BOL/79912 – 2580/15

PROJECT	BOL/79912 “Conservation of Biodiversity through the sustainable management of forest by local actors”
Name of invitation	<p>By means of this, interested individual consultants are invited to submit proposal for:</p> <p>“CONSULTANCY: INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT TO PERFORM THE EMT EVALUATION OF PROJECT GEF FOREST”</p> <p>Proposal request No. BOL/79912 – 2580/15</p> <p>According to the attached ToR</p>

United Nations Development Program

**INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC CALL
PROPOSAL REQUEST BOL/79912 – 2580/15**

The United Nations Development Program under the Project frame BOL/79912 – **“Conservation of Biodiversity through the sustainable management of forest by local actors”**, requires performing the following consultancy:

BOL/79912 – 2580/15 “CONSULTANCY: INTERNATINAL CONSULTANT TO PERFORM THE EMT EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT GEF FOREST”

Those interested in participation can consult the Invitation Document of each call and obtain a copy of them through the website www.oportunidades.onu.org.bo Interested in submitting an offer must register its participation in this website.

Disclaimer, amendments and addenda will be posted in the website www.oportunidades.onu.org.bo Convener won't accept responsibility for the lack of capacity of the computer of the offerer for receiving bidding documents, loss or late reception of any document and/or sending to email addresses or other incomplete type. In case of requiring technical assistance, please communicate with UNDP or via fax to 2795820 or to the mail address adquisiciones.bo@undp.org

Offers should be presented to the email address adquisiciones.bo@undp.org **up to May 18, 2015**. Offers later won't be accepted.

“United Nations is committed to accomplish labor biodiversity within its office in gender terms, nationality and culture. Individuals of minor social groups, indigenous groups and handicapped people are equal motivated to apply. All labor applications with be treated with major confidentiality”

United Nations Development Program
14th Street with Sanchez Bustamente Avenua, Calacoto, 4th floor
Telephone (+591) 2795820
e-mail: adquisiciones.bo@undp.org
La Paz, Bolivia

**INTERNATIONAL CALL
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
BOL/79912-2580/15 “CONSULTANCY: INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT TO PERFORM THE
EMT EVALUATION OF THE GEF FOREST PROJECT”**

1. Office	UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
2. Buyer	BOL/79912 – “Conservation of Biodiversity through the sustainable management of forests by local actors”
3. Request for Proposal No.	BOL/79912 – 2580/15
4. Eligible Offerers	<p>Individual consultants must meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect Children’s Rights • Safety standards and suitable working environment • Not exercise corrupt practices • Not use names, emblems or seals of UNDP • Exercise and promote the green policy <p>The contract to sign is an individual contract (IC). An individual contract (IC) for its acronym in English is an UNDP proper legal instrument and cannot be governed by national law in the countries where the UNDP operates. The IC is governed only by its written terms. Including ToR and General conditions for the IC. IC is a legal instruments used for services of acquisitions provided by an individual hired by the UNDP, in its individual capacity, to provide technical services, advisory services, abilities or technical knowledge to perform certain task or job.</p>
5. Relationship between proponent and convener	<p>Relationship between convener and proponent must keep the highest standards of ethics and it should only be done in written when referring to this call.</p> <p>This clause applies from the beginning of the process up to the award except the consultation meeting</p>
6. Consultation	In case of consultations, must be done only through the e-mail adquisiciones.bo@undp.org Deadline for consultations is May 13, 2015
7. Preparation of proposals	The proponent must submit at cost the technical and economic proposals. The technical proposals may content the legal, administrative and technical documents without including the cost detail. Detailed cost of the proposal must be included in the economic proposal
8. Proposal template	<p>Proponent must submit its proposal by e-mail address identifying it as follows:</p> <p>SECTION: ACQUISITIONS SENDER: NAME ADRESS AND PHONE</p> <p>To United Nations Development Program 14th Street with Sanches Bustamante – Calacoto</p>

	<p>Call for proposals: BOL 79912 – 2580/15 “INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT TO PEFROEM THE EMT EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT GEF FOREST”</p> <p>DO NOT OPEN UNTIL MAY 18, 2015</p> <p>Proposals must be sent signed and scanned in PDF format to the e-mail address adquisiciones.bo@undp.org Please take into account email capacity is of 10MB and it is responsible of the proponent to confirm email reception. Convener won't accept responsibility for late reception or documents loss.</p>
<p><u>A. TEHCNICAL PROPOSAL</u></p> <p>i. Legal and administrative documentation to submit:</p>	<p>Proposal must contain the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter of proposal presentation (Form No. 1) • Proponent identification, express declaration model and professional commitment letter (form No. 2) <p>For the contract signature, UNDP will request the awarded the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Original of medical certificate issued by a registered professional at the medical college - ID photocopy - Form Vendor – Personal data update
<p>ii. Proponent documents</p>	<p>The proponent must present:</p> <p>Form No. 3 – P11 Specific Experience must be supported with documentation and / or relevant certification</p>
<p><u>B. ECONOMIC PROPOSAL</u></p>	<p>Economic proposal must be done in Form No 4</p> <p>The economic proposal must express the offered amount in numeral and literal, in case of discrepancy between numeral and literal, the last one will be consider as offered amount.</p> <p>The economic proposal must include the budget breakdown by activity to perform.</p> <p>The total amount of the economic proposal will be the same as provided in the proposal presentation letter</p>
<p>9. Prices and currency of the proposal</p>	<p>Proposals must be offered in US dollars</p> <p>Price should include all cost related to the current project and will remain fixed during the contract.</p> <p>The economic proposal must include taxes and the corresponding payment to the social security. Paying taxes for income derived from the provision of services and payment to the social security is the sole responsibility of the awarded proponent according to the rules applicable</p>
<p>10. Modality of acquisition of the service</p>	<p>Individual Contract</p>
<p>11. Payment currency</p>	<p>Currency to perform the payments will be: US dollars</p>
<p>12. Method of payment</p>	<p>According to the attached ToR</p>

