



**Mid-Term Review of the project  
“Contributing to the Integrated Management  
of Biodiversity of the Pacific Region of  
Colombia to Build Peace” – Pacífico  
Biocultural  
GCP /COL/061/GFF  
GEF ID 9441**

**Executive Summary**

Doris Cordero  
Francisco Ruiz  
**MTR team**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)**

**Bogotá, June 13, 2023**

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

1. This document presents the results of the Mid Term Review (MTR) of the project "Contributing to the integrated management of the biodiversity of the Pacific region of Colombia for peace building" - Pacífico Biocultural (GCP /COL/061/GFF - GEF ID 9441).
2. MinAmbiente, through PNN, is the project's Executing Agency<sup>1</sup>, although in practical terms it is implemented and executed by FAO, which is technically and financially responsible to the donor. The project is being developed as a joint effort of the Regional System of Protected Areas of the Pacific - SIRAP Pacific (Acronym in Spanish), formed by: National Natural Parks of Colombia (PNN); 5 Regional Autonomous Corporations (CAR): CODECHOCÓ, CARDER, CVC, CRC and CORPONARIÑO; the Institute of Environmental Research of the Pacific (IIAP); and Institute of Marine and Coastal Research José Benito Vives de Andreis (INVEMAR).
3. The MTR was done using a participatory and transparent methodological approach, consulting the various stakeholders throughout the process. The main evaluation tool used was the evaluation matrix containing a series of evaluation questions (guiding questions) for each of the six evaluation criteria used: i) Strategic relevance, ii) Effectiveness, iii) Efficiency, iv) Sustainability of project outcomes, v) Factors affecting performance and vi) Cross-cutting concerns.
4. As part of the methods used to collect information, visits were made to the cities of Tumaco, Pereira and Cali, where the MTR team held meetings and interviews with key stakeholders. For the analysis of the information, data triangulation was used, combining several methods and sources (interviews, meetings, field observations in the case of Tumaco and documents on the same topic), in order to avoid biases in the findings and results of the evaluation.
5. The project is implemented in high-risk areas, with security and public order problems, and therefore, due to the indications of the United Nations and FAO Colombia security team, field visits to the communities and territories where the project actions are being implemented could not be carried out. This is considered the main limitation to this review process since it was not possible to directly observe the actions developed by the project at field level and how they are impacting local stakeholders.
6. To mitigate these and other limitations, interviews were conducted with all stakeholders, integrating the main groups of stakeholders with a direct and indirect role in the project at national, regional, and local levels. Special attention was given to members of indigenous

---

<sup>1</sup> The PRODOC assigns different roles to MinAmbiente, indicating that it will act as project executing agency, executing entity, and executing partner, which generates ambiguity regarding the ministry's role in the project. The Project Operating Manual (MOP) details "*MinAmbiente será responsable de la ejecución general del proyecto y actuará como entidad de ejecución nacional, también denominada Socio Operacional Nacional en la terminología de la FAO. Los organismos nacionales de ejecución conjunta serán designados y contarán con el apoyo del Comité Directivo y una Unidad de Implementación del Proyecto. La responsabilidad general de la ejecución del proyecto implica la rendición de cuentas sobre el uso previsto y apropiado de los fondos, así como la entrega oportuna de insumos y productos. MinAmbiente, designará como parte de su cofinanciamiento, al Director del Proyecto, el cual será el responsable de la ejecución y coordinación del proyecto*". In practical terms, the project is executed and implemented by FAO, and MinAmbiente has the role of executing partner.

peoples and Afro-descendant communities, field staff of the project implementation unit and institutional partners at the local, regional, and national levels. This minimized the possibility of generating a bias in the review results by consulting only stakeholders with a direct role in the implementation of the project and/or concentrating the consultations on those located at the national level.

