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# Acronyms

ACR Regional Conservation Areas (for its acronym in Spanish)

PNA Protected Natural Areas

CC Climate Change

EbA Adaptation Program based on Ecosystems (for its acronym in Spanish)

ECAS Executor of Administration Contract (for its acronym in Spanish)

GEF Global Environmental Facility

GORES Regional Governments (for its acronym in Spanish)

MINAM Ministry of the Environment (for its acronym in Spanish)

MTR Mid Term Review

NIM Modality of National Implementation (for its acronym in Spanish)

LoA Letter of Agreement

UNDP United Nations Development Program

PUMA Landscape Purús – Manu (for its acronym in Spanish)

SERNANP National Service of Protected Natural Areas (for its acronym in Spanish)

UNDAF United Nations Development Assistance Framework

YESI Landscape Yanachaga – El Sira (for its acronym in Spanish)
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# Summary table of MTE valuations and achievements

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **MTE rating** | **Description of the achievement** |
| **Progress in achieving results** | Valuation  Objective: MS | It is expected that most of the established results will be achieved by the end of the project, however, there are significant risks in terms of the impact and sustainability of the Outputs in Outcome 2. It requires strengthening its impact in terms of its main objective, which is to generate capacities and tools for resilience to climate change (CC). |
| Valuation Outcome: 1 S | The Outcome shows high feasibility of meeting the objectives set, showing significant risks in its ability to achieve the expected funding goals. |
| Valuation  Outcome: 2 I | It shows a considerable delay in its execution and a high risk of diluting its impact and compromising the sustainability of the investments made. |
| **Execution and adaptive management** | MS | Unbalanced execution between Outcomes. They waited too long to make decisions and now they have little time to execute and comply, especially with regard to Outcome 2. |
| **Sustainability** | MS | The work on central issues such as the strengthening in management instruments of the NPAs and financing mechanisms to ensure resources for the NPAs are scarce, it puts at risk the continuing of the project's legacy once it has been completed. |

**Scale of Valuation**

| Scale of Valuation | Description of valuation |
| --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | It is expected to achieve or exceed the objectives / outcomes set for the end of the project without major shortcomings. Progress towards achieving the objectives / results can be presented as a "good practice" |
| Satisfactory (S) | It is expected to achieve most of the objectives / results set for the end of the project with only minor deficiencies. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | It is expected to achieve most of the objectives / results established for the end of the Project, but with significant deficiencies. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | It is expected to achieve most of the objectives / results established for the end of the Project with important shortcomings. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | It is not expected to achieve most of the objectives / results established by the end of the Project. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory  (HU) | No objectives / results have been achieved by half of the period and it is not expected to achieve any of the stablished by the end of the Project. |

# Introduction

## Objective

The general objective of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) is to provide recommendations based on evidence to contribute to the achievement of results proposed by the project.

The following are the specific objectives of the evaluation:

1. Explain the level of progress towards the achievement of intermediate goals, based on the analysis of results, the implementation strategy designed and the execution of its activities.
2. Evaluate the management of the project, from the analysis of its management procedures, monitoring and evaluation systems, information and internal and external communication, institutional arrangement.
3. Analyze the possibilities that the impact of the project is sustainable beyond its completion, from the identification and weighting of the external and internal factors limiting and stimulating.
4. Provide recommendations to improve the implementation of the project, based on the identification of best practices and learning opportunities.

## Scope and Methodology

The evaluation was led by José Galindo and Fátima García as a specialist in climate change and territorial governance, it was developed during the period between September and November 2018. The methodology used for this document is aimed at achieving the objectives defined for the Mid Term Evaluation ToR´s (Annex 1). During the process, there was an active relationship and interaction between the consultant, the UNDP Peru, the Project Team, MINAM and other interested parties, in order to streamline the evaluation process and enable timely feedback of the findings.

In general, the evaluation was guided by the guidelines defined in the UNDP Guide for Mid-Term Assessments and its stated objectives. The methods and methodological instruments that were developed and used in the evaluation process were:

* Evaluation matrix
* Documentary analysis
* In-depth interviews with key informants and meetings-workshop
* Direct observation / visits to the implementation sites

At all times, the consultancy used a participatory and inclusive approach, based on data derived from programmatic, financial and monitoring documents, and a reasonable level of direct participation of interested parties through interviews, meetings - workshop and review of the documents generated in this evaluation.

Initially, on September 12, a first meeting was held, with the objective of presenting the consultant team and initiating an induction to the Project. In addition, delivery times and coordination mechanisms between the consultant and the designated counterparts, communication channels, direct supervision of the consultancy and coordination of information delivery, product delivery and organization of the mission were defined in this space. . In this meeting the consultant team requested the necessary information to start the consultancy.

**Cross-cutting criteria applied in the Evaluation: gender, interculturality and human rights**

The MTR considered gender and interculturality approaches with the human rights approach and reviewed to what extent the Project design contemplated different impacts on men and women, and among the 19 ethnic groups in the Project's scope of implementation. It was evaluated how these approaches were addressed in the implementation of the Project, as well as to what extent the evaluation and monitoring of the Project addresses the impact of this on gender equity and intercultural relations, if there are mechanisms to monitor differently by gender and ethnic origin the participation of the actors in the activities promoted by the Project and in the benefits that derive from it. The gender balance on the Governing Council and the project team and its ability to incorporate approaches in the project was revised.

During the field mission, we reviewed how the Project relates to men and women and how it addresses intercultural relations among the actors, what effects it has had on the actors differentiated by sex and ethnic origin. It recommended complementary indicators sensitive to gender and the intercultural approach that facilitate the incorporation of these approaches in the execution of the Project.

From a human rights perspective, the MTR also identified to what extent the Project design is aligned with the SDGs; evaluated if vulnerable groups are identified and how their integration is facilitated in the processes promoted by the project; and if these processes contribute to empowerment for the exercise of their rights; what mechanisms are used to monitor access to project benefits; to what extent in the implementation of the project are people considered as key actors for their own development and active agents of change.

Regarding the quality of the process of involvement, it should be noted that the selection of people who participated in interviews and focus groups was adequate and included a diversity of actors from different levels such as technicians, authorities, representatives of indigenous peoples and or others. informants who maintain the memory of the processes and were able to share information and perceptions about the Project. The process of involvement of the actors in the evaluation counted on the participation of the national authorities and key actors of the Project, in the inception meeting at the beginning of the mission and the presentation of the results of the mission.

### Revision of documents and inception report

The documentation submitted by the contractor was reviewed, which includes a series of documents provided by UNDP and the Project team, among which are listed:

* Project Document (PRODOC)
* Project Identification Document (PIF)
* Project Implementation Review (PIR)
* Annual Progress Reports
* Quarterly Report on Progress and Project Achievements
* Combined Delivery Reports (CDR)
* Summary of the METT Sheet
* Audit Report
* Minutes of the Meeting of the Directing Council
* Project intervention maps
* Outcome Products of Outcomes 1 and 2
* Document of adjustment to the Logical Framework of the Project
* Inception Workshop Report
* Matrix M&E
* Documents related to the monitoring of the Project
* UNDP Country Program Document (CPD)
* Strategic Plan of UNDP, other strategic and legal national documents, and related to the project; and other documents that are detailed in Annex 8.

On the basis of the review, a detailed description of the Project was made, covering the identified problem, the established objectives, Outcomes and their respective activities. Subsequently, an evaluation framework was established that combines the orientation questions for the five key evaluation criteria and the performance evaluation categories of the Project (Project formulation and design, Project execution, results, monitoring and evaluation).

### Mission to Peru - Information gathering, interviews and field visits

The evaluation mission allowed the consultant team to have a better view of the context of the Project. In addition, through the field visit, the consultants were able to demonstrate the activities carried out so far, in addition he made direct contact with the most representative actors in the implementation of the Project and received first-hand testimonies about the advances and barriers encountered so far.

During the mission, four methods of gathering information were applied. On the one hand, semi-structured interviews were carried out based on the guide of questions presented in Annex 2 and 3; Secondly, visits to the project's execution sites were made, which involved long travel periods in which in-depth interviews were held with the Project Coordinator, the technicians who lead Outcomes 1 and 2; project staff at headquarters and other relevant actors who participated in this activity. In complementarity, telephone interviews were conducted with the Project Coordinator and the Coordinator of Outcome 1 (November 23 and December 20), as well as other non-formal conversation spaces, in which aspects of interest for the evaluation were addressed.

In addition, participant observation was carried out transversally during the field mission (Annex 4). At least 4 induction workshops were carried out to the Project, in which its Outcomes and the results obtained were analyzed; the inception meeting of this evaluation and the presentation of preliminary findings with the participation of the Project Steering Council were also held.

A total of 56 interviews were conducted with authorities, organizations linked to the management of protected areas, implementing partners, project team personnel, other related projects and relevant actors participating in the project intervention framework (Annex 5 and 6). ). Each interview had an estimated duration of an hour and a half, and were carried out individually, thus ensuring the confidentiality of the answers provided by the interviewees. In the cases of representatives of organizations such as the Executors of Administration Contract, Management Committees or others related to the project, at least the Board and technical team were approached, and the information was collected through a meeting-workshop.

### End of Mission - Presentation of Preliminary Findings

The information gathered and analyzed was presented to the Project Team, Project Steering Committee, representatives of UNDP Peru and SERNANP, Implementing Agency and National Project Counterpart respectively, through a Power Point presentation (Annex 7). At the end, their feedback was obtained (Annex 14), which facilitated the formulation and justification of conclusions and lessons learned, which in turn will feed the definition of recommendations for future projects.

### Draft Evaluation Report

The information gathered from the different sources of information was organized and codified by topic. To ensure the credibility and validity of the findings, judgments and conclusions that will be presented, the consultant used triangulation techniques, which consist of crossing the information obtained.

Each Outcome and phase of the Project was evaluated according to the categories established in the Terms of Reference: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Moderately Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory and Highly Unsatisfactory (Annex 9).

Based on the results obtained, the consultant formulated several recommendations of a technical and practical nature, which reflect a realistic understanding of the Project's achievements. The Mid-Term Review of the Project was applied to the development and implementation until the moment of the Project for the four categories of progress:

* **Project Strategy:** Formulation of the Project including the logical framework, assumptions, risks, indicators, budget, country context, national ownership, participation of design actors, replicability, among others.
* **Progress in the achievement of results:** focus on implementation, participation of stakeholders, quality of execution by each institution involved and, in general, financial planning, monitoring and evaluation during implementation.
* **Execution of the Project and Adaptive Management:** identification of the challenges and proposal of the additional measures to promote a more efficient and effective execution. The aspects evaluated will be: management mechanisms, work planning, financing and co-financing, monitoring and evaluation systems at the Project level, stakeholder involvement, information and communication.
* **Sustainability:** In general, sustainability is understood as the probability that the benefits of the Project will last in time after its completion. Consequently, the Mid-Term Sustainability Assessment examines the likely risks that the Project faces so that the results will continue when the project ends.