13. Validity of the offer	The proposal must be valid for at least 90days calendar from the date fixed for the submission of the proposal
14. Date and address for the proposal submission and open of proposals	Deadline to submit proposals is May 18, 2015 to the e-mail address adquisiciones.bo@undp.org Proposals open will be carried out in a private act.
15. Proposals presented late	Any proposal to be submitted after the deadline for receipt of proposals won't be received, by registering that fact in the minutes of proposals reception, stating the proponent name.
16. Competition void or annulled	The proposal is declared void if proposals were not received
17. Evaluation of legal documentation and economic proposal	Legal and administrative documents will be evaluated with the system "meet or does not meet" the requested. Academic training, overall and specific experience and interview will be scored according to the terms specified in the evaluation criteria. Applicants must achieve a minimum of 500 on 700 points to be enabled to the economic proposal review. Only to be reviewed the reasonableness of prices and correction of possible arithmetic errors.
18. Award criteria	The proposal meeting all requested and obtaining the highest score resulting from the sum of the marks obtained in the technical evaluation and economic proposals awarded to the proposal meets all requested and obtained the highest score resulting from the sum of the marks obtained in the technical evaluation and economic proposal
19. Confidentiality of the process	Started the process of evaluation of proposals and until the completion of the recruitment process, all information related to the clarifications and proposals evaluations will be considered confidential as well as the recommendations of award of the tender. Information conserved as confidential may not be known by or divulgate to persons that are not direct or officially involved with the proposals evaluations. Such forbiddance includes the proponents
20. Buyer's right to accept any offer or reject any or all offers	The convener reserves the right to reject the proposals and to annul the tender, when an act of force majeure justified arises that extinguished the need for recruitment. The convener does not incur any liability to the proponents concerned by this decision
21. Guarantees and contract sign	<p>Seriousness of the proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP reserves the right to invite the individual proponent in future calls in case of violation the seriousness of the proposal <p>Compliance of contract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP reserves the right to invite the individual proponent in future calls in case of violation the signed contract

22. Requisition of offerer registration	<p>Under the frame of the UNDP policies in Bolivia, it is required that all organizations/institutions/ and/or persons participating in any of the goods or services acquisition processes should register the required information in the offerer data base in the following e-mail address: www.oportunidades.onu.org.bo</p> <p>In case you require technical assistance please contact the UNDP via fax to: 2795820 or to the e-mail address adquisiciones.bo@undp.org</p>
--	--

CALL FOR PROPOSALS
Terms of Reference for the Mid-term evaluation: UNDP-GEF

Template 1: Formatted for submitting as attached document through the website of the UNDP Contract and acquisitions

1. INTRODUCTION

These are the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the mid-term evaluation (MTR for its acronym in English) of UNDP GEF for the ordinary or mid-size project denominated ***“Conservation of Biodiversity through the sustainable management of forest by local actors-BOL79912”*** (No. PIMS 4197), implemented through the *Vice Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change and Forest Management and Development* to be carried out in 2015. The project started on April 11, 2012 and currently is in its third year of implementation. In consonance with guide for MTR of UNDP GEF, this process of Mid-Term assessment started before the presentation of the Project Execution second report (PIR). In the current ToR, the current MTR expectations are fixed. The process MTR must follow guidelines stated in the document *Guide for performing Mid-term assessments in project supported by UNDP and funded by GEF* (<http://web.undp.org/gef/>)

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION

Bolivia is among the 17 countries more diverse in the world, however, biodiversity of global importance is threatened by deforestation and degradation. The State controls approximately 43% of forest areas in the country, this area of surface covers productive forests and protected areas (APs), these last established with the purpose to protect and conserve the biodiversity resources (BD), however, the protected areas network itself is fragmented, many are included in the category of scarce protection and the social and economic costs to enhance them are too high. On the other hand, forests that are not included in the protected areas represent the major proportion of forest cover in the country, therefore are of vital importance for the conservation of biodiversity in diverse ecosystems, consequently, is of vital importance to improve protection of this forest areas to ensure biodiversity conservation in the long term.

