

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	9441
Project Name:	Contributing to the Integrated Management of Biodiversity of the Pacific Region of Colombia to Build Peace
Countr(ies):	Colombia
Implementing Agency:	FAO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	3
A. Description	3
B. Key Dates	3
C. Disbursements	3
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES	4
A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings	4
B. Stakeholder Engagement	11
C. Gender Equality	11
D. Knowledge Management	12
III. CORE INDICATORS	13
IV: CO FINANCING	18
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	21
VI. ANNEX	22

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Contributing to the Integrated Management of Biodiversity of the Pacific Region of Colombia to Build Peace

Country

Colombia

GEF ID

9441

Implementing Agency

FAO

Executing Entity

Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development
(MADS), (PNN), SIRAP Pacific (IIAP, CARs)

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

To mainstream the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services in vulnerable landscapes of the Colombia's Pacific region in view of generating global and local environmental benefits and supporting the peace process

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

4/12/2019

Agency Approval

11/30/2018

Implementation Start

11/30/2019

First Disbursement

2/7/2020

Expected MTR

MTR Submission

3/16/2026

Actual MTR

5/2/2023

Expected Completion

11/30/2025

Actual Completion

1/30/2026

Actual TE

9/7/2025

TE Submission

3/16/2026

Final Disbursement

C. Disbursements

Project Financing

8,281,001.00

Cumulative Disbursement

7,552,141.00

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

Executive summary

Introduction

1. The project 'Contributing to the integrated management of biodiversity of the *Pacific Region of Colombia to Build Peace*', hereinafter 'Pacífico Biocultural', was implemented in six departments of the Colombian Pacific. This region is part of the Chocó-Darién ecoregional complex, one of the most biodiverse places on the planet, covering an area of approximately 11 million hectares. Paradoxically, this region has high levels of poverty, social inequality and marginalization.
2. The project consisted of four components: 1) Institutional strengthening to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Colombian Pacific region; 2) Integrated management of PA, buffer zones and Community Conservation Areas (CCA); 3) Sustainable production practices as alternatives for local development, biodiversity protection and support for the peace process; and 4) Knowledge management and M&E of the project. The actions took place in five areas called Mosaics of Biodiversity Use and Conservation (MUCB).
3. The evaluation served a dual purpose: accountability and generation of learning. The proposed objectives were: i) to evaluate the results of the project, its relevance for the participating partners and stakeholders, and its alignment with national needs and priorities; and ii) to document the main lessons learned for future projects or programs that seek to provide continuity, replicate or expand the results achieved.
4. A participatory and collaborative, learning-oriented methodological approach was used. The data collection was carried out using mixed data collection methods: document review, semi-structured interviews, and observation visits. The selection of the stakeholders consulted was done through purposive sampling, carried out with the support of the Project Management Unit (PMU). The information gathered was systematized and then triangulated in order to reinforce the validity of the findings obtained and the formulation of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned based on evidence.
5. Given the security and public order situation in the Colombian Pacific, it was not possible to carry out direct observation visits to the territories of the project's partner ethnic communities. Instead, key community stakeholders and other interested parties traveled to the cities of Turbo, Tumaco and Cali, where interviews and meetings were held with the national evaluator. This approach made it possible to gather the relevant perceptions of the stakeholders consulted, to understand key dynamics and to feed the analysis of the evaluation criteria.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1. Relevance. The project was highly relevant as it effectively responded to the environmental and development priorities of communities and institutional partners. Its design integrated conservation, sustainable production and territorial governance, aimed at generating social and environmental benefits in the landscapes of the Colombian Pacific. Alignment with national and international frameworks -including public policies, sectoral strategies and global commitments- ensured strategic relevance, territorial legitimacy and consistency with sustainable development objectives, strengthening the ownership of local stakeholders.

Conclusion 2. Coherence. The project approach was fully consistent with the reality of the Colombian Pacific and the MUCBs, integrating conservation and sustainable production in an articulated manner. Internal consistency was reflected in the logical sequence between objectives, results and activities. External

coherence was expressed in the articulation with existing processes led by community and institutional partners, which enhanced synergies, generated complementary actions and strengthened sustainability.

Conclusion 3. Effectiveness - Achievement of results. The project achieved outstanding performance in meeting its goals and objectives, with 94.2% progress in the expected results and surpassing several of the established targets. This effectiveness was made possible by the resilience and adaptive capacity of communities and institutions in the face of adverse conditions, including the pandemic, political changes and the law and order situation. The implementation of flexible strategies allowed the continuity of the processes and evidenced the commitment of the participating actors (Effectiveness | Achievement of results).