# Project Description

The Project Transforming Management of Protected Area/Landscape Complexes to Strengthen Ecosystem Resilience, aims to improve resilience to the impacts of climate change on vulnerable ecosystems in protected natural areas and in surrounding landscapes, in order to ensure their biodiversity, functionality and the provision of ecosystem services.

It is implemented during the period 2015 - 2021 under the National Implementation Modality - NIM with LoA, the executing partner being the SERNANP and the Implementing Agency the United Nations Program for Development - UNDP. The Project has a budget of US $ 8'991,434 financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF-5).

The Project consists of two Outcomes, one related to expanding and strengthening the conservation regime of areas sensitive to climate change; and the second promotes sustainable land management to increase the resilience of ecosystems to the impacts of climate change. Geographically, it focuses on two natural landscapes: Yanachaga - El Sira (YESI) and Purús - Manu (PUMA), which together comprise 9 protected areas of different protection categories, their buffer zones and other conservation areas and productive uses, adding an area of 16'973,976 ha. The actors linked to the Project are public and private institutions linked to the management of conservation areas, and local people of indigenous origin and settlers[[1]](#footnote-1).

The project is in its third year of implementation, both for the mandate of the GEF and for the Evaluation Plan 2017-2021, the UNDP Peru Office foresees in a Mid Term Review - MTR to verify the achievement of objectives, determine the progress towards the expected results included in the Project Document, and early identification of risks for sustainability. In that sense, the purpose of the Review is to provide recommendations based on evidence, to contribute to the achievement of results expected by the Project.

# Evaluation findings

This chapter presents the main findings of the evaluation, based on the review of the information received, the interviews conducted and the results of the mission. The analysis refers in general terms to the Project, understood as the executing partner SERNANP, the UNDP as the implementing agency, and the different spaces constituted for its governance.

## Project Design

The project responds to national priorities expressed in different plans and policies at national, regional and local levels. It is seen as a great opportunity to look at the conservation of biodiversity beyond the boundaries of protected areas and integrate them into other social, productive and economic dynamics that occur around them. It contributes to the connectivity and improves the functionality of the core areas of conservation in the south of the Amazon, through a variety of conservation figures that go beyond from those that have been traditionally addressed in previous interventions. Perhaps, this is its most important legacy and an opportunity to boost new figures and conservation stakeholders in the territory.

In general, the project has an innovative approach, because it complements the conceptual guidelines of vulnerability with local communities, this has allowed having a more holistic and profound view of what resilience represents from a landscape approach. In addition, the design of the project is built based on the UNDPs portfolio and has received a conceptual complement from other programs or projects such as the Ecosystem-based Adaptation Program (EbA) and the Joint Declaration of Intent (DCI). Furthermore, the project contributed to the design of the project proposal Sustainable Productive Landscapes (PPS) and is currently articulated with the Green Commodities Program.

At the beginning of the project, the team discovered some difficulties in the design of the indicators of the project in general and the Outcomes, for this reason, it was decided to modify several indicators, which in certain cases included revising the baseline and the proposed goal, in other cases, regrouping and reorganising, the new indicators sought to respond in a better way to the context in which the project is developed. This updating and modifying process of the PRODOC consumed a large part of the team's time during the start-up phase, however, it is considered as an adequate investment in order to improve the quality of intervention in the two selected landscapes. The new indicators that were proposed, were presented and subsequently approved by the Steering Committee.

**Table 1 Modifications to the Logical Framework of the Project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **# Original indicator** | **# Current indicator** | **Name of the Indicator** | **Base Line** | **Goals at the end of the Project** |
| Project Indicator | I2 | I2 | Modified | Modified | Modified |
| I4 | I3 | Modified | Not modified | Modified |
| Outcome 1 | 1 | 4a | Not modified | Not modified | Not modified |
| 2 | 4b | Modified | Modified | Modified |
| 3 | 2 | Not modified | Modified | Not modified |
| 4 | 3 | Modified | Modified | Not modified |
| 5 | 1 | Not modified | Modified | Not modified |
| ND | 5 | A new indicator is included | | |
| 6 | 6 | Modified | Modified | Modified |
| Outcome 2 | 1 | 1a | Modified | Modified | Modified |
| 2 | 2a | Not modified | Not modified | Not modified |
| 3 | 3 | Not modified | Modified | Modified |
| 4 | 2b | Not modified | Not modified | Not modified |
| 5 | 1b | Modified | Modified | Modified |
| 6 |  | Not modified | Not modified | Modified |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

## Project Execution and Adaptive Management

The start of the project was slow, which to a certain extent is justified, considering the complexity of the objectives set, the work with multiple institutions from different regions at the national level, and the learning curve required to operate within the framework of a project with the GEF. However, this delay affects the execution of the final activities of the project, since it leaves less time for the execution and later for the development of topics such as sustainability, appropriation, knowledge transfer and the exit strategy.

The beginning of the project’s execution took longer than expected, initially, there was a delay in the designation of the National Directorate in SERNANP and there was a six-month delay for the recruitment of the National Coordinator because the first contest was declared unfulfilled and other obstacles emerged in relation to other designations and contracts. The second delay arose because the project team invested a considerable amount of time in updating and adjusting the original plan expressed in the PRODOC. This suggests a series of weaknesses and inconsistencies within the concept (which had to be revised in depth), the delimitation of the intervention zones, the selection of priorities and the intervention strategies at each site.

Despite the importance of improving the quality by investing time and relevance of intervention in the territory, it is verified that the time lost has not yet been recovered. This is particularly reflected in the delay of Outcome 2’s execution, this was also affected by the rejection of organisations based on the initial scheme proposed in the direct contracting of technical institutions of PRODOC that subcontract local operators in the YESI landscape, however, this scheme was successfully applied in the PUMA landscape. On the other hand, rethinking and restructuring the intervention, coincided with the resignation of the person responsible for Outcome 2, which hindered a swift adoption of the new scheme. Nevertheless, the team points out that important work has been done at the general planning stages of the project so that the goals set for this Outcome are achievable. Furthermore, during 2018, the implementation of this Outcome has been accelerated with concrete results reported to date and the attainment of certain key products. As will be described in greater detail in the following chapters.

The analysis of information also indicates that certain actions could have been executed in advance, such as the installation of the head offices and the hiring of key personnel. In the latter case, a significant delay in the incorporation of support professional to SERNANP is identified, which is a key profile in the uptake strategy of USD 5.4 million. The consultant in question was hired in June 2018, which leaves a very narrow margin to be able to coordinate with other activities considered as part of the planned strategy, to reach the goal set in the two years remaining to the project.

During the interviews, particularly at the beginning of the project, difficulties were mentioned in the management of expectations with the protected areas, communities and some partners. Several interviewees agree that during project start-up in the different presentations made, and in order to make the project budget more transparent, an appropriate explanation of the complexity and magnitude of the project and its budget was made. Despite this, occasionally it was not possible to avoid generating a big expectation facing up to the resources that the beneficiaries expected in the different areas.

One of the difficulties frequently mentioned by the vast majority of men and women interviewed, make reference to the fact that the project "does not listen". This is verified throughout the interviews carried out to different stakeholders both in the project head offices, as well as in the Lima city. While it is true, in certain cases, the comment could be understood in a context in which the project cannot meet the specific requirements and needs demanded by the key stakeholders, because they are beyond their scope, budget or priority.

According to their testimonies, it is mentioned that sometimes different leaders have come to the project to request that their NPAs be included, or that they are granted resources to cover certain needs that are a priority, from the headquarters standpoint, however, since the requirements were not identified within the planning framework of the project they were not granted. Nevertheless, it must be clarified that sometimes this difficulty could have been linked to the fact that SERNANP central plant defined the top priorities that needed to be executed. This could be seen in 2016 when the project attended to certain strategic activities of the SERNANP central plant, which also correlated with the logic proposed by the PRODOC.

Despite the obstacles mentioned, the project has sought to link the different headquarters, in 2017, the planning of activities was carried out encouraging greater participation of the SERNANP central and the review of the headquarters. In 2018, the head offices participated in meetings of review, approach and adjustments of the planning in each head office to collect their contributions and also, meetings with specialists from SERNANP central head office. The information crossover indicates that at the headquarters level, the project is seen as a closed entity, due to the fact of not having executed certain requirements of the headquarters, however, at the planning level, its contributions have been considered.

In the same way, the testimonies make reference to the fact that the project "imposes, and is a like a lock", basically the justification for this comment is based on the fact that several times the park administration and technicians are given already completed products, such as terms of references, without having allowed input from them. In another instance, the topics for capacity building and training where decided without their input. It is necessary for the project to have a more political management, which does not imply that everything must be agreed to, but rather to promote a better relationship between the parties involved, opening spaces to work together.

The appropriation of the project turns out to be relatively low, the different parties have different readings, however, they agree that the project is much more identified with the UNDP than with the SERNANP, this fact is more evident at the head office level but is also shared by stakeholders from the central level in Lima. Among the different factors in relation from the stakeholder's perception, it is mentioned that at least at the beginning, the team in the head offices were identified as UNDP personnel, also the corporate identity and communication material do not reflect sufficient leadership by SERNANP within the project. Another factor that contributes to the project being looked at from this point of view, is related to the physical location of the team in Lima within the UNDP offices. Other aspects that can be less attractive but mark relevance, make reference to the dominion and the presentation of the e-mails, despite appearing to be not very significant, they converge to generate a relatively low positioning of the project as belonging to SERNANP.

The work through the partner institutions has not positioned the project sufficiently and practically make SERNANP appear invisible. It is necessary to give a 180-degree turn, to make the work of the national institution evident, specifically in the creation of new areas of conservation, connectivity, extension, etc. In addition, it has been noted that the work between the partners and SERNANP is not integrated. For example, the headquarters of the NPA practically do not participate in the creative processes of new conservation areas and according to the testimonies collected, they are not sufficiently aware of the actions taken and the progress achieved, for this reason, it is necessary that the head office play a more proactive role in ensuring that the leadership of the NPAs get involved or participate in a more proactive way and that they are the ones that generate pressures towards SERNANP in relation to conservation priorities. Likewise, the coordination could do more to ensure that there are spaces to share experiences and views in relation to the strategies applied by the partner institutions in the execution of Outcomes 1 and 2.

A factor mentioned frequently is that the decision times take too long, the answers to technical issues, such as the location, the direction of funds and activities are very extensive, although it is recognised that they are very serious and highly analytical. Management decision making must weigh the balance between quality and opportunity, this also means being more willing to take risks, considering that they have a team with the capacity to respond with agility and adaptive management.