Proposed solution to contain underlying causes of biodiversity loss in the long term and for the strengthening of forest biodiversity management in Bolivia, is supporting communities to be more competitive in the market which will lead to investments in conservation of biodiversity, therefore project BOL/79912 was designed with the objective of “Improve conservation and protection of biodiversity in the Amoro Madidi corridor, through a sustainable management of forests, Based on fostering markets for certified forest products and to increase local revenues^{1 19}

To achieve the objective, several key barriers must be overcome, mainly: limited institutional capacity to implement sustainable forest management and certification and practices in biodiversity; (ii) limited knowledge and ability of community organizations to

1 Project Document BOL/79912 “Conservation of biodiversity through the sustainable management of Forests by local actors” (PRODOC), page 37

implement sustainable forest management, certification and practices of biodiversity and (iii) Financial and market barriers. The Project strategy is addressed to improve the protection and conservation of biodiversity in the Amoro Madidi corridor through the sustainable management of forests, based on the promotion of markets to achieve products from certified forests thus an increase in the local revenue, for this purpose the following outcomes are foreseen:

1. Institutional support mechanisms are created to promote the conservation of biodiversity through sustainable management and forest certification.
2. Communities with strengthened capabilities in integrated forest management and to obtain and maintain certification and management of forests in a sustainable with respect to biodiversity.
3. Economic incentives exist to attract and keep community forestry operations committed to sustainable forestry and BD management practices.
4. Project management, monitoring and evaluation.

For the implementation of outcomes, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, receives in 2010 a grant of 5.5 million from the Global Environmental Facility (for its acronym in English GEF – Global Forest Facility), aimed to support activities related with the Conservation of biodiversity. With these resources, the project BOL/79912 execution starts in 2013 under the name of “Conservation of Biodiversity through a sustainable management of forests by local actors”, which execution/partner entity is the Vice Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change and Forest Management and Development, partner responsible of the project is the Ministry of Environment and Water and means of implementation is the General Management Division and Forestry Development, and the resources administrator in the United Nations Development Program – UNDP.

Project has two kind of beneficiaries: a) direct beneficiaries such as TCO PICOL and TACANA and the Authority for the Supervision and social control of Forests and Land – ABT; indirect beneficiaries are the Municipalities of Northern La Paz where the before mentioned TCO converge, as well as the intercultural population.

3. OBJECTIVES OF MTR

MTR will evaluate advances performed for the objectives and expected outcomes achievement as stated in the Project Document, analysing the first sign of success or failure with the purpose of identifying any needed change for the project back on track and achievement of the expected outcomes. The MTR will also review the project strategy and its risk to sustainability.

4. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE MTR

Data contributed by the MTR should be based on credible, reliable and useful information. The MRT team will consider all relevant sources of information, including documents developed during the preparation phase (for example, PIF UNDP initiation plan, UNDP Environmental and Social protection policy, Project Document, Project Reports as the Annual Assessment PIR, project budget revisions, lessons learned reports, legal documents and national strategy and any other material the team consider useful for the assessment based in objective data). The MTR team will analyze the

Follow up tool of the intervention area of GEF at the beginning of the project, submitted to this organization with the approval from the CEO, and the follow up tool at mid-term which must be completed before starting the field visit of the MTR.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participative scope²⁰ that guarantees a close relationship with the Project team, government counterparts (person or entity designed as responsible or operational link of GEF (Operational Focal Points), UNDP country offices, Regional technical Advisors (RTA) of the UNDP GEF and other key stakeholders.

The involvement of stakeholders is vital to the success of the MTR, such involvement should include interviews with agents who have responsibility in the Project, among them (22): implementing agencies (Vice Ministry of Environment, climate change, biodiversity and forest management and development, with the following divisions: Forest Management and Biodiversity Management) Officials with the main responsibilities and task force / their leaders, experts and consultants in the project area, the Project Board, project stakeholders, academics, local governments, ESC, etc. It is also expected that the MTR team perform field missions to northern La Paz, including the following sites:

- Community Carmen Pecha – Municipality of Ixiamas
- Community of Tumupasa, CIPTA – Municipality of Ixiamas
- Populated Center Guanay, PICOL – Municipality of Guanay

Final Report of MTR should contain a complete description of the approach followed and the reasons for its adoption, explicitly pointing out the assumptions and challenges, strengths and weaknesses of the methods, and the approach taken for the assessment.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF MTR

The MTR will evaluate the following four categories of the project progress. For wide descriptions see – *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF financed Projects (Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF financed Projects)*

i. Project Strategy

Project Design

- Analyze the problem addressed by the project and the assumptions made. Examine the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes in the context on the project outcome achievement as stated in the Project Document.
- Analyze the relevance of the project strategy and determine whether this provides the most effective way to achieve the expected / desired results. Are the lessons learned in other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
- Analyze how projects are included in the priorities of the country. Check national ownership of the project. Was the project concept aligned with the development priorities of the national sector and plans for the country (or countries participating in case of multi country)?
- Analyze the processes of decision making. Was it taken into account during the process of project design those who could be affected by decisions related to the project, those who

²⁰ For ideas about innovative strategies and techniques and participative of follow up and evaluation, see UNDP discussion paper, Innovations in Monitoring and Evaluation results, November 5, 2013

could influence their outcomes and who could provide information or other resources during the processes of project design?