Conclusion 4. Effectiveness - Peacebuilding. Beyond the technical achievements, the project contributed to the consolidation of territorial peace through the strengthening of community governance, social cohesion and the generation of trust, which allowed the legitimization of conservation decisions and sustainable use of the territory. This contribution resulted in the recognition of community authority, participatory territorial planning and coordination with state institutions. This approach of co-responsibility and respect strengthened community authority and generated structural conditions for the construction of the possible future^[1] projected.

Conclusion 5. Capacity building. Capacity building was a pillar of the project, generating technical, administrative and commercial skills in communities, institutions and productive organizations. Methodological diversity -diplomas, leadership schools, workshops and field schools- ensured broad and relevant coverage, promoting practical learning and cascading training processes. These efforts allowed Afro-descendant and indigenous communities to participate in more balanced conditions in territorial governance, consolidating their role as strategic actors. The impact achieved confirms that investing in local capacities is key to sustainability and ownership of results.

Conclusion 6. Progress towards impact. The project promoted structural changes in governance, conservation and bioeconomy. Guidelines were consolidated for territorial planning, community conservation, sustainable productive activities, green businesses and nature tourism. The communities went from being beneficiaries to implementing partners and SIRAP Pacifico was consolidated as a regional platform. At the community level, community forestry and green businesses demonstrated the capacity to generate income and social cohesion. These changes consolidated communities and institutions as strategic actors in sustainable landscape management.

Conclusion 7. Additionality. The additionality was reflected in a decisive impetus for the adoption and consolidation of innovative work and management approaches. This added value strengthened the project's capacity to experiment, learn and adjust its strategies according to the territorial contexts, favoring a more participatory, adaptive and sustainable management, demonstrating that international financing can trigger transformative processes with long-term impacts in complex territories, which would have been difficult to achieve without the donor's contribution.

Conclusion 8. Efficiency. Efficiency was based on strategic design and implementation decisions, such as territorial targeting in intervention windows and the use of letters of agreement as a contracting mechanism. Governance structures (committees) facilitated inter-institutional coordination and decision-making, optimizing the use of project resources. Despite administrative constraints, flexibility and adaptive management sustained implementation. The focus on intervention windows optimized impacts in large and complex territories.

Conclusion 9. Financial management and co-financing. The project demonstrated efficient financial management by executing 97.13% of the allocated budget, including resources paid and committed, reflecting an adequate use of grant resources. In turn, the mobilization of 112% of the committed cofinancing demonstrated a high level of ownership and commitment from institutional partners, who contributed their

own resources in cash and in kind. This co-financing not only strengthened the implementation, but also contributed to the additionality of the project, allowing it to exceed most of the initially planned goals and provide greater sustainability of the results achieved.

Conclusion 10. Implementation - Execution. FAO effectively fulfilled its role as implementing agency, providing technical soundness, constant supervision and adaptive management in adverse scenarios. Their accompaniment ensured compliance with safeguards and the technical coherence of the interventions. The joint execution between FAO and MinAmbiente combined the technical capacity of the former with the political legitimacy of the latter, which facilitated the alignment of the project with national policies on biodiversity, climate change and land use planning. This complementarity of roles strengthened community articulation and project governance.

Conclusion 11. Sustainability. The project built a solid foundation for sustainability by strengthening community, institutional and business capacities, as well as institutional and financial frameworks. The promotion of bioeconomy and community forestry initiatives, including the obtaining of 20 and 30-year forest management permits and the creation of community enterprises, show continuity over time. However, sustainability faces financial, institutional and security risks that require additional support to ensure the permanence of the achievements attained.

Conclusion 12. Design and implementation of the M&E system. The monitoring and evaluation system was adequate, robust and innovative. Based on SMART indicators and technological tools such as Power BI, its effective implementation allowed for rigorous monitoring, traceability of results and transparency in accountability. The system facilitated decision making, learning and risk management during implementation. The use of the Power Bi platform was limited by actors other than FAO.

Conclusion 13. Partnerships and stakeholder participation. The project consolidated a model of collaboration among multiple partnerships and stakeholders, integrating ethnic communities, the private sector, academia and public institutions. This articulation generated trust and legitimacy in the processes, and strengthened community ownership of the results. Academic and private involvement strengthened innovation. The strategic alliances and co-responsibility achieved ensured the territorial relevance of the interventions and enhanced their long-term sustainability.

Conclusion 14. Communication, management and knowledge products. Communication and knowledge management were consolidated as cross-cutting themes that strengthened appropriation, social cohesion, and the visibility of results. Community communication made it possible to give visibility to the voices of women, young people and ethnic communities. Knowledge management made it possible to systematize experiences and generate shared learning. However, limitations persisted in the joint visibility of the institutional partners.