The Coordinator’s presence in the territory is perceived as relatively distant. The testimonies collected in the territory refer to the fact that the Coordinator has only been known for the macro meetings, that is, the relationship is not individual, giving a result of a more distant view to the coordination of the project. In this sense, it is necessary that there be a closer relationship from the Coordinator, which allows him to perceive at first hand, the events that occur in the territory and whose contribution is more political to the technicians who are in the field.

In general, it is observed that the execution of the project has focused specifically on the technical level, therefore, it is necessary that the project open spaces for dialogue with the new municipal authorities, with the aim of influencing political decision-making, as is the case of the creation of conservation areas, which require a better official positioning and of the territorial planning exercise such as that carried out in the province of Oxapampa.

In the PRODOC of the project, a series of activities aimed at trying to co-finance and articulate with other cooperation stakeholders are identified. Output 6 of Outcome 1 refers to "Financial mechanisms established to increase resilience in the landscapes", which raises a number of potential sources of funding, as well as, demonstrate the need to coordinate with initiatives and agencies to promote sustainability of the landscapes. This Outcome is fundamental for the sustainability of the intervention in a large territorial area such as that covered by the project. In effect, meeting the goal set for this Outcome requires a greater capacity of political relations and a greater presence of the coordinator in the territory to build, encourage and maintain this type of relationship.

According to the information provided by the project, there is a conceptual design of the training, which responds to the project’s objectives, however, the information gathered from the interviews shows that the training provided does not respond to the specific needs identified from the NPA. It should be noted, that there are different logics of training, on the one hand, those that are directly incubated in the project and on the other hand, those that come directly from SERNANP and are supported by the project. Although training has been developed in a variety of subjects, whether they are directly executed by the project or supported by SERNANP, they have been carried out in a standardised manner, to all the same and in the same dose, without discriminating differently by workgroups or protected areas. It was possible to carry out a differentiated work at the level of technicians, heads of the area, executing agencies, indigenous organisations, etc. For example, it is mentioned that sensitive issues such as the gender approach, in some cases, were treated with indigenous communities without the presence of a translator, however, it is recognised that in a very few particular occasions, a translator was incorporated to deal with sensitive issues.

Initially, the PRODOC’s design did not contemplate the communications area, nor a person responsible for it, however, in the PRODOC, communication activities related to each Outcome were planned, estimated at USD 90,000 and intended for the production of audio-visual material. Despite this, the design of the project did not allocate a budget destined to develop a plan or a strategic approach for the communication of the entire project, translating this into one of the weakest areas of the whole intervention and offered little function to support in the execution and specification of the project's objectives. Despite this, the project has tried to meet communication needs, so in 2018, a plan was developed that still awaits approval.

Based on the review of the communication products developed by the project and in agreement with the opinion of the majority of people interviewed, it is considered that the communication of the project responds more to the corporate area of UNDP than to the specific objectives of the project in terms of executing the Outcomes in the territory. Although communication in the field has been foreseen from Strategy 1.1 and provides the participation of the ONGs that accompany some of their products, in practice, there is a weak relationship between the communication activities developed with the products and results of the project. It is not yet perceived that the communication area accompanies and is adequately exploited from a strategic perspective to support the realisation of the project’s objectives. For example, the positioning of climate change and resilience issues which is surprisingly low in the beneficiaries, executing partners and practically all the stakeholders interviewed.

The central theme of resilience, which gives its name to the project, while it has been conceptualised, principles and strategies have been defined, in some cases, it is not clear how it is operationalised from the Outcomes and its results. Likewise, resilience as a differential focus of the project remains unnoticed or in other cases, as a diffuse concept for the actors outside of UNDP, a situation that contributes that each stakeholder waits for the priorities they identified to be accepted by the project, however, there is a high positioning and remembrance of ecosystem services matter. This matter is evidenced in the project's strategy, which indicates that the care of the aforementioned services is fundamental for the PANs, the productive systems, and in general, they are transversal to the 7 principles of resilience, as established by the project's theory of change.

There is a clear division between Outcomes 1 and 2; there are indeed spaces for opportunities of mutual benefit, as well as, talents and skills in the team that can be complementary and that should not necessarily be so sharply divided among Outcomes, on the contrary, this condition would allow working on cross-cutting matters that allow adding value from the existing multiple competencies.

According to the testimonies of the interviewees that are shared by the evaluation team, an unbalanced relationship with the certain actors in the territory is verified. In the case of the Regional Governments, for example, an extraordinary relationship with Cuzco is confirmed, but no type of relationship with Madre de Dios is maintained. Likewise, the indigenous organisations manifest their expectation to keep better informed and have a closer relationship with the project to coordinate the execution of products that involve their bases. Faced with this, the project clarifies that the authorities have been invited to different activities and that their intervention focuses on the ECA Amarakaeri and the Management Committee of the PN Alto Purús. It is important to take advantage of the positioning that UNDP has and that in some way facilitates access to these instances, likewise, it is important to invest in improving relationships and achieving more proximity with the stakeholders in the field, particularly those who are expected to execute products, especially those related to Outcome 2.

## Gender, interculturality and human rights

The PRODOC identifies strategies for the incorporation of the gender approach within the project, as a specific allocation in the project budget and proposes addressing explicitly the economic empowerment of women, ensuring equitable participation in decision-making, particularly in the identification of productive options, emphasising women as potential agents of transformation, in the social and cultural context of each case. Interculturality is not explicitly addressed in the design of the project, rather it is indicated that the sociocultural conditions of the settlers and the indigenous communities for the development of resilient productive systems will be taken into account. In the design, specific indicators were not developed on the approaches that allow monitoring the incorporation of the strategies indicated in the project’s document, rather they are collected in a limited way at the level of the goals for productive systems of Outcome 2.

During implementation, introductory workshops were held to train the approaches in accordance with the United Nations conceptual framework, as part of the polycentric governance strategy to increase sociocultural and ecological resilience. An important product has been the identification of potential alliances, expectations and proposals from the actors linked to the project, whose incorporation into the management of the project and therefore its monitoring has been pending. After these events, two of the four partner institutions have developed proposals for good practices in the intervention carried out within the framework of the project, in general, aimed at achieving greater participation and involvement of women in the activities promoted. From Outcome 1, to facilitate the continuous participation of women some workshops were complemented with specific measures, productive initiatives led by women have been selected as part of the strengthening of conservation areas. While no explicit strategy has been formulated for the economic and social empowerment of women as indicated by the PRODOC, the project has developed actions that contribute to this process, such as gender strategies for intervention, training and facilitation of the participation of women, proposals for the revaluation of ancestral knowledge of "wise[[2]](#footnote-2)".

The need to incorporate the intercultural approach has been markedly evident in the execution of the micro capital agreements, particularly for the advice and administrative follow-up by the project team. Also, in the construction and application of educational and monitoring tools such as the entrance and exit evaluations and in the planning of some workshops with indigenous participants specifically, those carried out in Pucallpa and Madre de Dios about gender and interculturality. In these specific cases, the absence of a translator limited the appropriation of the concepts presented by the project.

The UNDP Amazon Program has a specialist who has provided induction on the approaches to the technical team of the project and has guided the training workshops carried out, with results and positive impact. However, a close accompaniment is required to improve the capabilities of the team and to apply these approaches transversally to the project.

## Progress in the achievement of results

### Outcome 1: Greater resilience to climate change in NPA of fundamental importance

The first Outcome is made up of 6 Outputs, which in turn have various associated indicators depending on the case. The first Output corresponds to "Extension of an area under conservation regime favouring connectivity". The project identified 10 local initiatives for the creation of biodiversity and agrobiodiversity conservation areas in priority zones, that in total involve 284,065 ha, under different legal frameworks and mechanisms between ACR, ACP, CC, in some cases innovative in the national context as the recognition of agrobiodiversity zones in Cusco. The execution of the stages for the creation of these areas is carried out by 3 partner institutions, in Ucayali, Pasco-Huánuco and Cusco[[3]](#footnote-3), with recognised work experience in the area of intervention in each case and with experience in the subject at the institutional level or its professionals. The articulation in these processes has been successful at a regional and local government level and with the social stakeholders, especially in Cusco, and with less approach in Ucayali and Pasco. The involvement of SERNANP has been from Lima, in reviewing the dossiers and monitoring each process, remaining weak or invisible of its participation as a key stakeholder to insert the ecosystem services, connectivity, climate change and resilience approaches into planning territory at the regional level.

The recognition of conservation area processes are at different levels of progress and possibilities to materialise during the project execution time, so it is convenient to support from a political role of UNDP and from the project, those with greater viability, accompanied by a communication strategy for the incidence in political decision making.

In the following, Table 2, the state of progress of each process is presented, using the semaphore scale to indicate the feasibility of materialising in the time of execution of the project.

**Table 2 Progress of the Output Process 1.1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Proposals for conservation areas [[4]](#footnote-4) | Surface (ha) | Advance [[5]](#footnote-5) | | Commentary |
| ACR Ausangate | 80,900 | 3 |  | Finished technical process, regional political will for its recognition, anticipated public incidence. |
| Area of agrobiodiversity Marcapata Collana | 22,808 | 1 |  | Risk that rural communities are not interested |
| Area of agrobiodiversity Collasuyo | 14,780 | 1 |  | Risk that rural communities are not interested |
| Affectation of use of the property Quincemil Araza | 10,000 | 1 |  | Risk of the process being stopped or delayed by changes in DRAC and UNSAAC authorities. |
| CC Yurúa | 48,429 | 3 |  | File entered the GOREU, priority area for conservation. |
| CE Sepahua | 67,148 | 1 |  | Risk that the GOREU prioritize forest use in this area. |
| ACR Codo del Pozuzo | 11,000 | 2 |  | 100% overlap with hydrocarbon lot in operation. |
| ACR Chontabamba Huancabamba | 17,000 | 1 |  | Overlap with forestry concessions for reforestation, with no response from SERFOR on its viability. |
| ACP Huachón | 12,000 | 1 |  | The sanitation of the base documentation may require long times, due to the breadth of the community, and the need to articulate the population located in the Amazon and upper parts of the Community. |
| Total | 284,065 |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Viable |
|  | Risk of political obstacles, or complex processes that exceed the project's execution time. |

The project’s map of areas of intervention shows several proposed conservation areas that are not included in the previous Table[[6]](#footnote-6), i.e, the areas were ultimately not prioritized for the project, because no potential activities were identified during the quarterly meetings with the partner organizations, nor was additional, adequate information obtained by the field offices.