## Findings

**Finding 1.** The project is relevant, its approach and results are aligned with FAO Strategic Framework 2022-2031, FAO Country Program Framework 2021-2024, and GEF-6 Strategic Objectives related to the Biodiversity Strategy BD-1 & BD-4, the Land Degradation Strategy LT-3, and the Sustainable Forest Management Strategy SFM-1 & SFM-2.

**Finding 2.** The project is aligned with the current Colombian policy framework, which gives great importance to the conservation of natural resources, the reduction of deforestation, ecosystem restoration, the promotion of clean and biodiverse economies, and the overall peace process, of special relevance for the Colombian Pacific.

**Finding 3.** The design phase of the project had the active participation of its target population, which includes indigenous and afro-descendant communities of the Colombian Pacific, and a group of national and regional institutions, most of which are part of SIRAP Pacific, so the proposed actions and results respond to their needs and priorities.

**Finding 4.** There have been no changes in the relevance of the project since its formulation. The vision of the new national government, which took office in August 2022, proposes a transition to a functional land use planning that recognizes the cultural, environmental, and social diversity of the population, which is closely related to the project's conceptual proposal. However, it is possible that adjustments may be made to public environmental policy, which forces the project to provide adaptive management at all times.

**Finding 5.** The project is contributing to the integration of sustainable management, biodiversity conservation, and the provision of ecosystem services for the generation of environmental benefits in vulnerable landscapes of the Colombian Pacific. Additionally, it is contributing to the strengthening of local governance structures and the reconstruction of the social fabric, although this is not embedded in its internal narrative.

**Finding 6. Component 1. Institutional strengthening to support conservation and sustainable use in the Pacific region of Colombia.** Four out of six outputs of the results framework have achieved the proposed mid-term goal. The strategic evaluation of ecosystem services carried out in four MUCBs, the progress in the characterization of management instruments for the formulation of guidelines for the harmonization of departmental and municipal territorial plans and ethnic communities' own instruments, and the support given to six governance structures linked to the SIRAP Pacific stand out.

**Finding 7. Component 2: Integrated management of PAs, buffer zones and OEC.** Four out of six outputs of the results framework have achieved the proposed mid-term target. The implementation of 10 PA management plans, the progress in the formulation of the SIRAP Pacific Financial Sustainability Strategy, the support to 5 OECs for the formulation of their planning

instruments, and the promotion of the formalization of the declaration of 3 new departmental PAs are highlighted.

**Finding 8. Component 3. Sustainable production practices as alternatives for local development, biodiversity protection and peace process support.** All outputs under this component have significant delays, due to the exit of UNIDO<sup>2</sup> and the time required for FAO to initiate formal implementation of the component. The strengthening of community-based nature tourism initiatives is the product with the greatest progress, followed by the development and execution of Green Business initiatives action plans.

**Finding 9. Component 4. Knowledge management and project monitoring and evaluation.** The outputs of this component generate the enabling conditions for project implementation. All outputs have achieved the mid-term goals. The development of the Comprehensive Participatory Action Plans (PPIA) for each of the MUCBs, the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) processes, the Communication Strategy, and the M&E System stand out.

**Finding 10.** There are a number of internal and external barriers, as well as risks that can impede the progress and achievement of the project's environmental objective. The internal barriers are mainly related to the complexity of FAO's internal administrative procedures (procurement processes and purchases of goods and services, formalization of Letters of Agreement and Security Clearances for field missions to the territories), and the external barriers relate to decision-making by government entities, that affect the project, and the specific characteristics of the governance structures of the ethnic communities. The main risk identified is insecurity and public order problems in the territories where the project is implemented.

**Finding 11.** The technical strength, credibility and management capacity of FAO and the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), together with the technical and political support of the SIRAP Pacific, and the implementation and governance arrangements, involving multiple stakeholders, have contributed to the project efficiency.

**Finding 12.** The project's response to changing conditions such as the COVID 19 pandemic, the withdraw of UNIDO, the public order situation in the Colombian Pacific region, and the change of national government in 2022, are a clear demonstration of the project's capacity to adapt, along with the efficient management carried out by the coordination team with support from FAO.