- Analyze to what extent relevant gender issues played in the project design. For further details of the followed guidelines, see *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF financed Projects*
- If there are significant areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement

Outcomes Framework

- Undertake a critical analysis of the indicators and goals of the project logical framework, assess the extent to which mid-term and end-term goals accomplish the SMART criteria (abbreviation in English for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) and suggest specific modifications/reviews of such goals and indicators to the extent necessary.
- Are the project objectives and outcomes or its components clear, practical and feasible to perform during the project lifetime?
- Analyze whether progress has so far generated beneficial development effects or could catalyze in the future (for example, in terms of income generation, gender equity and women empowerment, improvements in governance, etc.) so that should be included in the project outcomes framework and monitored annually.
- Ensure effective monitoring of the broader project development and gender aspects. Develop and recommend SMART indicators, which should include indicators disaggregated by gender and others that capture the benefits of development.

ii. Progress in the outcomes achievement

Analysis in the progress of the outcomes achievement:

- Review the logical framework indicators and compare them with the progress against the project goals through the Progress Matrix in the outcomes achievement according to the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF financed Projects*: reflect advances following the color system “semaphore type” based on the achieved progress level: assign a rating of progress achieved to each expected outcome, make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on track to be achieved" (red).

Chart: Matrix of Progress in the Outcomes Achievement (outcomes against the goals set for the end of the project)

Project Strategy	Indicator	Initial Reference level	Level of the first PIR (auto reported)	Goal at the project end	Goal at the end of the Project	Level and Mid-term evaluation	Valuation of achievement	Valuation rationale
Objective: Improve the protection and conservation of BD in the Amboro and Madidi corridor through the sustainable forest management based on the promotion of markets for certified forest products and the local revenue increase.	Indicator							
Outcome 1: Mechanisms of institutional support are generated to promote the BDF conservation through the sustainable forest management and certification	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2: Communities capacities are strengthened to achieve and	Indicator 3:							

maintain sustainable and friendly forest certification for BD	Indicator 4:							
Outcome 3. Economic incentives were set to attract and maintain the timber operations with sustainable management and practices to BD								

Code for the indicators' evaluation

Green – Achieved	Yellow – On track to achieve	Red – Not on track to achieve
------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------

Besides the analysis of the progress in the outcomes achievement:

- Compare and analyze the follow up tools of the GEF to initial baseline with completed before the mid-term review
- Identify remaining barriers to the achievement of the project objectives up to the project completion.
- Once evaluating the project aspects that have been successful, identify formulas for the project to expand the benefits achieved

iii. Project execution and adaptive management

Management Mechanisms

- To analyze the overall effectiveness of project management as is outlined in the Project Document Have the changes carried out? Are they effective? Are the responsibilities and chain of command clear? Are decisions taken transparently and at the right time? Recommended areas of improvement.
- Analyze the quality of the execution by the GEF Partner Agency in the execution and recommended areas for improvement.
- Analyze the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommended areas for improvement.

Work Planning

- Analyze any delay in the launch and implementation of the project, identify their causes and examine whether they have already solved
- Are the work planning processes based on outcomes? If not so, can ways to guide the work planning to focus on outcomes suggested?
- Examine the use of project outcomes logical framework as a management tool and review any changes since the beginning of the project.

Financing and Co-financing

- Assess the financial management of the project, with particular reference to the effectiveness of interventions.
- Analyze changes in allocations of funds as a result of budget revisions and determine whether these reviews have been appropriate and relevant
- Has the project adequate financial controls, including appropriate information and planning, to enable the Directorate taking informed decisions on the budget and to provide a flow of funds in adequate time and deadlines?
- From the information contained in the follow up chart of co-financing to be filled, write comments on co-financing. Is the co-financing used strategically to help the project objectives? Does the project team meet with all co-financing partners to align funding priorities and annual work plans?

Monitoring and evaluation systems at project level

- Analyze the monitoring tools currently used. Do they offer necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or incorporated to the national systems? Do they use the existing information? Are they efficient? Are they profitable? Do they require additional tools? How can they be more participative and inclusive?
- Analyze the financial management of the budget for the project monitoring and evaluation. Are sufficient resources assigned for monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources used with effectiveness?

Stakeholders' involvement

- Project Management: Has the project developed and forged appropriate alliances both with direct stakeholders as tangential agents?
- Participation and processes driven from the country: Do the local and national governments support the project objectives? Do they still have an active role in the project decision making that contributes to an efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public sensitization: To what extent has involvement and public sensitization contributed to the progress towards the project objectives achievement?

Information

- Analyze the mechanism used by the Project Coordination to inform about changes in the adaptive management and communicate to the Project Board.
- Evaluate to what extent the project team and partners carry out and accomplish with all the information requirements of GEF (For example: what measures were taken to tackle PIR with low valuations, when applicable?)
- Evaluate how lessons derived of the adaptive management process were documented and shared with key partners and how they were internalized by them.

Communication:

- Review the project internal communication with stakeholders: Does a regular and effective communication exist? Are there important stakeholders out of the communication channels? Are there feedback mechanisms when the communication is received? Does communication contribute with stakeholders so that these have a major consciousness over the project outcomes and activities, as well as the investment in the project outcomes sustainability?