The project is also supporting the strengthening of the management of existing conservation areas. In some cases, with a clear focus on financial sustainability in the intervention, as in the case of the ACM Sho'llet for rights of way, the ACP Fundo Cadena with a project profile to leverage public funds for pisciculture and the ACP Japu with the strengthening of the textile technique to improve the commercialisation. In other cases, the support has been an opportunity and in a timely manner, as in the case of CC Soqtapata, and Machusaniaca and II; and in the case of the YESI landscape, the strengthening of the ACPs are not defined[[7]](#footnote-7). In the case of productive initiatives, both textiles and pisciculture, the climate change and resilience approach has not been incorporated. Likewise, especially in the case of Japu, the intervention must be complemented with a strategy to ensure that the improvement in the textile activity favours the social and economic empowerment of women. In general, the Output its indicator registers a 60% advance (Table 3).

**Table 3 Output advance matrix 1.1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Expansion of the coverage of conservation areas to protect essential ecosystems | 09 protected natural areas (5'966,203 ha), 08 Private conservation areas (22,612ha), 02 Municipal conservation areas (15,238ha), 09 conservation concessions (193,035ha), 10 ecotourism concessions (25,774ha) and 04 Territorial Reserve / Indigenous Reserve (2'620,423 ha) in the two landscapes. | 100,000 has been destined to the conservation of essential ecosystems through alternative modalities (additional to SINANPE). | 60 | S | The project has not foreseen actions for the political incidence and strategic communication that impel the political decision making for the creation of the conservation areas, especially in the cases whose viability is greater. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected** **Areas to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the matrix of the achievement of Results in Annex 10.**

In relation to the Output 1.2: Conservation agreements with local communities and organised groups to increase resilience in landscapes have been made, the project has contributed to the conceptualisation of conservation agreements and the definition of a proposal for guidelines to implement them at the SINANPE level. It is required to conclude this process with the appropriate level of socialisation, in order to formalise the existing proposals and move towards its implementation.

In relation to the goal, the YESI landscape progressed with 2 agreement proposals (roadmaps) in BPSMSC & PNYCH and 10 agreements were established in the RCY[[8]](#footnote-8). The project has also made progress in the strengthening of governance spaces at the local level that could later lead to conservation agreements, such as the Sepahua Surveillance Committee and the ECAs themselves through micro capital agreements. Table 4 below reflects the progress of the indicator, which is clarified in detail.

**Table 4 Output advance matrix 1.2**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Level of local participation in the supervision and control of NPA, measured in terms of the existence of conservation agreements through which local communities complement SERNANP actions. | Two conservation agreements in force in the prioritized PNAs (PNYCh and RCY) | At least one (01) conservation agreement in force in each prioritized NPA, thanks to which the local communities have greater participation in the control and management of NPA. | 20 | S | The progress towards the goal is limited, however, the impact of the Output is high since it will have repercussions at the SINANPE level.  In the area of Madre de Dios, the approach of the Project to local stakeholders has been limited, this may be a risk for the effective implementation of the conservation agreements that are established in this area, |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10.**

The third Output of Outcome 1 refers to the "Strengthening of the NPA’s management instruments (conservation areas and RI / RT) to address the threats induced by CC and the other pressures that affect resilience". The analysis shows that the project has made progress in the incorporation approaches to climate change and resilience into two master plans (PNAP, RCP) and another in the process (PNM). There were also 3 prior consultation processes for approval of the zoning (RCA, RCY, RCE).

Climate change and resilience approaches are still diffuse concepts to be incorporated into the management decisions of conservation areas, from SERNANP GORE, and private managers. The advances are presented in the following Table.

**Table 5 Output advance matrix 1.3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Level of incorporation of aspects related to resilience to CC in the management instruments of NPA, AC, and RT / RI. | None of the priority NPAs or conservation area, RT / RI has incorporated the resilience to the CC in their analyzes or master plans. | All prioritized PNAs have incorporated resilience to CC in their analyzes and master plans, which is reflected in their management decisions. | 15 | MS | While management decisions address the resilience strategies defined by the project, climate change and resilience approaches are still diffuse concepts for SERNANP, GORE, and private managers. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10.**

In relation to the Output 1.4 "Strengthened capacities for the management of NPA (Conservation Areas and RT / RI) in the context of adaptation to CC and increase ecosystem resilience", the results of the evaluation show that from this product, the project accompanied and promoted different strategies aimed at strengthening capacities for the management of conservation areas such as: review of 09 strategies for control and surveillance, spaces for polycentric governance (CAR, SCR, RBY), macro-regional meetings of SERNANP analysis of institutional networks and opportunities for alliance with relevant stakeholders, SIRAC’s work plan, biophysical and sociocultural analysis of ecosystem services, legal advice to reduce anthropogenic threats in the YESI landscape, training (ecosystem services, fire control, gender & interculturality, monitoring), 03 micro capital agreements with ECA (ECOSIRA, ECOPURÚS, AMARCY), equipment for control and surveillance with GPS and communication material.

During these processes, knowledge was strengthened and capacities were exercised for planning, participative & inclusive management, and the treatment of threats, both by state managers and the related population. It emphasises the level of remembrance of the training provided, which in some cases was replicated by trained stakeholders to other members of their organisations. The micro capital agreements also stand out as a tool to proceed in the closing of gaps in the capacities of the RCTs for the co-management and polycentric governance, and gaps for intercultural dialogue from the project team and state agencies.

During the mission in the field, the strengthening of the management capacities of the management committees was not visible. On the main approaches of adaptation to climate change and resilience, state stakeholders, grassroots stakeholders and partner institutions, do not identify the relationship between the Outputs and activities of the project, with the principles and strategies for the resilience defined. The project must identify the basic capacities required by the key stakeholders to internalise and operationalise these approaches in the management of the territory and the conservation areas, and complement the strategies deployed with other actions articulated to a strategy of capacity building, planned in conjunction with the stakeholders, including collective construction of processes: concepts such as resilience, strategy to strengthen the management committees in each case; and the validation and socialisation of technical studies approved.

About the METT tool, the project must improve the technical support for the application of the tool, aimed at reducing subjectivity and obtaining consistent information. The following table presents the progress of the indicators associated with the Output.

**Table 6 Output progress matrix 1.4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Better NPA management capacity, as measured by the METT tool. | PNYCh: 55, RCY:  60, BPSMSC: 47,  RCS: 57, PNM: 75,  PNAP: 62, RCP:  55, RCA: 44, SNM:  60. Average: 57.2 | Average NPA rating of 68.8 (according to METT tool). | 46 | S | Measuring the improvement of management capacity from the METT tool requires the careful application of good practices. The Project from the teams in the headquarters accompanied the SERNANP staff in application of the METT tool, however it did not receive any previous training nor was it evident the application of good practices in that exercise. |
| Effectiveness in the supervision and control of prioritized NAPs, measured in terms of compliance with monitoring and control strategies that include the CC context and action at the landscape level (at least PAN + ZA) | No PAN has a surveillance and control strategy that includes the CC context and the action at the landscape level (at least PAN + ZA). | 09 PAN have a monitoring and control strategy that includes the CC context and the action at the landscape level (at least PAN + ZA). At least, 04 PAN implements it. | 45 | S | The approach of climate change in the actions carried out by the Project to strengthen strategies is not yet evident. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10.**

The fifth Output of the Outcome refers to "Monitoring mechanisms established to measure the increase of the resilience in landscapes", in relation to its progress it is reported that connectivity has been defined as a monitoring variable, leaving the others in the process to be identified. SERNANP has established an ad hoc group to construct the indicators, and the project is reviewing the existing studies and articulating with international initiatives to facilitate the access of information to the group. The advance of the associated indicator is shown in the following Table.

**Table 7 Output progress matrix 1.5**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Number of variables for measuring resilience incorporated in the SINPANE monitoring system | The SINPANE monitoring system does not incorporate variables to measure resilience. | At least 07 variables for the measurement of resilience incorporated in the SINPANE monitoring system. | 0 | MU | Progress in the Output is delayed, no significant progress is evident. The time for SERNANP to start up the monitoring group for the identification of indicators and their incorporation into the SINPANE monitoring system has been extended. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10**

Finally, the activities related to the Output 6 "Financial mechanisms established to increase resilience in landscapes", show that the leadership of 9 PAN (RCP, PNAP, CER) and 3 RCTs were trained in the methodology to establish the financial gap, with the participation of the Heritage Peru Initiative, in such a way that the information be included in the cost of management goals of the Initiative.

SERNANP has been supported in the preparation of 3 conceptual notes of projects totalling around USD 50 million. It should also be mentioned the identification of other mechanisms for the financial sustainability of conservation areas, such as the MERESE in the case of the proposal by ACR Ausangate, and the formulation of productive projects for ACP. The progress and rating of the indicator are shown in the following Table 8.

**Table 8 Output progress matrix 1.6**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Availability of economic resources (US $) for the management of prioritized PNA taking into account the implications of CC. | Income (2014): $ 2'396,512  Resources needed (basic scenario): $ 4'398,771  Balance (basic e.):  - $ 2'002,259    Resources needed (optimal e.): $ 7,541,958  Balance (optimal e.): - $ 5'145,445 | Income from current sources 2'396,512  Income from other financial strategies 5'400,000  Total income 7'796,512  Resources needed (basic management scenario) with CC perspective -5'718,403  Resources needed (optimal management scenario) with CC perspective -9'804,545  Balance (basic management scenario) with perspective of CC + 2'078,109  Balance (optimal management scenario) with CC perspective -2'008,033 | 10 | MU | It is probable that the expected goal is not achieved, because the time required from the formulation of concept notes to the approval of projects, may exceed the execution time that remains for the Project.  Delay in the hiring of the consultancy. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10**

### Outcome 2: Resilient Productive landscapes to CC buffering PAN

This Outcome is made up of four different Outputs. The first refers to the "Institutional framework for the planning and management of buffer zones". The advances found show that the analysis of risks to climate change is underway. With the technical support of CEPLAN, the development process of PDLC (04 districts and 01 provinces) and PEI (04 districts and 01 provincial) of the YESI landscape was developed, which articulates life plans and master plans in the planning of the district and province. In the context of the transfer of management, the project should promote the socialisation of these documents with the elected authorities, and if it is feasible to obtain their approval by the municipal councils before the change of management. In the PUMA landscape, the project participates with technical contributions in the implementation of climate change strategies; At the Ucayali level, work is underway: 1. Update of the Regional Climate Change Strategy, with the participation of the 04 SERNANP leadership; 2. Contributions in the construction processes of the second phase of the DCI; 3. Mesa Redd Regional de Ucayali.