**Finding 13.** The project's governance bodies - Steering Committee, Technical Committee and the 5 MUCB Technical Committees - have been operating as planned since 2021, facilitating inter-institutional coordination and bottom-up decision making, contributing to the project's efficiency.

**Finding 14.** The adoption of the project's actions, and the tools and instruments generated in the plans, policies and planning and management instruments of the territories, including life plans and ethno-development plans, will contribute to the sustainability of the results achieved.

---

<sup>2</sup> In April 2021 UNIDO and MinAmbiente decided not to sign the project implementation agreement due to a legal issue, so the funds corresponding to Component 3 were transferred to FAO, which assumed the implementation of this component. The approval of this change by the donor was received at the end of August 2021, generating a delay of 1.6 years (20 months) in the implementation of the programmed activities, counted from the EOD (starting date) of the project. UNIDO's withdraw was handled in an agile and efficient manner by the Senior Natural Resources and Governance Specialist and the FAO Representative in Colombia.

**Finding 15.** The design has allowed to generate the expected results of outcomes and outputs, the results framework integrates the gender perspective. The components are clear and coherent, but the causal logic does not contemplate links between components and MUCBs, nor a sequence between the scope of outputs and outcomes. The issue of peace building is not explicitly addressed in the design.

**Finding 16.** During the formulation phase, the first 3 steps of the FPIC process were implemented with a group of representatives of ethnic communities (indigenous and '*Afro-descendant*'), generating their ownership of the project.

**Finding 17.** FAO, as the implementing agency, has fulfilled its functions and responsibilities in the project coordination and administration. The main challenges are related to FAO's own administrative processes (procurement processes and purchases of goods and services, formalization of Letters of Agreement and Security Clearances for field missions to the territories), considered by most of the stakeholders interviewed as a bottleneck for implementation of the project.

**Finding 18.** The project has executed 33.84% of the total budget allocated by the donor (as of December 31, 2022). Components 3 and 4 have the lowest execution levels of 19.90% and 17.34%. The project has received 58% of the programmed co-financing, with outstanding contributions from the Government of Nariño and IIAP.

**Finding 19.** FAO Colombia played a key role in the formulation and design process of the project, led by the SIRAP Pacific Regional Technical Committee (in operation since 2014). The project currently receives technical, administrative, and operational guidance and support from FAO Colombia, as well as advice from the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Funding Liaison Officer (GEF Technical Officer, GTO - ex Technical FLO).

**Finding 20.** The dynamics developed by the project, from the design phase, together with the existing relationship between the project partners, have ensured the participation, ownership and commitment of the institutional stakeholders and the ethnic communities, who consider themselves as implementation partners or stakeholders and not beneficiaries.

**Finding 21.** The Letter of Agreements - LoAs are the main tool for implementing activities with ethnic communities. Some interviewees expressed their disagreement with the large number of requirements and administrative processes required, despite positively valuing having an instrument that allows them to directly execute project actions in their territories. As of December 31, 2022, the project has 14 LoAs under implementation, 3 with ethnic communities and 3 with civil society organizations, in both cases these promote the development of actions in the project's MUCBs.

**Finding 22.** Communication and knowledge management is a transversal axis of the project, which has a Communication Strategy that allows it to communicate key messages and results to its partners, stakeholders, and the general public. However, there is no clear narrative among PIU members, which allows to give a vision of the project that integrates the synergies and complementarities between components and MUCBs and makes visible the support to peace building in the territories.

**Finding 23.** The project has a practical and robust M&E system, including a procedure for the systematic information gathering, fed by the PIU members. The information contained in this system facilitates decision-making to adapt and improve project planning and implementation.

**Finding 24.** The PRODOC has a roadmap for gender mainstreaming. However, there was no evidence of gender mainstreaming in the project components, despite the fact that the active participation of women is promoted in all project activities.