- Review the external project communication Have adequate communication channels established – or are being established – to express the project progress and the public impact desired (for example: Is there web presence? Has the project carried out adequate communication and public sensitization campaigns?)
- For information purposes, write a half page paragraph that summarizes the project progress towards outcomes in terms of their contribution to benefits related with the sustainable development and global environment.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate if the identified risks in the Project document, the Project Annual Review PIR and the Risk Management Module ATLAS are the most important and if the risk valuations applies are adequate and updated. Otherwise explain why:
- Also, evaluate the following risk to sustainable:

Financial Risks to sustainability

- Which is the probability to reduce or terminates the economic resources availability once completed the GEF contribution (considering that potential resources may come from multiple sources, including the private and public sectors, income generating activities and other resources will be adequate to sustain the project outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability

- Are there social or political risks that may endanger the project outcomes sustainability? What is the risk that the level ownership and involvement of stakeholders (including governments and other stakeholders) is insufficient to sustain the project outcomes / benefits? Are diverse key stakeholders conscious that are interested in project benefits continue flowing? Have the public and stakeholders sufficient awareness level to support the long term project goals? Do the project team document lesson learned continuously? Are the lessons learned transferred to adequate agents that are in position to apply and potentially reproduce and / or expand them in the future?

Risk to sustainability related to the institutional framework and governance:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, structures and processes of governance present risks that could endanger the maintenance of project benefits? When assessing this parameter, it is important to take into account whether the required systems / mechanisms for accountability, transparency and expertise are installed.

Environmental risks to sustainability

- Is there an environmental risk that may endanger the project outcomes maintenance?

Conclusions and recommendations

The MRT team will include a section in the report were the conclusions are collected from the data collected and tests performed.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for a critical intervention that must be specific, measurable, achievable applicable and relevant. A recommendations chart should be included within the executive summary of the report. For more information of the recommendations chart see the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF financed Projects*.

Recommendations of the MRT consultant/team should be limited to 15 at most.

Valuation

The MRT team will include project outcomes valuations and brief descriptions of the achievements associated in a *Valuation Chart of MRT and achievements summary* in the Executive Summary Report. See annex E to check valuation scales. It is not necessary to perform a valuation of the Project Strategy now a general valuation of it.

Chart. MRT Valuations and Summary of achievement (Conservation of Biodiversity through the sustainable management of forests by local actors)

Parameter	MTR Valuation	Description of achievement
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress of the outcomes	Assessment of the level of achievement of the objective. Assessment of achievement (Rate in 6 points scale)	
Progress in the outcomes	Assessment of the level of achievement of outcome 1. Assessment of achievement (Rate in 6 points scale)	
	Assessment of the level of achievement of outcome 2. Assessment of achievement (Rate in 6 points scale)	
	Assessment of the level of achievement of outcome 3. Assessment of achievement (Rate in 6 points scale)	
	Etc.	
Project execution and adaptive management	(Rate in 6 points scale)	
Sustainability	(Rate in 4 points scale)	

6. EXECUTION SCHEDULE

The total duration of the MTR will be **5 weeks** approximately, starting on 25.05.2015, and will not exceed 5 month from the hiring of the consultant. The provisional schedule of the MTR is the following:

EXECUTION PERIOD	ACTIVITY
May 18, 2015	Close of Call
May 18 to 22, 2015	Selection of the MTR team
May 25, 2015	MTR team preparation (Delivery of the Project documents)
June 5, 2015	Documents review and elaboration of the initiation MTR report
June 8, 2015	Finalization and validation of the MTR: later date for starting the MTR mission
June 9 to 14, 2015	MTR mission: meetings with stakeholders, interviews, field visits
June 16, 2015	Meeting for the mission end and presentation of the first conclusions: earliest date for the MTR mission finalization
June 22, 2015	Elaboration of the draft report
June 24, 2015	Incorporation of the audits tests from the data exposed in the draft report/finalization of the MTR report
June 26, 2015	Preparation and communication of the executing agency response
June 30, 2015	Date for submission of the final MTR report

The initiation report should present options to carry out the field visits.

7. PRODUCTS OF THE MID TERM ASSESSMENT

#	Product	Description	Term	Responsibility
1	MTR initiation report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Mid-term Evaluation	June 5, 2015	MTR team presents to the contracting authority and the Project Coordination
2	Presentation	Initial conclusions	June 16, 2015	MTR team presents to the Project coordination and the contracting authority
3	Draft Final Report	Full Report (use guidelines of its content collected in Annex B) with annexes	June 22, 2015	Submitted to the contracting authority for the RTA, Project Coordination Units, GEF, OFP
4	Final Report*	Reviewed report with proof of audit where is detailed how they have been addressed (or not) in the MTR final report, all comments received	June 30, 2015	Submitted to the contracting authority

Final MTR report should be in English. Whether is applicable, the contracting authority can decide translate the report to a major use language among the national agents-

8. MTR MECHANISMS

The main responsibility in this MTR management correspond to the contracting authority. The Contracting authority for the MTR of this project is the *Bolivia office of the United Nations for Development Program*.

The contracting authority will hire the consultants and will ensure the punctual payment of the per diem and trip expenses of the corresponding country to the MTR team. The project team will responsible for communicating with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set interviews with stakeholders and organize field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

The MTR team is composed by an independent consultant with experience and exposition to projects and evaluations in other regions and worldwide. The consultant should not have participated in the preparation, formulation and/or execution of the project (including the project document writing) and should not have conflict of interests with the activities related to it.