In relation to the participation of the ECA and indigenous organisations in environmental governance spaces, no evidence was identified. Rather, it has facilitated their participation in other key areas for the management of the PAN as prior consultation processes for the zoning of PAN, and to strengthen the co-management as national meetings of ECA, and working spaces with local governments. Table 9 shows the progress through its indicators.

**Table 9 Output progress matrix 2.1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Level of integration of the perspective of resilience to the CC in the planning instruments articulated in the three levels of government, in the prioritized provinces | No prioritized province nor its districts in the landscapes incorporate in its planning instruments the perspective of resilience to the CC, nor is it articulated between the three levels of government. | At least 1 province of 02 prioritized regions, and 1 district in each of them, have local planning instruments that incorporate the perspective of resilience to the CC and are articulated between the three levels of government | 40 | S | The follow-up for the approval of the PDLCs and PEI formulated has been limited, this being a key activity in the face of the change of municipal management. There is a risk that the documents remain at the level of non-binding proposals. |
| Greater participation of local communities, which promote gender equity, in environmental governance in landscapes. | No RCT of the 4 RCs, nor an indigenous federation representing the CCNN in the PAs of the prioritized PANs, intervene in the spaces of environmental governance. | Each one of the RCs of the 4 CR and at least 01 indigenous federation representing the CCNN in the ZA of the 9 PAN, within the scope of the project, are involved in at least 1 space of environmental governance (municipal environmental commissions, conciliation tables of fight against poverty, etc.). | 0 | MI | There is evidence of delay in the progress of the Output. It was not evident the approach of the Project to the indigenous organizations, to facilitate their participation in the spaces of governance that the Project invigorates.  In relation to the ECAs, the time remaining for the execution of the project may be limited to accompany their intervention in spaces of environmental governance. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10.**

The second Output of "Sustainable productive systems and resilient to the CC generate benefits in the sustainable management of the land and in reducing the extractive and demographic pressure in vulnerable ecosystems", realises that the project has elaborated a strategy for the implementation of productive activities, which includes technical, administrative and financial-accounting support from the Project, ECA in the case of RC and indigenous organisations in the other PANs. This strategy should include the strengthening of these organisations with cultural relevance, and provide greater sustainability to the initiatives to be undertaken. It also must be included the gender approach in a transversal manner, and the development of the capacities of technical teams' to implement.

The grassroots organisations have been identified and in one case the technical partner, the ambits to be intervened and the economic activities that will be strengthened in each ambit are contracted. During the mission in the field, the incorporation of the climate change adaptation approach was not identified as a priority for the stakeholders involved in this intervention, except in the case of the Rainforest Alliance partner. This organisation is developing the baseline to later implement improvement plans for resilient farms. The related indicators show low progress rates, as shown in the following Table.

**Table 10 Output advance matrix 2.2**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Increased potential of tree-based production systems (coffee, cocoa) to cushion PANs against the direct and indirect effects of CC in the prioritized provinces surrounding these | 49,914 ha of coffee and 14,500 ha of cocoa under shade in La Convención province; 7,804 ha of low coffee  shadow in the province of Oxapampa. | The areas remain stable but in 10% of the area (7,222 ha: 5,771 ha of coffee and 1,450 ha of cocoa), management systems are applied that promote resilience to the CC and cushion the PAN, contributing to the sustainability of local livelihoods and gender equality, which directly benefits 18,050 poor people (of which 8,123 are women and 80% are indigenous) | 10 | MU | There is considerable delay and there are still no advances in the field.  The experience of the technical partner is a strength to achieve the goal, however there is a risk of affecting sustainability due to the short time for implementation, and resource limitations. |
| Agroforestry systems in buffer zones contribute to global environmental benefits, stabilize landscapes and develop resilience to CC | 20,685 ha of agroforestry systems in buffer zones, with a total of 3'092,200tC and an average soil erosion rate of 2.64t per ha per year | An additional 2,000 ha of agroforestry systems in the buffer zones generate a total net increase of carbon sinks of 176,920tC and a total net erosion reduction of 208,000t, which benefits 20,000 poor people (mostly indigenous people and 9,000 women) in 4-000 families, through greater productivity and sustainability of their productive systems | 0 | I | No significant advances are reported.  Risk of affecting sustainability due to the short time needed to implement the strategy. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10.**

In relation to Output 3 "Forest management systems resilient to CC that facilitate sustainable management and effective conservation of forest ecosystems", Table 11 reports the progress recorded. In addition, the analysis shows that potential beneficiary organisations are being identified, and productive chains that could be strengthened (shiringa, handicrafts and copaiba oil). As in the previous Output, the project must ensure the inclusion of the climate change adaptation approach in these productive initiatives. Likewise, in the case of the Tayakome community in the PNM, the project must articulate this initiative with others implemented by local actors in Madre de Dios, such as FENAMAD.

**Table 11 Output progress matrix 2.3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Community forest management promotes the protection of forests in the context of the CC, and reinforces the rights to occupy the land of local communities. | The community forestry management plans promoted by the  forest protection, do not incorporate CC perspectives and resilience | Management plans for at least two products  non-timber, based on community forest management that promotes forest protection, incorporates CC perspectives and resilience, and reinforces the sense of ownership / ownership of the communal forest. | 5 | U | It presents important delay.  The technical partner (s) are not hired.  The time remaining for Project execution may be limited to achieve ownership and manage resources in a community manner.  Risk of affecting sustainability due to the short time needed to implement the strategy. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10.**

Finally, the four Output of "Capacities to develop, transfer and apply productive systems resilience to the CC, also shows a low advance (Table 12). The reported progress shows that in partnership with local institutions in the YESI landscape, it has initiated training on coffee quality, aimed at coffee men and women. The project should address training in a pragmatic manner, articulating other actions for capacity building from other products of the project, and ensure the inclusion of climate change adaptation and resilience approaches.

**Table 12 Output advance matrix 2.4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | Final goal | % Advance | Achievement rating | Justification of the valuation |
| Level of incorporation of aspects related to resilience to CC and biodiversity in rural extension programs | The community forestry management plans promoted by the  forest protection, do not incorporate CC perspectives and resilience | 18 extension agencies throughout the intervention area incorporate aspects of CC resilience and biodiversity conservation. | 5 | MU | It has a delay.  No significant advances are reported.  The training actions carried out are punctual, and their link with the indicator is limited. |

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

**\* Greater detail of the achievement matrix of Results in Annex 10.**

## Financial execution

The original budget of the Project proposed in the PRODOC ascends to USD 8.99 million for the 5 years of implementation, the resources come from the GEF. Up to June 2018 USD 3.079 million has been executed, equivalent to 34% of the total available resources. As shown in the following chart, most of the resources have been allocated to Outcome 1, to date they have executed close to USD 1.8 million, that is, 60% of the total. In the case of Outcome 2, USD 1.1 million or 36% have been executed (Graph 1).

**Figure 1 Budgetary Execution by Outcome**

**Source: UNDP Expenditure Report, 2018**

In relation to budget execution by type of expenditure, Figure 2 evidenced that, at mid-term of the execution project, there are still significant gaps in execution in different expenditure categories. So far, the execution needs of the Outcomes give a result that most of the resources have been channelled to individual contractual services that refer to payments to project personnel (project coordinator, regional coordinators, field technicians, specialists, etc.). In the next level are the payments for contractual services to companies, in which it has invested about USD 446 thousand (Figure 2).

**Figure 2 Budgetary Execution by Type of Expenditure**

**Source: UNDP Expenditure Report, 2018**

The budgetary execution at the beginning of the Project (2015) was USD 28.9 thousand, that is, 0.3% of the total resources executed to date. In the following years, the execution increased. This particular in the first year is normal for the standard process that all GEF projects follow, due to the time taken for the designation of the National Directorate and the preparation phase between UNDP and SERNANP. Figure 3 shows that once the project began to consolidate, budget execution also increased, that is how in 2017 USD 1.68 million was executed.

**Figure 3 Time Line of Budget Execution by Outcome**

**Source: UNDP Expenditure Report, 2018**

The increase in the execution is related to the fact that in subsequent years more resources were allocated to contracting consultancies, contractual services with companies and training, together representing 39.2%, that is, 23% more than in 2016. This trend maintains to June 2018, 34% of the total budget executed in the year has been allocated, the aforementioned can be seen in the following Figure 4.

The values ​​presented in the previous Figure agree with the data shown in the Financial Audit Report of the project for the years 2015, 2016 and 2017, in relation to the budget execution, this instrument allows the monitoring of the budgetary execution of UNDP. The conclusions of the report distinguish between the volume of values ​​budgeted and executed, until December 31, 2017, the results show an audited value of USD 555,493, as an available balance, corresponding to different types of expenditure (national consultants, tickets and travel expenses, contracts for company services, among others). The Report also mentions that according to the general ledger of assets and equipment audited up to the same date, the investment in the acquisition of assets and non-expendable assets was USD 203,989, with an audited balance of USD 0.

**Figure 4 Budgetary Execution by Type of Expenditure and Year**

**Source: UNDP Expenditure Report, 2018**

## Effectiveness and Efficiency

The effectiveness refers to the progress in the fulfilment of the activities planned, in relation to its percentage of progress towards the fulfilment of the different milestones and key processes. To determine the percentages of advancement by Outcome, it was made an average between the progress of the indicators that comprise them. From this perspective, a greater performance of Outcome 1 can be observed, which has a 28% fulfilment of its impact indicators. However, in terms of efficiency, which is understood as the ability to achieve the expected results with the minimum possible resources and in the shortest time possible, and assuming a linear correspondence between the budget execution and the achievement of the goals, the project presents in general terms a low performance in its two Outcomes. A clear example can be seen in the Figure, in relation to Outcome 2, it is observed that it has used 26% of the total of planned resources and only shows an advance of 10% in its implementation (Figure 5).

**Figure 5 Budgetary Execution vs% Implementation by Outcome**

**Source: UNDP Expenditure Report, 2018**

Since 2016, the execution of the project has been carried out in accordance with the annual plan of the POA, in 2017 the execution was 99%. Up to the end of the first semester of 2018, 34% of resources have been executed, this shows that despite the fact that during the first year the execution was low, the project found its way to improve budget execution. The project has 2 years and 10 months to make effective the remaining budget and according to the multi-year planning, it is expected to fulfil this objective. Outcome 2 shows that it has a pending execution of 74% of the total budget (Figure 6).

**Figure 6 Performance Gap by Outcome**

**Source: UNDP Expenditure Report, 2018**

## Results and Impact

In relation to the project’s progress and impact indicators, it is seen that there are important advances in the achievement of each one of them. However, it is important to note that these advances do not necessarily respond to the projects’ management, in some cases they could respond to interventions prior to the start of the project. There is still a need to homologate the application of these tools so that they can be methodologically comparable in the different measurement periods.