**Finding 25.** The project respects the cosmovision of ethnic communities (indigenous and '*Afro-descendant*'), including their governance structures, uses and customs, rituals, roles, and languages (support from translators). As of December 31, 2022, the ethnic communities have approved 12 FPIC processes.

**Finding 26.** The project design includes an analysis of environmental, social, political, and institutional risks related to its implementation, and a risk management plan with mitigation measures, both of which consider the ethnic differential approach. The M&E system monitors compliance with FAO environmental and social safeguards as part of the implementation of the risk management plan.

## Conclusions

7. Based on the findings described above, the MTR team reached the following conclusions:

**Conclusion 1. Relevance.** The project is aligned with the strategic and operational priorities of the GEF and FAO, the current Colombian policy framework, and the SIRAP Pacific Action Plan at the regional level, which gives great attention to the reduction of deforestation, ecosystem restoration, promotion of biodiverse economies, and the overall peace process. At the same time, it responds to the needs and priorities of the ethnic communities (indigenous and '*Afro-descendant*') of the Colombian Pacific that took part in the formulation phase.

**Conclusion 2. Effectiveness.** Project implementation has progressed satisfactorily, generating changes in the territories of ethnic communities (indigenous and '*Afro-descendant*') and protected areas linked to the project, facilitating the development of actions aimed at biodiversity conservation, the provision of ecosystem services and sustainable use. However, actions aimed at the sustainable use of biodiversity, including value addition and the strengthening of value chains, are the ones that show the greatest delays.

**Conclusion 3. Effectiveness.** The project has achieved most of the mid-term indicators of the outputs and outcomes of components 1, 2 and 4, promoting a change that leads to the integration of sustainable management, biodiversity conservation, and the provision of ecosystem services for the generation of environmental benefits and peace building in vulnerable territories of the Colombian Pacific.

**Conclusion 4. Effectiveness.** Component 3 has a significant delay in the scope of all its outputs and outcomes, and in budget execution, because its start-up took place 20 months after the EOD (starting date) of the project, due to the withdraw of UNIDO, the agency responsible for the implementation of this component, and the time required for FAO to assume its implementation, and to hire partners who are supporting actions in the territories.

**Conclusion 5. Efficiency.** Project implementation is based on a series of governance arrangements (committees) involving multiple stakeholders that facilitate the implementation of project actions and contribute to improving efficiency and reducing costs, as well as avoiding duplication with other initiatives.

**Conclusion 6. Efficiency.** The role of MinAmbiente is defined in the PRODOC as executing agency, executing entity, and executing partner, generating ambiguity regarding the ministry's role in the project. This role is then clarified in the Project Operating Manual (MOP), which indicates that MinAmbiente will act as the National Operational Partner (in FAO terminology). In practical terms, FAO plays the dual role of implementing agency and executing agency of the project.

**Conclusion 7. Sustainability.** To the extent that the activities, tools and instruments promoted by the project are integrated as part of the planning and management plans, policies and instruments of the territories, including the life plans, ethno-development plans of the ethnic communities linked to the project, and the natural resource management plans, the results and impact achieved will have a greater chance of being sustainable over time, despite the existing socio-political, institutional, financial, security and public order risks.

**Conclusion 8. Factors affecting performance.** The project design, including its outcomes, objectives, and components, is clear and coherent. However, the causal logic does not contemplate linkages between components and MUCBs, nor a sequence between the scope of outputs and outcomes. During the formulation phase, an FPIC process was carried out that generated ownership by the ethnic communities (indigenous and '*Afro-descendant*') that constitute the project's target population, who consider themselves as implementation partners or stakeholders and not beneficiaries.

**Conclusion 9. Factors affecting performance.** The coordination and administration of the project has been efficient and effective, with the support of the project's governance structures (committees), FAO and MinAmbiente. FAO, as the implementing agency, has fulfilled its functions and responsibilities in the coordination, administration, and technical and administrative support to the project, despite the difficulties related to FAO's own administrative processes, considered by most of the stakeholders interviewed as a bottleneck for implementation. The project has a practical and robust M&E system and a plan to systematically feed it.