The consultants' selection will be aimed to maximize the "team" general qualities in the following areas:

EVALUATION CRITERIA – International Consultant	
Curricular evaluation: Technical proposal and interview (700 points). The minimum score to enable for the interview is 300 points. The minimum score to enable to the economic evaluation is 490 points	700 points

Professionals: Academics: 100 General Experience 100 Specific experience 300			Maximum 500 points
Academic training of the professional Maximum 100 points	4 th level professional (PhD, masters or similar) in themes related to project management and/or environment or other field closely relates	100	
General experience of the professional	10 years or more of experience in the relevant technical areas (Project management of BD in community based activities)	100	
Specific experience of the professional Maximum 300 points	Recent experiences with evaluation methods of Results Based Management in the application of SMART indicators (in the construction and validation of the initial scenarios). For one work performed will be scored 50 points	50	
	Experience of work in project of use and conservation of Biodiversity community based and/or forest management. For 10 years or more will be scored 50 points	50	
	Experience of work with GEF or with evaluations performed by this organism at global level (Experience in project evaluations/revisions within the United Nations system will be valued) For three evaluations will be scored 150 points (50 points for each evaluation) or for 5 years of experience of specific work will be scored 50 points, for an additional year will be scored 10 points up to a maximum of 150 points	150	
	Demonstrated knowledge in themes related with gender and biodiversity, experience in evaluations and gender sensitive analysis. 25 points will be scored for work performed in this thematic.	50	
INTERVIEW			200 points

	Competences in adaptive management applied to Biodiversity Explanation of results in similar experiences Demonstrable analytic abilities Excellent communication skills	200	
Economic Proposal -the minimum score to enable to the economic evaluation is of 490 points			300 points
The lowest price will be scored with a maximum of 300 points. Higher prices will be scored according to the following formula: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 10px auto;">$EE = \frac{PEMB}{Pei} \times 300$</div>		300	
Where: EE = Economic evaluation PEMB = Lowest economic proposal Pei= Applicant economic proposal			

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% Payment to the definitive approval of the MTR initiation

30% to the presentation of the MTR draft report

60% to the finalization of the MTR report

Or how the contracting authority and the MTR team agreed

11. APPLICATION PROCESSES

Presentation of the recommended proposal

- a) **Availability and Interest Confirmation letter** through form N° 1 template provided by UNDP:
- b) **CV and Personal history Form**
- c) **Brief description of the project scope/technical proposal** and how that the applicant believes is the most suitable person for the project, and proposed methodology on how he/she plans to focus and complete the work (minimum 1 page)
- d) **Financial proposal** stating the total price and inclusive of the contract and all related costs (air ticket, per diems, etc.) supported with a detailed breakdown of the expenses, using the attached template to the Interest Confirmation letter model. If an applicant is hired by an organization/company/institution and plans his/her employer charges a management rate by ceding UNDP for refundable loan agreement (RLA), the applicant

must indicate in this moment and ensure the cost are included in the financial proposal submitted to the UNDP.

All the call materials should be sent to the address (Av. Sanchez Bustamante with 14th street – Calacoto – Edif. Metrobol II) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference: *“Consiltant International/national for Conservation of Biodiversity through the sustainable management of forests by local actors – BOL 79912 – Midterm review”*, before (Monday, May 18, 2015).

Incomplete request will be excluded of the process.

Criteria for the evaluation of the proposal: Only those applications that meet all the requirements were assessed. Offers will be evaluated consistent to the combined scoring method (*Combining Scoring*) according to which the academic training and the experience in similar projects will have a score of 70% while the economic proposal will have a score of 30%. The applicant receiving a higher combining scoring and accepting the UNDP terms and conditions will receive the contract.

- EMT evaluation Matrix (evaluation criteria with questions, indicators, data source and key methodologies)

Evaluation Criteria – Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How the project is related to the main objectives of the area of interest of FMAM and with the environmental and development priorities at local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the intervention objectives of the project are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and policies of partners and donors? • To what extent the project adapted to the local and development priorities of local and to organizational policies, including changes over time? • To what extent the project is consistent with GEF operational programs or strategic priorities on which the project was financed? • From the point of view of government counterparts, and from the project, regulations or policies favorable to the conservation of biodiversity through sustainable management of forests by local actors were developed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National plans related to sustainable development (forestry, multiannual plans, etc.) • Corporate plans UNDP, GEF, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Documents • Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document Analysis • Questionnaires
Effectiveness: To what extent the planned project outcomes and objectives were achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the project objectives were achieved? • To what extent the intervention project expected outcomes were achieved • Have substantive institutional changes incorporating planned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot experience implemented • National plans of sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Documents • Interviews • Field visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Questionnaires • Direct observation