Conclusion 15. Social and environmental standards. Adequate management of social and environmental standards made it possible to maintain a moderate level of risk throughout implementation. The risk analysis included social, political and institutional dimensions, with a differential ethnic and gender focus, and the adoption of preventive measures ensured respect for the rights of communities, cultural integrity and the conservation of biodiversity. With a focus on prevention and monitoring, the project ensured that no major corrective measures were required during implementation.

Conclusion 16. Gender and social inclusion. The gender approach was progressively mainstreamed, strengthening the participation of women and young people in decision-making spaces and productive initiatives, mainly. The Gender Mainstreaming Plan, together with practical measures such as child care and the creation of the Indigenous Women's House, facilitated equal participation. Women's leadership in green business and community tourism strengthened social cohesion and legitimacy of the processes.

Conclusion 17. Ethnic communities. The active participation of ethnic communities was a central achievement of the project, guaranteed through FPIC processes and their participation in decision-making spaces. This involvement on equal terms with institutional actors strengthened the legitimacy of the processes, ensured the cultural relevance of the actions and promoted co-responsibility in territorial management. The

recognition of their leadership marked a structural change in the relationship with the institutions, allowing the consolidation (in process) of an inclusive and legitimate model of governance and co-responsibility.

Recommendations

To promote the sustainability of the results achieved:

Recommendation 1. For the FAO office in Colombia. It is recommended to continue supporting MinAmbiente and SIRAP Pacífico in maintaining and strengthening the horizontal and trusting relationships built between communities and institutional actors, given that they constitute a fundamental element for sustainability in changing territorial contexts.

Recommendation 2. For the FAO office in Colombia, MinAmbiente and SIRAP Pacífico. To manage new sources of financing that allow for the continuity of ongoing actions and processes and to expand successful experiences, such as bioeconomy and sustainable forest management initiatives, which have contributed to consolidating the achievements made and generating income for communities.

For new similar projects:

Recommendation 3. For the FAO office in Colombia, MinAmbiente and SIRAP Pacífico. Ensure the early participation of ethnic communities in the design phase of new projects, as this strengthens their impact, consolidates local ownership and guarantees consistency with public policies. The application of the mosaic approach and intervention windows is fundamental to articulate conservation and sustainable production in large territories.

Recommendation 4. For the FAO office in Colombia, MinAmbiente and SIRAP Pacífico. Institutionalizing flexibility and adaptive management mechanisms with clear protocols will allow sustaining processes in risk scenarios. For example, the use of letters of agreement (or other similar instruments) can be promoted as a tool for co-responsibility with ethnic communities by fostering effective inclusion, trust and ownership.

Recommendation 5. For the FAO office in Colombia and MinAmbiente. Replicate the co-execution model in future projects (provided that the donor's rules allow it), since the complementarity between technical and political aspects strengthens both the implementation of activities and the territorial impact. It is also recommended to use regional platforms, such as the Pacific SIRAP, to anchor processes in legitimate governance structures, facilitate institutional and community coordination, and ensure the sustainability of interventions.

Recommendation 6. For the FAO office in Colombia and MinAmbiente. Prioritize the strengthening of access to diversified markets, including short marketing circuits and local markets. To this end, it is suggested to establish commercial alliances with private actors, strengthen the company's own brands and promote product differentiation, to ensure competitive positioning. These actions will generate sustained income for communities and strengthen the long-term sustainability of bioeconomy initiatives.

Lessons learned

6. The lessons learned gathered during this evaluation correspond to proven and effective experiences that proved to generate positive results during project implementation. Their relevance lies in the fact that they constitute concrete references that could be replicated or scaled up in other contexts, since they offer practical solutions adapted to territories of high socio-environmental complexity. Presenting them in a systematic way makes the most innovative and effective contributions visible, and at the same time provides useful inputs for the design and management of future projects.

Lesson learned 1. Capacity building - Inclusive and multi-stakeholder mixed methodologies. The mixed training strategy - integrating diploma courses, leadership schools, technical courses, practical workshops and field schools, with participatory methodologies and facilitators from the territory- proved to be a winning practice for strengthening local capacities. The inclusion of community leaders as trainers and the cultural proximity of professionals from the territory generated networks of trust and legitimacy, reinforcing the appropriation of the contents and community commitment. This formula allowed knowledge to be translated into applicable actions, while generating trust, legitimacy and social cohesion between communities and institutions. Its effectiveness shows that replicating this model in other contexts can be key to ensuring ownership of the processes, equity in participation and sustainability of results. (11. Knowledge, collaboration and learning)

Lesson learned 2. Efficiency - Adaptive Management. The project's experience showed that in highly complex contexts, the capacity to adapt and, in particular, flexible responses to internal and external difficulties are critical factors to ensure the continuity of actions. The reorganization of activities, the virtualization of processes and the targeting of interventions proved to be cost-effective measures that should be incorporated into the design of projects in regions with high levels of conflict. Adaptive management not only mitigated risks, but also generated capabilities and lessons learned applicable to future projects. Inter-institutional alliances and community legitimacy were indispensable conditions for sustaining implementation in difficult-to-access territories, offering support in risk management and guaranteeing the security of the technical teams through the role of the Indigenous Reserves and Community Councils as local guarantors. (2. Project management including financial and human resources issues).