**Conclusion 10. Factors affecting performance.** The Communication Strategy is an instrument that allows the project, in coordination with its stakeholders, to publicize the main actions, experiences, lessons learned and results of the project among the different target audiences. However, it is important to improve the narrative to offer a comprehensive vision including synergies and complementarities between components and MUCBs, strengthen communication processes in the communities and make visible the support for the reconstruction of the social fabric in the territories, as a contribution to peace building.

**Conclusion 11. Cross-cutting concerns - Environmental and Social Safeguards.** The project respects the cosmovision of ethnic communities (indigenous and '*Afro-descendant*'), which is reflected in the development of 12 FPIC processes with accompanying actions that have facilitated the participation and decision-making of ethnic communities towards the project. Likewise, representatives of ethnic communities (indigenous and '*Afro-descendant*') participate in the different governance structures of the project and have a role in decision-making.

**Conclusion 12. Cross-cutting concerns - Gender.** The project has a roadmap for gender mainstreaming in its actions and outputs (guidelines, directives, plans, etc.). However, there was no evidence of gender mainstreaming in the actions and processes underway, despite the fact that the active participation of women is promoted in all project activities.

## Recommendations

8. The MRT team developed the following recommendations<sup>3</sup> aimed at improving the achievement of the project's outcomes and impact:

9. For **FAO in its role as the GEF Implementing Agency**

**Recommendation 1.** Review current administrative processes and analyze the possibility of developing a differential approach for processes carried out with the participation of stakeholders belonging to ethnic communities (indigenous and 'Afro-descendant'), considering the reality of the territories in which the project is implemented where there is low access to banking services, limited internet access, lack of services such as chambers of commerce, unions and insurance companies, and informality in local commerce, among others.

FAO Colombia is currently working on a simplified Letter of Agreement - LoA model (for another project it is implementing with funding from the Green Climate Fund), so it is suggested to review the possibility of using this simplified LoA model in this project. It is also recommended to review the scope and possibilities of using the new FAO mechanism called *beneficiaries grants* as an option for joint actions with ethnic communities.

**Recommendation 2.** Provide support from a gender specialist from FAO Colombia, to accompany and advise the professional specialized in social participation and "*differential approach*" (ethnic and gender) of the project, to ensure the effective integration of the gender perspective in the activities carried out in the territories, and compliance with the plan for mainstreaming the gender perspective, including the development of studies on the roles of men and women in land management, to feed intervention strategies in the MUCBs. It is suggested to give special attention to gender mainstreaming in the activities of Component 3, given its lower level of progress, which will allow the project to move from complying with a requirement to having a greater impact on the actions implemented.

**Recommendation 3.** Analyze the possibility of a no-cost time extension once this proposal has been approved by the Project Steering Committee (see recommendation 13). The extension proposal contemplates a six-month period for the implementation of activities and a three-month period for the project's administrative closure, allowing the project to have a realistic timeframe for the achievement of results and the development of the proposed outputs, especially those corresponding to Component 3, which started with a delay of about 20 months.

**Recommendation 4.** To make visible the project's contributions to peace-building processes in the territories, such as those achieved through the strengthening of local governance structures, the improvement of communities' livelihoods and the construction of social fabric, which increases

---

<sup>3</sup> Annex 6 of the MTR report contains a summary of the recommendations including responsible and time frame for implementation.



resilience and reduces the vulnerability of local stakeholders to violence and illegality present in the Colombian Pacific region.

**Recommendation 5.** Analyze the appropriateness of the role played by MinAmbiente as the Executing Entity for the project, according to the PRODOC and the operational manual - MOP, versus the role it plays in practical terms, where both execution and implementation are the responsibility of FAO.

10. For the **stakeholders responsible for project implementation**

**Recommendation 6.** Focus efforts on the implementation of activities with the lowest level of progress, especially those of Component 3, and to promote at all times the articulation between components and MUCBs, using as a guide the socio-ecosystem connectivity strategy considered in the design, with the support of the MUCB professionals and the MUCB Local Facilitator, given their proximity to communities in the territories.

