

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 103		Review date:		11/03/06
IA/EA Project ID:	P039876	GEF financing:	at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Biodiversity Resources Development		7.0	7.0
Country:	Costa Rica	IA/EA own:		
		Government:		
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	4.0	17.2
Operational Program:	3, 4	Total Project Cost:	11.0	25.6
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Instituto Nacional para la Biodiversidad (INBio)	Work Program date		03/01/1997
		CEO Endorsement		02/04/1998
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		07/14/1998
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
		06/30/2005	12/31/2005	
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 7 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 7 years 6 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 6 months
Author of TE:	-	TE completion date: 06/29/2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: 9/12/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1.5 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR (PSR)	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	S	S	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	HL	HL	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	-	-	UA

2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	U	MS
--------------------------------------	-----	-----	---	----

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

No. This review agrees with the conclusions of the IEG review in that the TE did not provide a complete assessment of the project implementation. The TE should have included:

1. An upfront explanation of how the objectives were clarified between the Project Document-MTR-TE such as was available in the MTR;
2. More accurate cost reporting;
3. An assessment of the project's M&E system, and an expanded section on the quality (as opposed to the frequency) of Bank supervision;
4. A better explanation of the ways in which the project fits into the overall multi-donor program, in particular, in relation to the value added of separately funded and conducted participatory workshops and input mechanisms;
5. Better treatment of the indigenous issues. There is a gap between the intended financing of the work of the Commission on the Use of Indigenous Knowledge and the Sharing of Benefits, for example and actual work that was conducted with the Indigenous Conference (it is unclear if members of the Commission are the same as the members represented through the Conference).

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

No

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

• **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the Project Document the project would demonstrate that increased knowledge and information about particular species enhances their value and increases the marketability of biodiversity services, by enhancing the knowledge of Costa Rica's species, testing methodologies for undertaking a cost effective inventory, and maximizing the value of those species and the social return to the investment in knowledge through conservation and sustainable use.

According to the TE, the project global objective is to demonstrate that increased knowledge about species leads to a benefit in conservation and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity. Such benefits would be achieved by enabling more sustainable use and through increasing awareness of the importance of biodiversity.

• **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The Project Document mentions that the project would: (a) monitor and update the framework for undertaking a comprehensive biodiversity inventory of four major taxonomic groups - Hymenoptera, Coleoptera, vertebrate parasites, and fungi; (b) complete an inventory of these four major taxonomic groups at the ACG; (c) develop and test revenue and non-revenue generating activities related to the inventory; and (d) strengthen the institutional capacity at INBio.

The IEG review states that while there were no formal revisions of the objectives or components of the project, the objectives were "informally clarified" during the MTR process by the Bank team. Specifically, the project would: (a) increase the knowledge about a sub-set of Costa Rican species; (b) improve the sustainable use of biodiversity; and (c) improve the awareness of the importance of biodiversity.

The IEG review found that there are some inconsistencies in the way the objectives were articulated between the Project Document, the MTR and the ICR. Then it evaluated the project in the context of its long-term goal (improve the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity), identifying the following specific objectives: (a) to enhance the knowledge of these species; (b) to test methodologies for under-taking a cost-effective inventory of these