Lesson learned 3. Sustainability - Capabilities, institutions and financing. The sustainability of a project's results requires a comprehensive approach that combines strengthening community capacities, consolidating institutional frameworks, and guaranteeing long-term sources of financing. It was also learned that sustainability must be planned from the project formulation stage, incorporating clear exit strategies and institutional support mechanisms that transcend the duration of international financing. This approach helps to ensure the permanence of the achievements attained. (13. Sustainability).

Lesson learned 4. Sustainability - Bioeconomy. The project consolidated a green business model based on three replicable pillars: i) early strengthening of markets to align production with demand, ii) continuous technical and organizational support to ensure community response capacity, and iii) building stable, trusting business relationships between producers and buyers. This model also strengthened organizational capacities and facilitated the generation of new sources of financing. Taken together, these elements demonstrated that their integration contributes to ensuring the economic and social sustainability of the initiatives, becoming a reference for other projects that seek to promote the bioeconomy in diverse and complex territories. (13. Sustainability).

Lesson learned 5. Sustainability. Promote co-responsibility schemes in new initiatives and provide sustainability to community activities to favor the appropriation and legitimacy of the processes. The strengthening of communication networks, together with the promotion of women and youth leadership, is a key factor in increasing the sustainability and protagonism of the communities in the medium and long term. (13. Sustainability).

Lesson learned 6. Implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System - Transparency and Accountability. The combination of accessible technology and clear technical standards made the system a benchmark of best practices for monitoring, accountability and knowledge management. The project developed an interactive M&E platform in *Power BI*, publicly accessible, that integrated indicators of results, outputs, risks and cross-cutting approaches such as gender. This tool improved transparency, facilitated consultation by different stakeholders and allowed for systematic monitoring of implementation. In addition, specific technical guidelines were applied to avoid double counting of indicators and to ensure methodological consistency in the generation of data. (20. Monitoring and evaluation).

Lesson learned 7. Implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System - Data for decision making. The generation of accessible, consistent and verifiable data makes the M&E system a key instrument for accountability and collective learning. The project demonstrated that having a solid monitoring system, based on *SMART* (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) indicators, strengthens the credibility and usefulness of the results. The M&E system not only allowed for rigorous monitoring of progress and risks, but also established itself as a tool for timely decision making. (20. Monitoring and evaluation).

Lesson learned 8. Partnerships and stakeholder engagement - Role of ethnic communities. Working together with Community Councils and Indigenous Reserves is essential to achieve legitimacy and sustainability. Recognizing communities as active partners and not as beneficiaries makes it possible to build relationships of co-responsibility in implementation. Although multi-stakeholder management can be demanding in terms of time and effort, their contribution is decisive to give credibility to the processes. Experience shows that respect for the word and the building of trust are fundamental principles, together with the application of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as an indispensable condition in ethnic territories. (7. Stakeholders engagement/Indigenous Peoples/Local communities).

Lesson learned 9. Partnerships and stakeholder engagement- Multi-sector and multi-stakeholder governance. The creation of coordination bodies that integrate communities, public institutions, the private sector and academia is a replicable learning process to consolidate governance in complex territories. These coordination spaces strengthen the legitimacy of the processes, allow the alignment of conservation and development agendas, and generate trust among actors with diverse interests. The co-responsibility achieved ensures more inclusive decisions, improves implementation efficiency and lays a solid foundation for the sustainability of results in the medium and long term. (7. Stakeholders engagement).

Lesson learned 10. Communication - Empowerment through communication. The project showed that strategic communication must be defined from the outset, incorporating both the visibility of institutional partners and the participation of ethnic communities in decision-making. Communication is not an accessory component, but a pillar for ownership and social cohesion, especially when community exchange and dissemination processes are promoted. In this sense, community communication was consolidated as an empowerment tool that allowed women, youth and local leaders to recognize their voice in the process, strengthening the legitimacy of the results and the sustainability of the actions undertaken. (12. Communication and outreach).

Lesson learned 11. Gender and social inclusion - Operationalization of the differential gender approach. Experience has shown that integrating the differential approach from the design stage does not guarantee its full application during implementation. Effective mainstreaming requires specific plans, indicators and follow-up mechanisms to measure progress and make timely adjustments. Following the 2023 Mid-Term Evaluation, the more systematic adoption of the Gender Mainstreaming Plan strengthened the participation of women and youth in decision-making spaces, generating visible impacts on governance, community participation, and social cohesion. (10. Gender equality).