According to Figure 7, it can be seen that indicator 1 shows that 20% have been advanced in order to avoid the loss of 14,535 ha. An important and astonishing achievement through Indicator 4, shows the reduction in the probability of ecosystem involvement due to anthropogenic threats.

Considering that the project has a life expectancy of more than 2 years, it could be inferred that it is aimed at supporting SERNANP in the achievement of the goals if it is possible to advance with adequate planning. However, it is also true that the fulfilment of many of these indicators exceeds the management and the actual capacity of the project and that they are outside its sphere of influence.

**Figure 7 Level of progress in the impact indicators of the Project**

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

A second analysis has been made through the project monitoring tool (METT Sheet) for the Management Effectiveness Assessments of the GEF. The record was supplemented in 2013, 2016 and has been updated in 2017. In the Figure 8 is shown that after two years of project intervention, the management capacity of the PANs has been improved, with the exception of the Megantoni National Sanctuary.

**Figure 8 Variation of the scores of the METT sheet for the PAN of the Project**

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

In relation to the analysis of the reduction of threats for prioritised PANs, according to the measurement of the METT tool, on average it can be evidenced that it has decreased. The baseline to 2013 gave a score of 23, while for 2017 the score was 22.1, which translates into 3.4 points more than the target set (18.7 points). According to Figure 9, it can be evidenced that, in the case of the PANs of Megantoni National Sanctuary, Purús Communal Reserve, Manu National Park, Yanesha Communal Reserve and Yanachaga Chemillé National Park have reached the goal set.

**Figure 9 Reduction of threats for prioritised PANs, as measured by the METT tool**

**Source: Project "Transforming the Management of Complexes of Protected Areas / Landscapes to Strengthen the Resilience of Ecosystems", 2018**

## Monitoring and Follow-up

The project has followed the different milestones and monitoring and evauation tools established in the PRODOC. In support of the UNDP Environment Area, the project has executed several processes such as the inception meeting, midterm evaluation, the different types of reports provided (quarterly, annual), the PIR reports and holds regular meetings with the Council Executive.

In addition, the project manages the GEF monitoring tools, which correspond to three Tracking Tool: for Biodiversity projects, Focal Area of ​​Land Degradation and for SFM / REDD-Plus projects. In all cases, the tools have been updated in the course of this year in coordination with SERNANP. However, it is essential that clear methodological guidelines be generated so that these tools are filled in a consistent manner that allows for comparison and that also discriminates what is the real contribution of the project in the improvement or regression of the indicators analysed.

Various stakeholders, including the same project team, confirm that in previous years there was no solid monitoring tool that allows measuring the progress in graphics or percentages, the execution of the project, and it was not until the beginning of 2018 that they defined a tool that allows showing qualitative and quantitative information on the progress of the project. Despite this, it is still necessary to work on issues of access to the information generated by the project, cases are reported in which access is still limited.

In the case of the Steering Committee, it played a more informative role than deciding and discussing the problems found in the project. Which shows that it was not necessarily a space in which accounts can be rendered and commitments assumed, that is, there was no close and timely accompaniment to solve certain inconveniences that had been causing, especially in relation to the Competent 2.

In general, one of the project’s inconvenient is related to the monitoring of the project in relation to co-financing, which is not brought properly and a system or procedure for this purpose is not verified. There is no evidence that the issue of co-financing has been systematised yet. It is understandable that the registration of the different contributions is a complex issue, but it is necessary to show the contributions of the different institutions.

## Comparative Advantage UNDP

The UNDP has previous experience in the implementation field, as well as in the implementation of mechanisms related to climate change and resilience, through a portfolio of projects at national and international level, as a strength to ensure the availability of adequate capacities for the implementation of the project.

UNDP is a key partner of SERNANP that enjoys credibility and can mobilise support resources from other contributors to a national and international level.

The project is articulated with:

The project "Integrated Management of Climate Change in Communal Reserves in the Amazon" in Amazonas and Madre de Dios currently managed by an extension phase, seeks to reduce vulnerability to climate change for indigenous communities in the Peruvian Amazon, increasing its resistance through the incorporation of Community Based Adaptation (CBA) and Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EBA) strategies in the sustainable management of the RCA (Madre de Dios) and RCT (Amazonas) and of the beneficiary native communities. Within the framework of this project, micro-capital agreements were implemented to strengthen the capacities of the ECAs for co-management.

The project "Preparing the way for the full implementation of the “Transformation " phase of the Joint Declaration of Intent Peru-Norway-Germany" in Amazonas, San Martín, Ucayali, Pasco and Madre de Dios (2016 - 2018). This project supports the planning of the full implementation of the Phase of the Joint Declaration of Intent, analysis of deforestation, titling of indigenous territories, incentives for conservation, strengthening of capacities to control the change of land use and for the development of low carbon agriculture.

The Green Commodities Project (2015 - 2018) is implemented nationwide and seeks to ensure that certain commodities contribute to better livelihoods for the population, with a focus on climate change and biodiversity conservation. In Peru, it prioritised 4 deforestation drivers: coffee, cocoa, oil palm and livestock. Among other strategies, the project articulated the Peruvian National Coffee Plan and established a national technical assistance system for farmers to implement better production practices.

The Sustainable Productive Landscapes Project (2017 - 2023), whose objective is to promote sustainable production systems based on the integrated management of the landscape. It is implemented in two scales: national at the level of policies and regulations and at the level of land management in Ucayali and Huánuco. It has three Outcomes: improving the policy, planning and governance framework for the harmonised use of land and avoiding deforestation; promote incentives and financial mechanisms for sustainable production providing access to the producers to certification standards and markets, and strengthen technical capacities to rehabilitate and preserve ecosystems.

There is a long tradition of joint execution between projects under different modalities of implementation between UNDP and SERNANP, in that opportunity each institution assumes the responsibility and leadership of a Outcome. In practice, this meant a high level of commitment and interest from the part of SERNANP for the project to work, involving the participation of different levels within the institution. For example, it is mentioned that for the project team, even on different occasions, this interaction has been more effective and functional with SERNANP than with UNDP, which could be attributed to the considerable burden of projects currently handled by the UNDP portfolio.

## Sustainability

There are different factors that motivate us to think that, in general terms, the interventions of Outcome 1 show high viability in terms of their ability to remain over time and be nested and collected by other institutions once the project is completed.

On the one hand, the selection of executing partners for the project 1.1, in all cases shows a clear commitment of permanence over time. A large part of the selected portfolio already had some level of progress and development prior to the intervention of the project and it has been confirmed that the commitment is maintained independently at the close of the project. The conservation agreements, which, while showing a good perspective of being achieved within the project term, will still need to be strengthened through the project's exit strategy to ensure that they are effectively implemented.

The SERNANP Master Plan is a great opportunity, possibly the most important bet in which the project must influence to ensure the sustainability of its related products to integrate aspects of CC and resilience in the management tools at the system and site level, as well as, Outputs related to capacity building. In relation to capacity building, these are linked to the strengthening plan of SERNANP, and it is reported that new training topics have been included that have been defined with the support of human resources specialists in charge. These actions suggest a real possibility of staying after the project is finished.

The Output related to capacities and raising of financial resources does not present a high prospect of staying after the completion of the project. The Heritage of Peru (PdP) initiative could be mentioned as a great opportunity to give sustainability from a systemic perspective. In the development of the initiative are involved the leader of the PdP, General Secretary (SG) of SERNANP and the alternate direction of the projects. It is important that the project take advantage of this space to clearly show its additionality and perspectives of sustainability, for which is necessary the satisfactory completion of the sub products related to i.) interinstitutional strategic financial plan for adaptation to the CC; ii.) financial plans and financial coordination mechanisms for PAN; and, iii.) advocacy instruments and capacities scientific-based to promote budget allocation for adaptation in PAN.

Outcome 2 has the Strategy for the implementation of the productive activities of the project, however, a high risk is identified regarding the sustainability of the interventions carried out, due to the pressure that the project faces to quickly execute the products that have a considerable delay. The relatively modest budgets that are available, considering the ambitious scope in terms of time, area and number of beneficiaries, pose a risk of diluting the impact and compromising sustainability.