species; and (c) to demonstrate how increased knowledge and information about these species could enhance their value and increase their marketability.
3.2 Outcomes and Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the major project outcomes and impacts, as described in the TE? <p>According to the TE the project's major outcomes and impacts were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contributed and generated information used for decision-making in the conservation areas of the country (e.g. change in category from Diria Wildlife Refuge to National Park; contribution of biological information to justify biological corridors and payment of environmental services) - developed practical methodologies and protocols to carry out biodiversity inventories that have been learned in global initiatives such as the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) and at regional scale - supported the negotiations of new projects in sustainable biodiversity use through INBio's bioprospecting program. Project-supported initiatives included, among others, the discovery of a new species of fungus that could fight pathogens in the vanilla plant, and the identification of 60 edible mushrooms with cultivation and marketing potential.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes	
A Relevance	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain <p>Both the Project Document and IEG review identify that the project's objectives were consistent with the guidelines of the Third Conference to the Parties (COP3) by supporting increased human and institutional taxonomic capacity, prioritizing species important in pollinization (Hymenoptera and Coleoptera) or in soil fertility (Coleoptera and fungi) as well as Costa Rica's National Conservation Strategy. The outcomes listed in the TE show that the project has contributed to promoting and improving the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity through the generation of information to support conservation measures.</p>	
B Effectiveness	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? <p>The project outcomes described in the TE, according to the specific objectives that IEG understands were intended to be achieved at project approval are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The objective to enhance the knowledge of four (later 5) taxonomic groups to benefit conservation and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity was highly achieved. Recognizing that the initial quantitative targets for species identified were not fully achieved, the project succeeded in identifying and cataloging a significant number of new species (2,000 new species were discovered and approximately 3 million specimens were catalogued). Inventory results for the 5 taxonomic groups can be accessed globally via Atta -- INBio's online biodiversity database at http://atta.inbio.ac.cr. Vouchered specimen data has also been provided to the Global Biodiversity Information Facility. Specialized taxonomic information has been disseminated to the world's scientific community in more than 1,000 publications in specialized journals. Furthermore, as enumerated in the TE, the identification and cataloging of new species led to several policy outcomes related to changes in land use categorization, definition of priority zones for payment of environmental services, hunting seasons, improvement of the management of butterfly sites and coffee leach scorch etc. 2. The objective to test methodologies for under-taking a cost-effective inventory of these species was highly achieved. The TE notes that INBio was the first institution in the world to implement a bar-coding system - which has expedited data entry, reduced errors, which has thus significantly reduced collecting costs. 3. The objective of demonstrating how increased knowledge and information about these species could enhance their value and increase their marketability was only modestly 	

achieved. Despite the fact that from the beginning of the project it was anticipated that most “real world” applications based on the inventory likely would not be realized during its duration, important project-supported initiatives were implemented.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	
<p>The IEG review found that the project was implemented and supervised in a highly efficient manner. The most efficient aspect of the implementation of the project was the in-kind contributions made by 350 international taxonomists from 170 countries that contributed collectively 40,000 volunteer days to the inventory component of this project. However, it also found that the GEF project's support of the country-led and InBio-managed Multi-Donor Integrated investment program for Biodiversity Conservation (Norad, Canada and the Netherlands) was highly efficient due to its willingness to operate within a programmatic framework. This enabled joint activities, joint missions (supervision), progress reporting etc. Given the successful nature of donor cooperation in this case, INBio adopted the integrated program's operational plan as its own. This uptake led to the further institutional strengthening of InBio (one of the GEF's project's component objectives).</p> <p>The TE mentions that INBio was the first institution in the world to fully implement a barcoding system in its collection, and that barcoding expedited data entry and reduced errors, thus significantly reduced collecting costs.</p>	

Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? <p>No one project indicator unambiguously links the biological inventories and research with improved biodiversity conservation, however, the project-generated information influenced a variety of important conservation decisions. According to the TE (pg. 31) these were related to changes in land use categorization, definition of priority zones for payment of environmental services, hunting seasons, improvement of the management of butterfly sites and coffee leach scorch, among others.</p> <p>In addition, the TE identifies that the project made an important contribution to addressing the “taxonomic impediment” – the widely recognized global lack of basic taxonomic expertise that limits many efforts to find applied uses for biodiversity.</p>

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: L
According to the TE, the main project activities were incorporated into INBio's institutional programming, which provided for other future sources of financing. Starting in 1997, there was a strong focus on the sustainability of INBio which led to a very aggressive fundraising and diversification process that has been complemented by a significant increase in its own-generated funds from goods and services.	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
According to the Project Document, the project was expected to generate direct and indirect employment in the local communities surrounding the conservation areas. However, the TE (Annex 8 – Borrower's Summary Evaluation) mentions that the perception remains that INBio has not liaised sufficiently with local communities or with direct users of biodiversity resources. On the other hand, it states that INBio is widely known and respected in public, political, and scientific circles, and that it is influential in promoting and implementing environmental conservation efforts.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
The TE mentions that the project was extremely successful at improving the capacity of INBio	

(financial, administrative, operational, etc), therefore considerably minimizing possible future risks regarding the issue of Institutional framework and governance.

D Environmental

Rating: L

The Project Document identified over-sampling as a risk, but the TE mentions that it was determined not to be a concern given the minimal sampling effort and dispersed geographic locations of sampling areas.

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

A Financial resources	Rating: HL
B Socio political	Rating: L
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: HL
D Environmental	Rating: HL
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: HL	

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good

Information gathered by the project has been disseminated through many scientific and educational publications produced by their in-house publishing group, editorial INBio; through their public educational facility INBioparque; and through the frequent presence of INBio on television, radio, and in print media.

2. Demonstration

As the largest provider of vouchered specimen data to the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, INBio has been chosen to lead mentoring programs with Argentina, Nicaragua, and Peru.