<p>expected outcomes and objectives achieved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which key outcome has the project generated (for example: significant improvements in the natural resources condition, substantive progress in the achievement of these impacts)? 	<p>incorporate the dimension of conservation through the sustainable management of forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norms and policies implemented or adopted • Capacity Building • Improvements in the environmental quality (for example, reduction of erosion, etc.) • Creation of differentiated markets 		
<p>Efficiency: The project was implemented efficiently in accordance with the rules and international and national standards?</p> <p>Project implementation and adaptive management: Has the project being implemented efficient, profitably and adapted to changing conditions? To what extent, the monitoring and evaluation systems contribute to the project implementation monitoring and evaluation, information and communication?</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the resources used adequately? • To what extent the project outcomes were achieved with those resources? • Have the budget and schedules initially stated in the document respected? • Are possible sources of co-financing as well as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financing structure • Data of co-financing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Questionnaires

<p>partnered and matching financing identified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are financial controls included? • Is due diligence demonstrated in the management of funds, including periodic audits? 			
<p>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio economic or environmental risks to sustain the project outcomes in the long tern?</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent a sustainable strategy was implemented or develop, including capacity building of national partners? • To what extent existing policies and regulatory frameworks support the sustainability of benefits? • Are beneficiaries committed to continue working on the project objectives after the end? • What has been the degree of participation and appropriation of the project objectives and outcomes for the beneficiary population in the different phases of the project? In particular target communities (Community Carmen Pecha. Municipality of Ixiamas; Community of Tumupasa, CIPTA – Municipality of Ixiamas; Populated Center Guanay, PILCOL – Municipality of Guanay. • What was the support and participation of the involved institutions? • Has there been institutional strengthening? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norma and policies implemented or adopted • Financial sustainability strategy • Capacity Building • Generation of market niches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Interviews • Field Visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Questionnaires • Direct observation

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do the involved institutional will continue supporting the project outcomes?• Was there any effect in the community organization that could ensure sustainability?• Are Costs for maintenance and monitoring actions suitable to the local context, is it possible they are assumed by key stakeholders and beneficiaries?			
--	--	--	--

- Questionnaire Model / Interview Guides to use in the data collection

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview to: _____

Institution _____

Date _____

Presentation of the evaluation process and the evaluator

Confidentiality and no – attribution

Evaluation questions

As the project is designed ¿Was the intervention logic adequate?

¿Are the Project outcomes clear and logic and addressed to the clear identified necessities?

¿Is the Project aligned with the mandates and priorities if the UNDP/GEF/Bolivia/Communities?

¿Does the intervention respond to the country development priorities or of the influence area?

¿Does the Project adequately responded to the beneficiaries necessities in its different intervention levels?

¿To what extent outcomes were achieved at the stated outputs level?

Extent to which the initiative has achieved the expected outcomes (outputs and effects) and extent to which progress has been made to achieve these outputs and outcomes

¿To what extent outcomes were achieved at the stated outputs level? ¿Has the project contributed to outcome achievements at effects level? If so, have there been advances addressed to the outcomes at effect level?

¿Do the used scope and strategies were adequate for the achievement or advance of the expected outcomes?

¿What were the changes, positive or negative, generated by the Project?

¿Have there been effects or any kind of policy change?

¿Have unexpected outcomes been achieved in the project design?

¿Do the target public and involved institutions perceive the expected outcomes were accomplished?

Related to socio cultural factors, there were changes ¿Were these changes well accepted by the target population and by others?

¿Were there coordination among different involved actors in the project implementation?

¿Were the external factors considered appropriate?

¿How flexible were the different management levels to adapt to outcomes to be achieved?

¿Were the resources used adequately? To what extent the project outcomes were achieved with those resources?

¿Have the budget and schedules initially stated in the document respected?

¿Has Political instability had an impact on the timely delivery of outputs?

¿Was there any synergy between the <project initiatives that contributed to reduce costs and contributed to outcomes?

¿To what extend a sustainable strategy has been implemented or develop, including capacity building of national partners?

¿To what extent existing policies and regulation frameworks support beneficiaries sustainability?

¿Are beneficiaries committed to continue working on the project objectives after the end?

¿What was the participation and appropriation degree of the project objectives and outcomes for the beneficiary population in the different phases of the project?

¿What was the support and participation of the involved institutions?

¿Has there been institutional strengthening?

¿Do the involved institutional will continue supporting the project outcomes?

¿Was there any effect in the community organization that could ensure sustainability?

¿Are Costs for maintenance and monitoring actions suitable to the local context, is it possible they

¿Which context elements and assumptions have facilitated and/or hindered expected outcomes achievement?

¿What process, among the more significant, should be documented to support the lessons learned at the end of the Project? Any can be relevant for capacity building for the forest management in Bolivia?

¿Which lessons can be identified related to effectiveness?

¿Which lessons can be identified in sustainability?

¿What has functioned particularly well and can be considered as “best practice”?

¿What recommendations would you give in the future for this type of Projects?