# Conclusions

* + In general, the project has a high pertinence and relevance in the national context; it responds to institutional priorities and policy guidelines. This is why it is important that other key institutions of the State, such as MINAM and MINCU, become more actively involved, which are important actors in order to give the project a greater strategic positioning and consequently strengthen its sustainability perspective.
  + The project presents a high complexity due to its multiple simultaneous fronts and the wide territorial surface that covers, which makes it very ambitious in relation to the time and resources available to execute. It is important to be very careful with the identification of priorities, accents and interventions foresaw especially in Outcome 2, to avoid the Project dilute its impact and show an unbalanced performance in the two Outcomes.
  + The project presents an innovative approach because it is a conceptual evolution of the community vulnerability approach towards a landscape resilience approach. Its internalisation and implementation in management decisions, from state and grassroots stakeholders, are learning processes that were not sufficiently foreseen from the design phase of the project. The complementarity between the knowledge and skills is relevant for the intervention to be carried out under the foreseen approaches, and to ensure processes driven by the project.
  + The design of the project has received contributions from other programs and projects of the UNDP portfolio, such as the Ecosystem-based Adaptation Program (EbA). In addition, the project contributed to the design of the project proposal Sustainable Productive Landscapes (PPS) and is currently articulated as with the Green Commodities Program.
  + At the beginning of the project, the team showed that there were some difficulties in the design of the project and Outcome indicators. For this reason, with the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation technical assistance, it was decided to modify several indicators, which in certain cases included revising its baseline and the proposed goal, and in other cases a regrouping and reordering. This suggests weaknesses and inconsistencies both in the concept, which had to be revised in depth and in the delimitation of the intervention zones and the selection of priorities and intervention strategies in each site.
  + The central theme of resilience, which gives its name to the project, while it has been conceptualised principles and strategies have been defined, in some cases, it is not clear how it is operationalised from the Outcomes and their results. Likewise, resilience as a differential approach of the project remains unnoticed or in other cases as a diffuse concept for stakeholders outside of UNDP, a situation that contributes to each stakeholder awaits the priorities they identify will be accepted by the project.
  + The construction of key concepts, definition of principles and strategies, should involve the different levels of project management and key actors, which will facilitate the appropriation of the project and the different approaches that it promotes. In that sense, the political profile and strategic communication have a key role that should be strengthened by UNDP and SERNANP.
  + The project represents a great opportunity to strengthen the management and vision of conservation. For example, in the case of SERNANP, the project contributes to expanding the outlook of the PANs; in the case of the GORES that have started the work with the systems of regional conservation areas (ACR); ECAS that can strengthen its management in order to be replicated in other sites, etc.
  + The implementation arrangements reflect an appropriate division of roles based on the nature and ambit of each Outcome. The most successful Outcome up to this evaluation has been the one led by SERNANP, about whom it is mentioned that in general terms it has a faster response capacity to serve the project team than UNDP. Although at the beginning it rotated between different areas of SENRNAP, the National Project Direction has given rhythm and leadership to the project.
  + Gender and intercultural approaches can enhance the success of the processes among the stakeholders, facilitating their sustainability, while at the same time facilitating an adequate relationship and keeping communication channels open. The learning towards the intercultural dialogue is of multiple routes, from the different towns, the institutions that represent them, the institutions of the State and the institutions of the project (SERNANP, UNDP).
  + Up to June 2018, the project has executed USD 3,079 million, equivalent to 34% of the total resources available, most of the resources have been allocated to Outcome 1. Outcome 2 has executed 26% of its total budget and shows an advance of 10% in the implementation of their goals, while Outcome 1, with 43% of budget execution reaches 28% in the achievement of their goals.
  + Considering that the project has a lifetime of more than 2 years, it could be inferred that it is aimed at supporting SERNANP in the achievement of the goals if it is possible to move forward with adequate planning. However, it is also true that the fulfilment of many of these indicators depends on the good performance and management of SERNANP both in the central plant and in the territory, as well as, other external factors such as threats to the integrity of the NPA, which do not depend exclusively of the capacity of the project.
  + The project manages all the monitoring and tracking tools of the GEF, its management has been adaptive and has shown an ascending performance, until reaching to the beginning of 2018 a tool that allows qualitative and quantitative information on the progress of the project. Despite this, it is still necessary to work on matters that are detailed in the recommendations, especially on the filling of the Tracking Tool and the registration of co-financing. However, the Technical Committee of the project has not been established, which is foreseen in the PRODOC.
  + The appropriation of the project is relatively low, the project is much more identified with the UNDP than with the SERNANP, a fact that is more evident at the head office level but is also shared by stakeholders at the central level in Lima. The document includes, in section 3.2, at least five reasons that may explain this perception and some related recommendations.
  + The start of the project execution took longer than estimated, given that the project team invested a considerable amount of time in updating and adjusting the original planning expressed in the PRODOC. Other delays that affected the project were caused by the designation of the National Direction in SERNANP, and in the hiring of the National Coordinator, as well as the designation and recruitment, this last process took 6 months because the first contest was declared unfulfilled.
  + The Outcomes advance separately, with little correlation between the progress and achievements of the activities and sub-products of each Outcome. For this reason, it is evident that they do not take advantage of opportunities for mutual benefit. Although this could be seen as an inconvenience, it also opens the opportunity to correct and take better advantage of the installed capacities with a less restrictive division of tasks and functions per Outcome.
  + There is a weakness in relation to the participation of the head offices in the development of the different products of the contracted consultancies. Likewise, the information that is generated through these spaces are not shared, or it is in a superficial manner with key stakeholders such as the GORE, ECA, heads of NPA. The latter has a particular interest in learning about these important inputs and are key partners in the implementation and sustainability of the products developed.
  + The project has a lot to communicate and paradoxically shows a discrete performance in terms of its capacity to deploy better communication responses. For example, it has been shown that in the election process, the main matters managed by the project, such as regional conservation areas, connectivity or resilience, were not placed on the candidates' agenda.
  + A risk is anticipated in relation to Outcome 1 as of the change of authorities, due to the possibility that the key personnel who have accompanied and lead the monitoring of the products and tools developed in the regions do not remain in their positions. This would force to strengthen the management of the project at the political level and to work again in the training of the technicians of the counterparts.
  + Regarding the first Output, the project identified 10 local initiatives for the creation of biodiversity and agrobiodiversity conservation areas in priority zones that in total involve 284,065 ha, under different legal frameworks and mechanisms, between ACR, ACP, CC, in some innovative cases in the national context such as the recognition of agrobiodiversity zones in Cusco. The processes of recognition of conservation areas under the leadership of SERNANP, are at different levels of progress and possibilities to materialise during the time of execution of the project, so it is convenient to prop up from a political role of UNDP and the project to those with greater viability, accompanied by a communication strategy for the incidence in political decision makers.
  + With regard to Output 1.2, the project has contributed to the conceptualisation of conservation agreements, and the definition of a proposal for guidelines to be implemented at the SINANPE level. It is necessary to conclude this process with the appropriate level of socialisation, in order to formalise the existing proposals and move towards their implementation.
  + Regarding Output 1.3, the project has made progress in incorporating climate change and resilience approaches into two master plans (PNAP, RCP) and another in (PNM) process. Also, 3 prior consultation processes for approval of the zoning (RCA, RCY, RCE) were made. The result of this Output has yet to be seen in terms of its applicability and appropriation by NPA managers, which is why it is essential to work on articulation with other Outputs of this Outcome such as Output 1.4.
  + In relation to Output 1.4, the project accompanied and promoted different strategies aimed at strengthening capacities for the management of conservation areas. During these processes, knowledge was strengthened and capacities for planning, participative and inclusive management were exercised, the treatment of threats, both by state managers and the related population. There is still a way to go in relation to the strengthening of the capacities of the management committees and fundamentally in strengthening the main approaches of adaptation to climate change and landscape resilience.
  + Outputs 1.4 and 1.5 are the ones that present the least advance within this Outcome 1. On the one hand, regarding the "Monitoring mechanisms established to measure the increase of resilience in landscapes", SERNANP has established an ad hoc group to build the indicators to which the project feeds technically. As for the "Financial mechanisms established to increase resilience in landscapes", the updating of financial gaps has been supported with the leadership of 9 NPA (RCP, PNAP, RCE) and 3 ECAs, SERNANP has been supported in the elaboration of project concept notes and opportunities such as the MERESE have been identified in the case of the Ausangate ACR proposal, and the formulation of productive projects for ACP.
  + Output 2.1 refers to the "Institutional framework for the planning and management of buffer zones". The advances recorded include the analysis of risks to climate change, the preparation of PDLC and PEI of the YESI landscape, which articulates life plans and master plans in the planning of the district and province. In the PUMA landscape, the Project participates with technical contributions in the implementation of climate change strategies.
  + Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 are angular within the design of the project and show a considerable delay in their implementation. At the moment, both sustainable production systems and forest management systems have an implementation strategy, grassroots organisations have been identified and in one case the technical partner who will be responsible for the execution in the territory, is hired. Finally, Output 2.4 closely related to the implementation of Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 also shows discrete progress in its implementation.
  + The working matrix for monitoring the financing and co-financing matter has been updated on the proposal in the PRODOC, it is evident that various stakeholders, in both cases, intervene and invest in the project in the same ambit and with common or complementary topics. In general, the commitment of co-financing is to support the achievement of results and complementarity of the project and also contributes to its sustainability, in this sense, it is evident that commitments have also been updated, however, a more structured effort can still be made in relation to the definition of strategic partners for the development and sustainability of the Outputs and Outcomes of the project.
  + It is evident that part of the professionals who provide technical assistance for the ECAs, in terms of micro-financing, has previously worked in the Peruvian Amazon; however, this does not mean that they are specialised in capacity building in an intercultural context. There is a need to strengthen their capacities and provide them with management tools to improve their relationship with the beneficiaries and the effectiveness of their intervention.
  + In general, the impact indicators of the project show important advances, although it would be ideal to establish the extent to which the advances respond directly to the intervention of the project. Such is the case of the reducing indicator of the ecosystem damage probability due to anthropogenic threats, which has reached a score of 100%. The goal linked to the increase in connectivity is at 40% compliance, while the reduction of threats and the habitat loss rate maintain a 20% performance.
  + The contribution of the project has been verified through the METT tool, applied to the nine NPAs, since 2013 (baseline) 8 of the 9 protected areas have shown better performance in relation to their management. In relation to the reduction of threats from the nine NPAs, the project has contributed to the fact that in 5 protected areas the indicator not only meets its goal but also falls even further than anticipated. Although there are some issues in which management has been maintained, it is evident that most of the aspects evaluated by the METT record show improvement in management, although clearly these results cannot be attributed exclusively to the management of the project.
  + The project has promoted processes that have allowed to improve knowledge and exercise the capacities of regional, local governments, ECA, NPA leadership, local population in the management of the territory, control and surveillance, prior consultation, among other aspects, still diffuse the concepts of adaptation to climate change and resilience, and therefore its application in management decisions.
  + The articulation with ongoing initiatives is a good strategy implemented by the project, which will contribute to the achievement of indicators and may influence the sustainability of the results. On the other hand, the selection of executing partners for Output 1.1, in all cases shows a clear commitment to permanence over time.