Lesson learned 12. Gender and social inclusion - Hiring with a differential ethnic approach. The application of an ethnic differential approach to the signing of letters of agreement between community partners and FAO, as a mechanism for contracting non-commercial services in territories with ethnic-territorial sovereignty, showed that adapting contracting mechanisms to the local context is key to strengthening governance, supporting the sustainability of results and improving efficiency in implementation. The transition of ethnic communities from a passive role as beneficiaries to implementing partners reflected a strengthening of their technical and administrative capacities, marking a structural change in the relationship between communities and institutions. (10. Gender equality).

GEF evaluation criteria assessment table

GEF Criteria/Dimensions	Classification:	Summary comments
A. RESULTS (relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency)	HS	The project demonstrated high relevance and coherence by aligning with the priorities of the FAO, the GEF and the national policy framework, responding to the needs of community and institutional partners, articulating a participatory and culturally appropriate approach, and complementing other relevant interventions. Furthermore, it achieved 94.20% of the expected results with efficiency and a cost-effective targeting strategy within the MUCB.
A1. Relevance.	HS	The project is highly aligned with FAO and GEF strategic priorities and the Colombian policy framework. In addition to responding to the priorities and needs of community and institutional partners.
A2. Coherence.	HS	The project's components and results were aligned with its objective, through a participatory and culturally appropriate approach (internal consistency).
A3. Effectiveness	HS	The project has an important connection and complementarity with other interventions carried out by community and institutional partners and other key actors (external coherence). The project achieved 94.20% of the expected results, surpassing several of the programmed goals. It is considered that all outcomes and targets will be met prior to project closure. The results achieved are relevant for the country, the Colombian Pacific region and especially for community and institutional partners.

GEF Criteria/Dimensions	Classification:	Summary comments
A4. Efficiency	S	Results have been achieved in a timely and efficient manner, despite delays in the first years of implementation and administrative and financial bottlenecks. The project's governance structures favored efficiency by facilitating coordination between partners and actions aimed at meeting objectives. Targeting intervention windows within the MUCBs was a cost-effective strategy.
B. SUSTAINABILITY (financial, socio-political, institutional and governance, environmental dimensions, including risks to sustainability).	ML	The project laid a solid foundation for sustainability by strengthening community, business, institutional and academic capacities. There are financial, institutional, political and security risks to sustainability, which could have a negative effect on the continuity of the benefits achieved.
C. IMPLEMENTATION	HS	Project preparation, implementation, technical support and supervision were sound and timely. Relevant GEF and FAO policies were applied. The MTR recommendations were implemented.
D. EXECUTION	HS	The implementation of project activities was timely and generated high quality products and results. Relevant GEF and FAO policies were applied, despite the challenges of the territory itself.
M&E Plan	HS	The design of the M&E system was sound, adequate and functional. Having specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) indicators made it possible to provide structured and rigorous monitoring of implementation.
Implementation of the M&E system	HS	The M&E system worked as planned, gathering information in a systematic and timely manner, with a sound methodology that facilitated implementation monitoring, decision making and learning. The Power BI platform facilitated transparency and public access to information, but it was not widely used by actors outside of FAO.
Overall project appraisal	HS	The overall assessment of the project is consistent with the average of the ratings assigned to the criteria evaluated.

Legend:

All criteria except sustainability

Highly satisfactory (HS)
Satisfactory (S)
Moderately satisfactory (MS)
Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)
Unsatisfactory (U)
Highly unsatisfactory (HU)
Unable to assess (UA)

Sustainability

Highly likely (HL)
Likely (L)
Moderately Likely (ML)
Moderately unlikely (MU)
Unlikely (U)
Highly unlikely (HU)
Unable to assess (UA)

Validation by the FAO Office of Evaluation

The report has undergone independent quality assurance and validation processes conducted by the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED). As a result, the performance ratings of the project “Contributing to the integrated management of biodiversity of the *Pacific Region of Colombia to Build Peace*” (ID FMAM 944), established in the GEF rating system, have been adjusted. The overall performance of the project is validated as Highly Satisfactory (HS); in addition, it is recognized that the project provided a decisive boost to the design and

implementation of innovative approaches to biodiversity planning and management in the country, creating a significant incremental value. See Appendix 8 (OED validation system) for more information on the validation of the ratings for each criterion.

^[1] El futuro posible es la visión compartida del territorio que las comunidades anhelan y trabajan por alcanzar.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Project partnership and stakeholder engagement

Finding 19. The project consolidated a multi-sector and multi-stakeholder collaboration and participatory governance model that integrated ethnic communities, public institutions, local governments, the private sector and academia. This model generated ownership and trust among actors and stakeholders.