**Recommendation 7.** Promote local communication spaces and mechanisms within the communities (*'mentideros'*, *'caminar la palabra'*, among others), with support from the MUCB professionals, the MUCB Local Facilitator and community communication collectives identified in the Katíos-Caoba and Cabo Manglares-Familia Awá MUCBs, as a strategy for the internalization and appropriation of external concepts promoted by the project.

In the MUCBs where there are no community communication collectives, analyze the feasibility and interest of local stakeholders to create this type of groups and/or identify other strategies to work communication issues and internalization of concepts with community stakeholders.

**Recommendation 8.** Create environmental working groups or committees, within each ethnic community participating in the project, made up of leaders appointed by the boards of directors and authorities of each Community *Resguardo* and Communal Council, who do not fulfill a political but technical role, with a medium and long-term vision, not being subject to the political ups and downs of the different governance structures of the communities.

The members of these groups will be trained in the main topics promoted by the project in order to acquire enough skills and abilities to continue the actions in the MUCBs at the end of the project, and in particular to facilitate the connection with the new boards of directors and authorities of indigenous and *'Afro-descendant'* communities, since they are renewed every year, avoiding delays as a result of these changes that could affect decision-making regarding the project. They will also play a key role in building and strengthening local capacities with women and youth groups in particular, serving as interlocutors with institutions and cooperation initiatives. All of these working groups or teams could be considered as part of a community conservation strategy or network anchored to the SIRAP Pacific.

**Recommendation 9.** Integrate into the project's M&E platform the gender mainstreaming plan and its indicators, as a subsystem, in order to closely monitor its compliance, especially those focused on the integration of the gender approach in the project's actions and products that are underway or that have not yet begun.

**Recommendation 10.** Develop a monitoring and follow-up plan for forest restoration actions that will make it possible to know the geo-referenced location of the intervened areas (either as passive or active restoration), the community where they are located, the area intervened, and other data such as planting density, species used, forestry arrangements, and the percentage of mortality and

replanting. It is suggested that each community be responsible for collecting the information and transferring it to the project every three or four months, which will be responsible for integrating it into a subsystem for monitoring and follow-up of the restored areas, which will be part of the project's M&E platform.

**Recommendation 11.** Coordinate with MinAmbiente the possibility of linking the SFM initiatives to be developed with the National Traceability System, which is currently being implemented. This in order to contribute to the operability of this system and to add value to the timber and non-timber products harvested as a result of the management plans.

**Recommendation 12.** Develop and implement a project Exit Strategy, in partnership with FAO and the SIRAP Pacific, that involves the transfer of responsibilities to institutional and community stakeholders that will remain in the territories at the end of the project, along with capacity building of local stakeholders on governance issues, strengthening of collectives and self-management capacities for decision-making.

11. For **project stakeholders**

**Recommendation 13. Project Steering Committee** – Review and analyze the proposed changes to the Results Framework and time extension, revised as part of the MTR. The first aimed at clarifying the scope of the Results Framework, and the second in order to be able to finalize the proposed outputs and activities (especially those of Component 3, which started with a delay of 20 months).

**Recommendation 14. Indigenous and 'Afro-descendant' communities** – Actively participate in the design of the project's Exit Strategy, with the objective that it includes a clear and concrete strategy for the transfer of responsibilities to local institutions, so that they provide technical, political, and financial support to the ethnic communities for the continuation of the actions developed by the project.

**Recommendation 15. Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible & BIOINNOVA** – Join efforts and take better advantage of the synergies and complementarities that arise as part of the process of implementing Component 3 actions in the MUCBs. Specifically, BIOINNOVA can be guided by the progress and learnings of *Biocomercio*, given the higher level of progress in the activities, and the Green Business in general, in the MUCBs where *Biocomercio* actions are implemented.