- **Valuation Scales**

<p>Qualification of outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency, M&E and execution of A&E</p> <p>6: Very satisfactory (MS): no deficiencies were presented 5: Satisfactory (S): minor deficiencies 4: Something satisfactory (AS) 3: Something unsatisfactory (AI) important deficiencies 2: Unsatisfactory (I): important deficiencies 1. Very Unsatisfactory: Serious deficiencies</p>	<p>Sustainability Qualifications</p> <p>4. Probable (P): Insignificant risks for sustainability 3: Something Probable (AP) moderate risks 2. Something Improbable (AI) significant risks 1. Improbable (I). Serious risks</p>	<p>Relevance Qualifications</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1. Not Relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact qualifications</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimum (M) 1. Insignificant (I)</p>
<p>Additional qualifications where appropriate:</p> <p>Not applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Cannot be assessed (N/V)</p>		

- EMT mission itinerary

Date			Time	Location
June 4	Trip to Bolivia from Argentina		11:30 am to 8:30 pm	--
June 5	Interviews	UNDP	7 to 11 am	UNDP
		Project GEF Forest	13 to 16 pm	Project GEF Forest
Saturday 6 Sunday 7 Monday 8	Saturday 6	Communities	3 am to 11 pm	Leave at 3 (Saturday 6) Arrival in Caranavi 9:00 Breakfast in Caranavi 0:00 to 10:00 Transfer to Kelquelera 10:00 to 13:00 Transfer from Kelequelera to Guanya 13:00-15:00 Meeting in PICOL 16:00 a 17:00 Meeting at the Municipality 18:00 to 19:00 Dinner in Guanay 19:00 to 20:00 Return from Caranavi 20:00 to 23:00 Overnight in Caranavi
	Sunday 7 Interview	Community	7 am to 8 pm	Leave Caranavi to Palos Blancos 7:00 to 10:00 Meeting with women producers 11:00 12:30 Lunch 12:30 – 14:00 Palos Blancos Rurenabaque 14:00 – 20:00 ²¹

²¹ Although the field visit was planned to continue to Rurenabaque and then to Tumupusa, in mid-way we realized the road was cut and we could not move forward. Therefore we returned to Caranavi and the day

	Monday 8 Transfers		6 am to 3 pm	Transfer Caranavi La Paz
Tuesday 9	Interviews	Ministry of Environment and Project GEF Forest	1 pm to 5 pm	Ministry of Environment
Thursday 11	Presentation of first findings for the Project GEF Forest	Presentation	11 am to 2 pm	Project GEF Forestal
	Presentation First findings to the UNDP	Presentation	3 pm to 4 pm	UNDP
Friday 12	Return to Argentina	Trip	7 am to 18:30	

Other meetings

June 26	Presentation of first findings	Presentation to RTA and Bolivia UNDP office	4 to 5:30	Via internet
---------	-----------------------------------	---	-----------	--------------

August 14	Follow up meeting to EMT	RTA	3 to 4;30	Via internet
-----------	-----------------------------	-----	-----------	--------------

December 7	Follow up meeting to EMT	RTA and UNDP Country Office	10 am to 11;30	Via internet
------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------	--------------

after we returned to La Paz to rearrange the agenda and reprogram interview with local actors of these communities via telephone.

- **LIST OF REVISED DOCUMENTS**

- Project Document (PRODOC)
- PIF
- PIR 2013
- PIR 2014
- PIR 2015
- Monitoring Tool of the intervention area of GEF at the beginning of the project (Tracking Tools)
- Project operative guidelines, manuals
- Meeting minutes of the Board of Conservation of Biodiversity through sustainable management of forests by local actors – BOL 79912 and others
- Maps of sites where project operates
- Financial and Physical advance report, June 2014
- Activities Final Report National Coordinator, January 2013
- Executive Director report, May 2015
- Guide for the elaboration Forest and Land Integral Management Plans (PGIBT) in communities origin, indigenous and peasants, intercultural and afro-bolivians, 2015
- STUDY: Identification of alternatives to generate add value to the Majo palm fruit (*Oenocarpus Bataua*) in the community of Pajonal Vilaque in the Municipality of Guanay, in the TCO of the indigenous people Leco Larecaja (PILCOL), 2015

- **UNEG conduct code signed**

Evaluators:

1. They must submit full and fair information in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses, so that decisions or measures taken have a good rationale
2. They must disclose all results of the evaluation along with information about its limitations, and allow access to this information to all those affected by the assessment that express have legal rights to receive the results.
3. They should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They must provide maximums notes, minimize demands on time, and respect the right of people not to participate. Evaluators should respect the right of individuals to provide information confidentially and must ensure that confidential information cannot be traced to its source. It is not predicted to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes they must reveal evidence of violations when conducting evaluations. These cases must be reported directly to the corresponding research organism. Evaluators should consult with other relevant supervision bodies when there is doubt about whether certain matters should be reported and how.
5. They should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in relations with all stakeholders. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the UN, evaluators must be sensitive to issues of discrimination and gender equality, and address such issues. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-esteem of those people with whom they are in contact in the course of the evaluation. Because we know that the evaluation could adversely affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate the purpose and results so that clearly respects the dignity and self-worth of stakeholders.
6. They are responsible for their performance and their products. They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair, oral or written, of limitations, the findings and recommendations of the study.
7. Solid descriptive procedures should reflect and be prudent in the use of assessment resources

MConsultant of evaluation Agreement Form

Agreement to abide the Code of Conduct for evaluation in the United Nations System

Name of Consultant: Maria Ostenilli

I confirm that I have received, understand and abide by the Code of Conduct for United Nations Evaluation

(signed) Signed in Buenos Aires, Argentina, June 2, 2015