1. Community participation was broad and significant, with a leading role played by the Community Councils, the Indigenous Reserves and various local organizations, which contributed to guaranteeing the territorial relevance of the interventions and reinforced the legitimacy of the project in the MUCBs. MinAmbiente highlighted this relationship with ethnic communities as a central aspect of the implementation.
2. At the same time, Corporación Biocomercio highlighted the consolidation of commercial alliances as a key contribution to linking with the private sector and promoting bioeconomy and green business initiatives. In addition, the importance of coordinating with the chambers of commerce to boost future market actions between producers and partners was stressed. For their part, the Universidad del Tolima and the Universidad Javeriana emphasized their role as an academic node, contributing to the articulation between applied research and the needs of the territory.
3. These differentiated contributions reinforced the legitimacy of the processes, favored community ownership and strengthened trust between institutions, communities, the private sector and academia. Although some stakeholders pointed out criticisms related to the intermediation of the organizations in certain processes, in general the positive assessment of the multi-stakeholder partnership model prevailed as a significant achievement of the project and as a key condition for the sustainability of the results over time.

C. Gender Equality

Gender and social inclusion

Finding 22. The project's design incorporated the differential approach - including gender, ethnicity and age - and guaranteed the participation of Community Councils and Indigenous Reserves as active partners in planning and implementation. Gender mainstreaming was implemented gradually during execution, achieving significant results in the participation of women in decision-making.

1. The project fully integrated the ethnic differential approach in its implementation by recognizing Community Councils and Indigenous Reserves as active partners in planning, decision-making and

execution of activities. The analysis of the role of ethnic communities in the project is addressed in section 6.5.

2. In parallel, the project consistently promoted the equitable participation of women and men in its decision-making mechanisms, including the Steering Committee and the Technical Committee. Likewise, the active presence of women was ensured in the sessions of the five MUCB Technical Committees, aimed at the construction, consultation, validation and follow-up of the Participatory Action Plans for the 2022-2025 period in each mosaic.
3. In terms of gender, mainstreaming was initially limited, although the inclusion of women in different activities was guaranteed. As of the Mid-Term Evaluation (2023), this approach was strengthened with the more systematic adoption of the Gender Mainstreaming Plan - contained in the design document - which, with its indicators, goals and periodic follow-up, allowed for articulating actions and guiding the PMU towards a more effective implementation.
4. Progress has materialized in the growing participation of women in productive, governance and community communication initiatives. Significant examples include the construction of the Indigenous Women's House in the Arquía Resguardo, which transformed community dynamics by strengthening the role of women; the allocation of 50 hectares (of 200 hectares destined for sustainable productive activities) in Calle Santa Rosa for artisan associations that take advantage of natural fibers for the production of handicrafts; female leadership in more than 50% of green businesses and UAVs, reaching close to 90% in community tourism; and mangrove restoration initiatives linked to food security. In addition, about 50% of women participated in capacity building activities. These actions show a tangible impact on the expansion of their role in decision-making related to the project's interventions in the MUCBs.
5. In addition, specific measures were adopted to facilitate participation, such as the provision of childcare spaces during community activities.
6. Finally, the project's results framework included a specific gender indicator that establishes that at least 40% of the SFM initiatives and productive systems were led by women (Result 3.1). This goal was achieved, since five of the 12 initiatives supported were led by women, which corresponds to 41.7%.

D. Knowledge Management

Communication and knowledge management products

Finding 20. Communication was consolidated as a transversal axis of the project, with emphasis on community communication based on its own cultural forms. Knowledge dissemination and management products were generated to strengthen ownership, awareness and collective learning, in addition to facilitating the systematization of experiences and their replicability.

1. The Communication Strategy, developed in 2022, guided the project's approach to communication. It was structured along four axes: i) internal communication, which strengthened cohesion among partners and facilitated understanding of a complex project; ii) external communication, aimed at making actions and results visible through regional and local media and social networks; iii) community communication, which built its own language reflecting expectations and cultural forms of the communities, consolidating them as protagonists in the processes; and iv) knowledge management and systematization, which made it possible to disseminate results, involve new actors -including the private sector- and contribute to the sustainability and scaling up of impacts.
2. Internal communication was aimed mainly at institutional partners and members of the PMU, through the preparation of progress reports, periodic reports, dashboards and systematization documents, supported by

online repositories, data exchange protocols and interoperability standards that ensured transparency, access and avoided duplication of efforts. These inputs made it possible to strengthen internal cohesion, capitalize on lessons learned, identify successes and mistakes, and monitor the project's progress.