Table 1. MTR ratings and achievements summary table

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating <sup>4</sup>	Summary comments
<b>A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE</b>		
A1. Overall strategic relevance	HS	The project is relevant and aligned with the strategic priorities of FAO and the GEF, in addition to being aligned with the Colombian policy framework and responding to the priorities and needs of the ethnic communities (target population) and institutional stakeholders.
A1.1. Alignment with GEF and FAO strategic priorities	HS	The project is relevant to FAO's strategic and operational priorities, the FAO Colombia Programme Framework and the GEF.
A1.2. Relevance to national, regional and global priorities and beneficiary needs	HS	The project is aligned with the current Colombian policy framework, which gives great importance to the reduction of deforestation, ecosystem restoration, promotion of clean and biodiverse economies, and the overall peace process, of special relevance for the Colombian Pacific.
A1.3. Complementarity with existing interventions	HS	The project has become an executing arm of the SIRAP Pacific, a multi-stakeholder platform (system) that promotes a participatory conservation strategy.
<b>B. EFFECTIVENESS</b>		
B1. Overall assessment of project results	MS	The level of scope of the outcomes <sup>5</sup> achieved for Components 1 and 2 exceeds expectations, for Component 4 it is satisfactory. For Component 3 the level of results achieved is moderately unsatisfactory, for reasons beyond the control of the executing agency.
B1.1 Delivery of project outputs	MS	The delivery of Component 3 outputs is lower than expected for reasons beyond the implementing agency's control. The other Components meet expectations at mid-term, exceeding targets in some cases.
B1.2 Progress towards outcomes <sup>6</sup> and project objectives	S	
- Outcome 1.1 The territorial and environmental management planning	S	The level of results achieved is in line with mid-term expectations.

<sup>4</sup> See rating scheme at the end of the document.

<sup>5</sup> The level of scope of the outcomes does not necessarily relate to the level of scope of the outputs due to the logic used in the project results framework.

<sup>6</sup> Assessment and ratings by individual outcomes may be undertaken if there is added value.

<b>GEF criteria/sub-criteria</b>	<b>Rating<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Summary comments</b>
instruments are harmonized with the instruments developed by the black communities and indigenous peoples to safeguard biological, cultural, and ecosystem services diversity, leading to a general reduction in potential threats from development- oriented activities		
- Outcome 1.2 Improved stakeholders' capacity and participation to support the enforcement of harmonized planning and environmental management in the MUCBs	HS	The level of results achieved is in line with mid-term expectations, exceeding expectations.
- Outcome 2.1 Reduction of pressures and threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services in 581,859 ha of existing PAs and their buffer zone	HS	The level of results achieved is in line with mid-term expectations, exceeding expectations.
- Outcome 2.2 New PAs and CCSs receive support for management planning and implementation	S	The level of results achieved is in line with mid-term expectations.
- Outcome 3.1 Biodiversity and ecosystem services are sustainably utilized in forest-based productive systems and generate multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits	MU	The level of results achieved is lower than expected at mid-term due to factors beyond the executing agency's control.
- Outcome 3.2 Products and services derived from biodiversity have value added and their value chains duly strengthened	MU	The level of results achieved is lower than expected at mid-term due to factors beyond the executing agency's control.
- Outcome 4.1 Project monitored and evaluated with a results-based management approach, and communication of lessons learned	S	The level of results achieved is as expected at mid-term.
- Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes	MS	The project shows significant progress towards achieving objectives and outcomes in Components 1, 2 and 4. Component 3 has significant delays due to factors beyond the executing agency's control.
B1.3 Likelihood of impact	Not rated at MTR	Does not apply
<b>C. EFFICIENCY</b>		
C1. Efficiency <sup>7</sup>	HS	Efficiency level exceeds expectations.
<b>D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES</b>		
D1. Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	MU	The risks associated with security and public order issues are significant for sustainability.
D1.1. Financial risks	ML	There are moderate financial risks.