# Recommendations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General recommendations** | **Responsable** |
| It is recommended to raise the political profile of the project, especially with the regions that have new authorities, as well as with MINAM and MINCU, important actors to give a greater strategic positioning to the project and strengthen its perspective of sustainability. It is essential to complement the technical assistance with the political intervention in the territory through a greater presence and direct involvement of the Coordinator, with the support and accompaniment of the authorities of SERNANP and UNDP. | UNDP  Project Team  SERNANP  MINAM  MINCU |
| It is recommended to contact the new authorities elected in regions who will approve or inherit the plans or processes that have been developed. It is important to confirm and ratify the commitments regarding the execution of the different activities related to the project, this process must be led by the project team and SERNANP and supported by UNDP. | UNDP  Project Team  SERNANP |
| Within project management, a greater collaboration of the whole team could be sought to strengthen Outcome 2. There are spaces for opportunities of mutual benefit, as well as talents and skills in the team that can be complementary, and that should not necessarily be categorically divided between Outcomes, on the contrary, this condition would allow work on cross-cutting issues that allow adding value from existing multiple competencies. | Project Team |
| It is important to seek better articulation and closeness with CONPAN and AIDESEP to improve coordination and keep these organisations informed about the interventions and activities planned with their bases. It is recommended to promote a more active linkage of these actors in the different fronts of the project and maintain open channels of information, and coordination in all interventions in the territory. | Project Team |
| The project has a lot of information to communicate, it is important to use communication as a strategic tool to achieve results. This condition must be reflected in an internal work document that serves as a Communication Plan until the end of the remaining period of execution. | Project Team |
| It is recommended that the project actively promotes spaces for the internal socialisation of strategies implemented by partner institutions in the execution of Outcomes 1 and 2. For example, these spaces can occur in relation to strategic communication for political advocacy (ACCA), incorporation of climate approaches in productive initiatives (RA), management of micro capitals by grassroots organisations (UNDP), interculturality (IBC, AIDESEP, CONAP), strengthening of conservation areas oriented towards financial sustainability (ACCA), adaptation to climate change (UNDP). | Project Team  UNDP |
| It is recommended to strengthen the exchange of experiences between implementing partners and beneficiary organisations, for example, these may be related to the creation of new conservation areas, the execution of micro capital agreements (ECA), economic empowerment with gender equality (ECOPURUS, Mabu Hiwe), among others. These spaces would stimulate learning and would facilitate the systematisation of processes and their sustainability. | Project Team |
| It is fundamental to strengthen the common understanding of the conceptual approach of the project in relation to the resilience of the landscape so that it is shared and understood by all participating institutions equally. It is recommended to build it jointly between SERNANP, MINAM, ECAS and Management Committees, through an inclusive methodology of the actors in Lima and regions that favours the appropriation and sustainability of the project. | Project Team  SERNANP |
| It is necessary to standardise and validate the application of the METT sheet and other Tracking Tools of the project so that they keep methodological forcefulness. The project should improve the technical support for the application of the tool, aimed at reducing subjectivity and obtaining consistent information. | Project Team  SERNANP |
| It is important to evaluate the external factors that are beyond the scope of the project team and the impact on compliance with the impact indicators. It is recommended that the monitoring tools record what the specific contribution of the project to the performance registered in each indicator has been, considering that there are other projects and initiatives whose synergistic and cumulative effects also support the achievement of the goals. | Project Team  SERNANP |
| It is recommended to look for a more balanced relationship with the different stakeholders, particularly those with whom the project has almost no relationship, such as the Regional Government of Madre de Dios. In all cases, the project must consider a proactive approach in presenting the project to the new authorities and positioning the major issues of the project in those who are about to assume their new positions. | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP |
| It is necessary to work more in leveraging resources and have more detailed and strategic management regarding the tracking and monitoring of co-financing, this at a methodological level. At the same time, a mapping of opportunities can be developed to seek financing with other stakeholders for resilience issues at the landscape level. | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP |
| The Steering Committee must strengthen its role, and become a space for decision and strategic accompaniment to the execution of the project. Likewise, the role of SERNANP in promoting a greater level of involvement and participation of the different institutions that make it up is important, in order to include the project in their work agendas. | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP |
| At this stage of the implementation, it is not considered necessary to put together the Technical Committee of the project. On the one hand, there is a risk of redundancy considering that AIDESEP and CONAP already participate in the Steering Committee. On the other hand, the project could lose some operability. However, it is recommended that the team maintain spaces for dialogue and constant communication with the GORE in order to receive their comments and technical contributions. | Project Team |
| It is recommended to implement strategies to increase the ownership of the project such as lowering the profile to the corporate image of the project and upload the profile of SERNANP, change the physical location of the team and the domains of the email to SERNANP, include SERNANP in the relationship and execution of activities with implementation partners | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP |
| For future projects, the definition of the implementation arrangements should consider the current project load of the implementation agency and its ability to simultaneously address a wide and complex portfolio. | UNDP |
| It is recommended that the project accompanies the participation of indigenous federations and ECA in the spaces of polycentric governance promoted by the project, and contribute to clarifying the role of each one. | Project Team |
| It is recommended to develop or strengthen the capacities of the project team at Lima and head offices level, to incorporate a gender and intercultural approach. Likewise, identify one or two people in the project, who support in the follow-up of the application of these approaches, in a coordinated manner with the gender and interculturality specialist of the UNDP Amazon Program. | Project Team  UNDP | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Recommendations Outcome 1** | | | The portfolio of new conservation areas exceeds the goal; at this point, priority must be given only to those opportunities that offer a high or very high probability of being finalised within the project deadlines. It is recommended to open up the portfolio and optimise the use of existing resources. | Project Team  SERNANP | | It is necessary to actively promote the institutional participation of SERNANP in the articulation with the implementation partners of the project to demonstrate the work on the creation of new conservation areas, NPA, connectivity, extension, etc. | Project Team  SERNANP | | Strengthen the Conservation Systems of Regional Conservation with key actions, especially in the areas where conservation areas will be created, as part of the regional institutional framework for territorial management. | Project Team | | It is recommended that SERNANP invigorate the process for approval of the guidelines with the appropriate level of socialisation and capacity building, in order to formalise the existing proposals and move towards their implementation. | SERNANP | | Balance the approach of the project in the two areas of intervention, with the leadership ECA and CG, in order to identify opportunities for the Conservation Agreements and strengthen the participation of the communities. | Project Team | | The SERNANP Master Plan is a great opportunity, possibly the most important bet in which the project must influence to ensure the sustainability of its related products to integrate aspects of CC and resilience in the management tools at the system and site level, as well as products related to capacity building. | Project Team  SERNANP | | The project must identify the basic capacities required by the key actors to internalise and operationalise these resilience and adaptation approaches to climate change in the management of the territory and conservation areas, and complement the strategies deployed with other actions articulated to a strategy of capacity building, planned in conjunction with the stakeholders. This includes processes of collective construction of concepts such as resilience and adaptation of landscapes, strategy to strengthen the management committees in each case; and the validation and socialisation of technical studies completed. | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP | | Develop a strategy and a plan for capacity building from a broad and comprehensive perspective, which reflects all the key concepts and issues proposed by the project in a tool suitable for different audiences, profiles and roles of each actor. The support of a specialised profile in institutional capacity building is recommended, which can support the team in identifying audiences, capacity gaps and developing the most appropriate strategies for each audience. | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP | | Continue supporting processes within SERNANP such as the approval of guidelines for conservation agreements, and position key approaches such as resilience, climate change, connectivity, in the monitoring system and in future processes such as updating the Master Plan. | Project Team  SERNANP | | It is recommended that SERNANP streamline the operation of the monitoring group, for the identification of variables to measure resilience and its subsequent incorporation into the SINANPE monitoring system. | SERNANP | | It is evident that on the progress of the project, the corresponding adjustments were made to various indicators, the one corresponding to 1.6 did not suffer any variation, however, according to this evaluation it is suggested to adjust the scope of the indicator 1.6 so that, instead of proposing financial mechanisms established, adjusting to financial mechanisms in the implemented process. Likewise, instead of a collection goal of USD 5.4 million, it should mention a goal of committed or directed resources. | Project Team  UNDP  SERNANP | | Among the strategies to achieve the goal of USD 5.4 million should include the concretion of co-financing commitments and complementary contributions from national and international sources for the sustainability of the project. | Project Team  UNDP  SERNANP |      |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Recommendations Outcome 2** | | | The project has promoted relevant participatory processes for territorial management through the formulation of the PDLC and PEI in the province of Oxapampa. The socialisation of these documents with the elected authorities should be encouraged, and if it is feasible to obtain their approval by the municipal councils before the change of management. | Project Team | | Incorporate climate change and resilience approaches into actions that are planned to strengthen existing conservation areas, formulate or update management instruments, and ensure that the intervention of technical partners incorporates these approaches. | Project Team  SERNANP | | It is recommended to take advantage of the fact that there is a Conceptual Model of Climate-Smart Practices for Coffee and Cocoa. The fact of having a strategic principle that makes it possible to differentiate the activities carried out within the framework of the project, become key points when evidencing the topics of climate change and resilience. | Project Team  SERNANP | | It is recommended to make more flexible, the selection of productive activities so that not only coffee and cacao are prioritised in the identified zones. There is a large number of products that have been identified by the NPA heads and that would be more compatible with the concept of resilience. | Project Team | | To have strategic principles and guidelines that make it possible to differentiate the activities carried out within the framework of the project, from those that are traditional support to the producer, evidencing issues of climate change and resilience. Specifically, it is recommended that the technical partners for the implementation of strategies 2.2 and 2.3 support the internalisation of these approaches, with indigenous and grassroots organisations that are articulated. | Project Team  SERNANP | | It is recommended that future partners for strategies 2.2. and 2.3 consider in their work methodology the criteria on climate change considered by the Rainforest Alliance within the framework of the contract with the project, also incorporating the methodology for surveying the baseline. | Project Team | | The project strategy for the productive activities of Outcome 2 should include organisational strengthening with cultural relevance and gender focus. | Project Team | | It is recommended to better prepare teams to provide technical assistance in relation to financial and administrative management, in order to have a more careful approach with intercultural aspects at the time of access to indigenous organisations. Two aspects are particularly relevant, the first relates to the skills, tools and knowledge to transfer skills in grassroots organisations. The second is related to transferring skills and action protocols to work with indigenous organisations. | Project Team  SERNANP | | In indicator 2.2, it is important to review the inclusion of other biodiversity products as part of local production systems, with the potential to buffer NPAs against the direct and indirect effects of CC.  In relation to the goal, it is important to review a decrease in the number of hectares and the number of beneficiaries for resilient production systems, in order to improve the impact and sustainability of the intervention. | Project Team  SERNANP | | Search alliances for co-financing and sustainability of productive activities, for which it is necessary to carry out a more political work from the territory, showing a greater presence in the head offices and looking for alternatives for the exit strategy of the project. Therefore, it is important to take advantage of one of the financial sustainability activities proposed in the project (Strategy 1.6), specifically designed to raise funds. | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP | | It is fundamental that the consulting products that are generated in the project, in relation to the NPA, be shared and socialised to the users and institutions, who will be the main users of the information. | Project Team  SERNANP | | Improve the linkage of the project intervention with other opportunities that are being implemented, such as Phase 2 of EbA, the PPS and other interventions of the UNDP portfolio. This proposal is made under the consideration that the aforementioned projects are in an implementation phase and fit appropriately with the activities of Outcome 2. | Project Team  SERNANP  UNDP | | Promote the participation of the ECAs and indigenous organisations in spaces of environmental governance, in an articulated manner to the strategy of capacity building. | Project Team  SERNANP | |  |  |

1. Population originally from another place, who has migrated to the field of landscapes where the project is executed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 1 Diagnosis of Q'ero crafts in the Japu Peasant Community and planning proposals for organisational strengthening and commercialisation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In Ucayali ProPurús with 2 proposals for CC, in Pasco - Huánuco IBC with proposals for ACR and ACP, and in Cusco ACCA with ACR proposals. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The proposal of ACR Marcapata Camanti was not included in the list because the project will define during the second semester 2018 the pertinence of investing financial resources, according to the perspectives for the process. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. To measure progress in the establishment of conservation areas, three stages have been considered: 1: identification of the initiative, contact with institutional and related stakeholders; 2: preparation of technical documentation according to sectoral regulations, with commitments from institutional and grassroots actors; 3: the process or file is in decision-making bodies for the creation of the conservation area. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Proposals from ACP Kika, Cheli, Nanayo, Santa Rita, Cortez, Francisco, Churumazú, Osopampa. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. ACP Zaragosa and Fundo Las Neblinas. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Within the framework of the micro capital agreement with AMARCY. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)