3. External communication was aimed at making actions and results visible in specialized media and social networks, with the consolidation of the project's web page standing out. Various institutional actors consulted highlighted weaknesses in the joint visibility of institutional partners and in the consolidation of inputs as contributions to public policies.
4. The project's website is an effective communication tool, presenting in a structured manner the components, audiovisual materials, documents and monitoring sections that reinforce transparency and accountability. Its main strength lies in the clarity with which it makes visible the objectives, progress and community and ethnic approaches, which facilitates appropriation by different audiences. However, the limited updating of content, especially in recent news and reports, reduced its potential as a dynamic information channel. The portal lacks a greater inclusion of testimonies and communicative products generated directly by the communities, which would have allowed a more authentic reflection of the impacts on the territory and consolidate the community dimension of communication.
5. Community communication was aimed at local partners through participatory processes and territorial appropriation. Initiatives such as the '*Caminar la palabra*' strategy, the creation of community communication collectives and a network of communicators for conservation, with broad participation of women and young people, stand out. These actions helped overcome traditional isolation and strengthen social cohesion. It also facilitated learning in the use of basic technological tools and promoted interaction with clients and green business partners, expanding opportunities for visibility and sustainability.
6. In knowledge management, a knowledge dialogue approach and the 'trainer of trainers' methodology predominated, prioritizing horizontal learning and the integration of traditional and technical knowledge in capacity building processes. We also promoted the co-creation of communication products with communities, institutions and partners. The project systematization exercise, currently underway, with the active participation of multiple stakeholders, stands out.
7. Multimodal tools (videos, photography, *storytelling*) and participatory methodologies (workshops, exchanges, continuous consultation processes and WhatsApp groups) were used to strengthen internal communication, facilitate external dissemination, promote the construction of community communication languages and nurture knowledge management. These contributions broadened the ownership of the project and were reflected in the generation of products, transparency in the relationship with the communities, the appropriation of basic technological tools and the active participation of women and young people. As pointed out by one of the stakeholders interviewed, '*one of the most relevant achievements was to have consolidated communication as a tool for territorial development and conservation*'.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	650180	447186	895405

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

	258603	51433	500186
--	--------	-------	--------

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Alto Calima Integrated Management Regional District	555790640	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources				18,115.00
Calle Santa Rosa	0	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		3,356.00	11,641.00	11,599.00
Enclave Subxerofítico Atuncela Integrated Management Regional District	555555827	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources				2,334.00
Páramo del Duende (Chocó)						94,494.00
Páramo del Duende Regional Natural Park (Valle del Cauca)	555555771	National Park				18,127.00
Relictos de Caoba	0	Others		63,686.00	0.00	124,144.00
Serranía de los Paraguas Integrated Management Regional District (Valle del Cauca)	555704187	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		0.00	39,792.00	39,792.00
Serranías de los Paraguas		Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		191,561.00	0.00	191,581.00

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
	391577	395753	395219

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
		Others							
Cuenta Alta del Río Nembí National	317060	Protected area with sustainable use of natural		0.00	2,473.00	2,472.00	0.00	39.00	39.00

Protective Forest Reserve		resources							
La Planada National Protective Forest Reserve	55555760	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		0.00	4,176.00	4,175.00	0.00	66.00	72.00
Los Farallones de Cali National Park	138	National Park		196,430.00	196,365.00	196,365.00	67.00	77.00	81.00
Los Katíos National Park	61610	National Park		72,000.00	77,968.00	77,968.00	66.00	78.00	78.00
Munchique National Park	146	National Park		46,969.00	46,982.00	46,982.00	68.00	70.00	73.00
Rio Bravo Natural Reserve	555697753	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		24,278.00	24,279.00	24,279.00	40.00	62.00	69.00
Tatamá National Park	13966	National Park		51,900.00	43,510.00	42,978.00	68.00	77.00	77.00

Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	190282		191988

Indicator 2.1 Marine Protected Areas Newly created

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
	190282		191988

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Cabo Manglares Bajo Mira y Frontera	555636091	Others		190,282.00		191,988.00	40.00	59.00	62.00

Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	1000		1121

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	1,000.00	0.00	1,121.00

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	220193	103054	298066

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	210,193.00	103,054.00	282,883.00

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	10,000.00	0.00	15,183.00

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)		3600703		7035851
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)				

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)		3600703	0	7,035,851
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)		0	0	0
Anticipated start year of accounting		2023	2023	2025
Duration of accounting		10	10	10

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)		0		0
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting		2023		2025
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		1,600	3,486	21,044
Male		2,400	3,364	20,302
Total	0	4,000	6,850	41,346

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)	Materialized at TE(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS)	In-kind		1,196,757.00		5,924,765.00
Recipient Country Government	PNN	In-kind		1,548,715.00	163,757.00	389,422.00