<sup>7</sup> Includes cost efficiency and timeliness.

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating <sup>4</sup>	Summary comments
D1.2. Sociopolitical risks	MU	There are significant risks associated with security and public order issues, change of regional and local authorities.
D1.3. Institutional and governance risks	ML	There are moderate institutional and governance risks, such as the change in priorities of the new regional and local authorities.
D1.4. Environmental risks	ML	There are moderate environmental risks (deforestation, crops used for illicit purposes, among others).
D2. Catalysis and replication	ML	There are moderate risks for catalysis and replication.

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	Summary comments
<b>E. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE</b>		
E1. Project design and readiness <sup>8</sup>	S	The design has allowed to generate the expected results of outcomes and outputs, the components are clear and coherent, but the causal logic does not contemplate links between components and MUCBs, nor a sequence between the scope of outputs and outcomes. Some inconsistencies were found in the results framework indicators.
E2. Quality of project implementation	HS	The implementation has been efficient and effective, fulfilling the delegated responsibilities, exceeding the proposed targets-goals in some cases.
E2.1 Quality of project implementation by FAO (BH, LTO, PTF, etc.)	HS	FAO as the implementing agency has fulfilled its functions and responsibilities related to technical and administrative support to the project, exceeding expectations.
E2.1 Project oversight (PSC, project working group, etc.)	HS	
E3. Quality of project execution	HS	The execution has allowed the project to be enhanced, exceeding expectations in terms of progress in Components 1 and 2, ownership of stakeholders, and functioning of governance structures.
E3.1 Project execution and management (PMU and executing partner performance, administration, staffing, etc.)	HS	The commitment and technical knowledge of the PIU (Project Implementation Unit) has allowed progress in implementation despite the inconveniences that have arisen (COVID 19

<sup>8</sup> This refers to factors affecting the project's ability to start as expected, such as the presence of sufficient capacity among executing partners at project launch.

<b>GEF criteria/sub-criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Summary comments</b>
		pandemic, withdraw of UNIDO and security risks mainly), exceeding expectations.
E4. Financial management and co-financing	MS	Financial execution is more or less as expected, there are shortcomings due to delays in the implementation of Component 3 that have been beyond the executing agency's control.
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder engagement	HS	The ownership-engagement of community and institutional stakeholders and the functioning of governance structures exceeds expectations.
E6. Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products	S	The communication and knowledge management products have generated the necessary enabling conditions for the project implementation.
E7. Overall quality of M&E	HS	The M&E system is practical and robust, includes a procedure for the systematic information gathering and its update in real time, exceeding expectations.
E7.1 M&E design	HS	The M&E system was designed with support from FAO Colombia, exceeding expectations.
E7.2 M&E plan implementation (including financial and human resources)	HS	The M&E system is managed by a highly trained professional and has a technological platform linked to the FAO Colombia M&E system.
E8. Overall assessment of factors affecting performance	HS	Most of the criteria that are part of this indicator have been rated as HS reflecting how the factors affecting performance of the project are managed.
<b>F. CROSS-CUTTING CONCERNS</b>		
F1. Gender and other equity dimensions	MS	The gender approach has not been mainstreamed in all the project activities, as proposed in the action plan contained in the design document.
F2. Human rights issues	HS	FPIC topics including the follow up process, human rights in general and the application of the ethnic differential approach have been developed beyond expectations.
F2. Environmental and social safeguards	S	Safeguards have been implemented according to expectations.
<b>Overall project rating</b>	<b>S</b>	

**Ratings for specific criteria used (more information in Annex 4 of the MTR report)**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Highly satisfactory (HS)	<i>Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings</i>
Satisfactory (S)	<i>Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings</i>
Moderately satisfactory (MS)	<i>Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings</i>
Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)	<i>Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings</i>
Unsatisfactory (U)	<i>Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings</i>
Highly unsatisfactory (HU)	<i>Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings</i>
Unable to assess (UA)	<i>The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements</i>

Source: GEF (2017c).