3. Replication

INBio's information database (Atta) was created during the project, and has been a model for other systems being installed in Central American herbaria and others across the world.

4. Scaling up

-

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)

Rating: U

The IEG review of the M&E system found that of the twelve performance indicators provided in the Project Document six are numeric (number of species catalogued, number of parataxonomists trained, number of voluntary taxonomic days, etc) and the Performance Monitoring Table provides only output type quantitative targets. The TE Log Frame Matrix (p. 17) also only identifies numeric indicators, in spite of the many policy oriented decisions the project influenced. The Matrix introduces 6 new indicators, but consistently across the entire matrix, there is no baseline data against which to assess project performance. In general, the indicators were not entirely appropriate to measure progress towards the achievement of project's objectives.

B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

Rating: UA

The TE does not provide complete information on how the M&E system was implemented and used. It only mentions that the Bank's supervision of the project was technically and administratively consistent throughout the lifetime of the project, that INBio's annual

implementation reports and operational plans were of high quality and submitted on time, and that suggestions from the supervision missions were taken into consideration.
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? Rating: UA
No information is provided to assess this.
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess this project's M&E system.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?
<p>The TE lists the following lessons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Select a mature institution as the project executing agency. INBio had years of experience in biodiversity research and management, as well as in working with other international organizations and donors. Financially, it was sufficiently sound to have attracted a good depth of human resources. - Socialize scientific information. The world-class collections held at INBio represent the results of 10 years of hard work and have a high scientific value. It was important however to also translate this scientific information into practical information for the nonscientist and general public. - Do not overestimate local communities' abilities to know their biodiversity needs. The project overestimated the degree to which local communities and stakeholders would be able to understand or define their needs for biodiversity information. - Create an enabling environment for science to work with local and international communities. Breaking barriers for communities (national or international) to work with INBio opened important doors. Many times, breaking down simple logistical barriers (for example, paying for airfare) went a long way to generate a willing attitude to cooperate. - Prioritize. Biodiversity information is so vast that no one institution can specialize in all groups or all areas. Prioritizing the areas of focus was fundamental for INBio to show important results not only to donors but also to the scientific community. - Product-based thinking is important for the sustainability of knowledge-based institutions. Marketable biodiversity products (e.g., books, magazines, and educational materials) are important to generate revenue. - Publicize benefits of conservation to local communities and society. The discussions and donor-funded work revealed that the sustainability of the conservation areas depends on the benefits generated for society and the local communities. These benefits must be communicated to the public. - Involve staff. INBio staff are motivated and committed to the success of the institution. Their involvement through participatory discussions is an important element in the future success of the institution. - Foster parataxonomists. Training local individuals, such as park rangers and hunters, to become parataxonomists empowered them to become one of the most successful elements of the biodiversity development program.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
--

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
No additional information was available to the reviewer.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE lacks clarity on the assessment of the project's objectives which were "clarified" during the Mid-Term Review.</p>	MS (4)
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Information provided in the TE is not always complete. For example, it only provides very simple information on the project-supported initiatives regarding the sustainable uses of biodiversity component, and it fails to explain the involvement (or lack of) indigenous people in the project.</p>	MS (4)
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes. The TE listed the risks identified in the Project Document and also assessed outcomes sustainability and INBio's exit strategy implementation (incorporating the main project activities into INBio's institutional programming).</p>	S (5)
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons listed in the TE are brief but comprehensive.</p>	S (5)
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Although total and per activity project costs are included in the TE, the issue of co-financing is not well explained. For example the cost statement in section 5.4 of the TE is incomplete and incorrect. There was indeed a significant increase in co-financing compared to what was anticipated in the Project Document -- this should have been explained in the costs section. Whether or not there was government financing, and the source from where the financing came from if any, should also have been explained in the text of the TE.</p>	MU (3)
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? No. The TE only mentions that some indicators were poorly or unclearly formulated, but makes no assessment of this problem.</p>	HU (1)

<p>4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.</p>	Yes: X	No:
	<p>Explain: Discoveries such as a new species of fungus that can fight pathogens in the vanilla plant potentially have global application for World Bank client countries like Madagascar. Other ongoing researches, for example, into vector control for dengue fever have widespread application potential for the Bank's client countries in sub-Saharan Africa. The Bank should strive to disseminate project research and findings outside of Mesoamerica.</p>	

<p>4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any) Project Document, IEG review, Project Status Report2003</p>
--