Recipient Country Government	Institute of Environmental Research of the Pacific (IIAP)	In-kind		484,838.00	2,092,114.00	2,341,503.00
Recipient Country Government	Institute of Marine and Coastal Research José Benito Vives de Andreis (INVEMAR)	In-kind		41,143.00		41,143.00
Recipient Country Government	Institute of Marine and Coastal Research José Benito Vives de Andreis (INVEMAR)	Grant		106,800.00		106,800.00
Recipient Country Government	Departmental Government of Nariño	In-kind		4,215,227.00	413,100.00	569,657.00
Recipient Country Government	Departmental Government of Nariño	Grant		504,823.00	3,475,130.00	3,475,130.00
Recipient Country Government	Departmental Government of Chocó	In-kind		72,012.00		
Recipient Country Government	Departmental Government of Chocó	Grant		96,833.00		
Recipient Country Government	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Risaralda (CARDER)	In-kind		274,264.00		
Recipient Country Government	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Risaralda (CARDER)	Grant		135,824.00		
Recipient Country Government	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Valle del Cauca (CVC)	Grant		5,871,918.00	4,130,919.00	5,718,902.00
Recipient Country Government	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Nariño (CORPONARIÑO)	In-kind		93,429.00		
Recipient Country Government	Regional Autonomous Corporation of Nariño (CORPONARIÑO)	Grant		6,546,997.00	7,241,499.00	14,037,568.00

Recipient Country Government	Regional Autonomous Corporation for Sustainable Development of Chocó (CODECHOCÓ)	Grant		3,547,790.00		
Beneficiaries	Major Communal Council of del Alto San Juan (ASOCASAN)	In-kind		170,010.00		
Beneficiaries	Communal Council of the Cacarica River Watershed - Chocó	In-kind		118,748.00		
Beneficiaries	Reservation Comunidad La Sierpe Reservation Calle Santa Rosa	In-kind		40,500.00		
Beneficiaries	Communal council of Bajo Mira and Frontera	In-kind		157,611.00		
Civil Society Organization	Corporación Biocomercio Sostenible - CBS Colombia	In-kind		395,926.00		204,079.00
Civil Society Organization	BIOINNOVA	In-kind		731,768.00		40,482.00
Civil Society Organization	Fundación San Cipriano	In-kind		108,488.00		184,374.00
GEF Agency	UNIDO	In-kind		800,000.00		
GEF Agency	UNIDO	Grant		2,423,765.00		
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind		510,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant		1,200,000.00	177,460.00	471,733.00
Civil Society Organization	Fundación Trópico	In-kind			219,329.00	219,329.00
Civil Society Organization	Ecohabitat	In-kind			247,628.00	312,247.00

Recipient Country Government	Regional environmental authorities (CRC)	In-kind				1,132,692.00
Total Co-financing				31,394,186.00	694,417.00	2,186,001.00

Comments

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
		Medium/Moderate	Medium/Moderate

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

1. The project design incorporated an exhaustive analysis of environmental, social, political and institutional risks, accompanied by a risk management plan with a gender and ethnic differential approach. This process was framed within the FAO and UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards, ensuring alignment with international standards (RMT, 2023).
2. During the design phase, the risk rating certification form reported a moderate level in relation to safeguards. Among the most relevant risks were identified: the presence of indigenous and black communities in the execution areas (FAO Safeguard 9 and UNIDO Safeguard 4), and the implementation of activities in protected areas and buffer zones (FAO Safeguard 2). PRODOC also highlighted Safeguard 8 on gender equity as a cross-cutting issue (WTR, 2023).
3. In 2022, the risk matrix was updated incorporating two new factors: i) the COVID-19 pandemic and ii) the lack of political will of local authorities and the private sector to apply territorial harmonization guidelines. Even with these updates, the Mid-Term Review (2023) maintained the moderate risk classification, and it was not necessary to activate additional mitigation measures, beyond the constant monitoring and preventive measures already integrated in the planning.
4. During the second half of the project, the M&E system included a specific module for monitoring compliance with safeguards and the risk plan. The interactive platform in *Power BI*, integrated indicators for results, outputs, risks and cross-cutting approaches such as gender. The system allowed monitoring of social, environmental and external risks, including those associated with FPIC, security, public order, political changes and the pandemic.
5. Overall, risk management was adequate and ensured that interventions respected community rights, cultural integrity and biodiversity conservation, without requiring corrective measures. The environmental and social risk rating for the project remained at the moderate level.

The complaints and grievances mechanism established in the project's operations manual served as a preventive measure to channel the concerns of local stakeholders. To date, no complaints have been registered through this system

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Terminal Evaluation (TE)	GEFID9441_TE_FAO_Colombia_Spanish
M and E Document	Terminal Evaluation (TE)	GEFID9441_TE_FAO_Colombia_English
M and E Document	Tracking Tool	GEFID9441_Core Indicators_TE_FAO_Colombia