

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF ID:	121		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Biodiversity Project	GEF financing:	7.00	6.80
Country:	Honduras	IA/EA own:		
		Government:		
		Other*:	0.300	0.20
		Total Cofinancing	34.500 (IDA loan – not evaluated)	-
Operational Program:	3	Total Project Cost:	41.800	7.00
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	State Forestry Admin (AFE-COHDEFOR); Honduran National Council on PAs (CONAPH); Department of PAs and Wildlife (DAPVS), Indigenous Peoples and other local communities	Work Program date		11/27/1996
		CEO Endorsement		08/26/1997
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		08/20/1998
		Closing Date	Proposed: 01/31/2003	Actual: 06/30/2005
Prepared by: Lee Risby	Reviewed by: DRAFT	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 4 years and five months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 6 years and 10 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 2 years and 5 months
Author of TE: Gunnar Platais; Elsie B. Garfield, Douglas Graham, Teresa Roncal.		TE completion date: 12/21/2005	TE submission date to GEF EO: ?	Difference between TE completion and submission date:

* 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	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFEO
2.2 Project outcomes		S	MS	MS
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	L	Not Applicable	U/A
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation		N/A	N/A	U

2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	MU
Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No Why? Statements made in the ICR that lack evidential substantiation (see 3.2 below).				
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? There was some mis-allocation of funds and corruption in some of the government partner institutions. However this has already been addressed.				
3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES				

<p>3.1 Project Objectives</p> <p>What are the Global Environmental Objectives?</p> <p>The overall objective of the Biodiversity in Priority Areas Project (PROBAP) is to contribute to the integrity of the Honduran section of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC) through better conservation of biodiversity in core areas and more sustainable use of biodiversity in the corridor buffer zones. This will be achieved by (a) improved institutional capacity for parks management nationally; (b) better and more participatory protection of selected protected areas (PAs); (c) Support for more benign natural resource management activities in the buffer zone; (d) strengthening of national biological monitoring capacity.</p> <p>1. Strengthen the Department of Protected Areas and Wildlife (DAPVS) and Local Capacity for PA Management (US\$ 2.6 million at appraisal; US\$3.8 million actual). This component will (A) Strengthen DAPVS at the national level but primarily at the field office and PA levels; (B) Build local capacity for PA management through training and workshops for NGOs, local government, members of the regional protected areas management committees (CORAPs), and members of the local PA management committees (COLAPs); and (C) Provide coordination support for project implementation.</p> <p>2. Manage globally important protected areas (PA): (US\$ 4.6 million at appraisal; US \$2.3million actual) through (A) management plans for priority PAs; (B) demarcation of core and buffer zones of priority PAs, with complementary delimitation of lands with indigenous property claims; (C) construction of a visitors' center in the Atlantic zone; (D) recruitment of personnel to manage select PAs; (E) construction of park guard facilities in some PA, including the acquisition and utilization of goods required for the operation of the facilities.</p> <p>3. Improve natural resource management in buffer zones: (US\$ 1.9 million at appraisal; US\$1.5 million actual): Finance buffer zone investments identified during the preparation of the protected areas management plans in the La Mosquitia region. Recipients were groups of individuals within the communities in the buffer zones of the protected areas.</p> <p>4. Biological monitoring (US\$ 0.3 million at appraisal; US\$0.4million actual):This component supported the establishment of a monitoring system to determine major changes in the status of biodiversity in the Honduran portion of the MBC.</p> <p>Any changes during implementation? No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the Development Objectives? Same as above <p>Any changes during implementation? No</p> <p>3.2 Outcomes and Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE? (text below taken from IEG ICR Review) <p>A) Improved institutional capacity for parks management nationally (Negligible). The ICR rated institutional development as modest and the ICR text indicates that the project's support to strengthening DAVPS as well as local capacity for PA management was Moderately Unsatisfactory. The project did provide for training for 866 persons from NGOs, DAPVS and other institutions, however there is no analysis in the ICR as to the outcome of that training as it pertains to strengthened institutional capacity to better manage PAs of global importance.</p> <p>(B) Better and more participatory protection of selected protected areas. (Substantial). Comments provided by the region discuss the development of co-management policies, although this is still being discussed in congress. Nevertheless, this PROBAP initiative, seemingly owned by DAVPS, provides some evidence that the network of NGOs and local community organizations supported by PROBAP will be better equipped to co-manage the twelve PAs. The ICR reported mostly outputs such as the fact that the project established the Patuca National Park and Tawahka Indigenous Reserve (the second and third largest PAs in</p>
--

the country); construction of three visitors' centers, an environmental training center, and seven knowledge centers (although one visitor center collapsed during a tropical storm in late 2005 due to a failure to complete physical works). The ICR mentions that new organizations emerged in Olancho and La Mosquitia and that there were strengthened under the project, however the ICR does not indicate how these organizations were strengthened or more importantly, how these organizations are directly contributing to better management of protected areas. For example, the ICR indicates that while the management of a number of protected areas is being led by NGOs, not all areas received the funding necessary to follow through with established management plans. Most importantly, the ICR acknowledges that the sustainability of the management of protected areas of globally significant importance hinges on the approval and implementation of the Protected Areas Fund which would generate sufficient resources to cover expenses, including recurrent costs. The Fund had been created but was not yet operational at project closure. Follow-up on the Fund will continue under several Bank-financed natural resource management projects beyond the life of this GEF-financed project.

(C) Support for more benign natural resource management activities in the buffer zone (Substantial).

Comments submitted by the region provide more specificity about some of the activities that contributed to the substantial achievement of this objective. For example, co-management training, the transformation of hunters into park rangers, or guides, the production of certified iguanas, certified SFM products, as well as NTFPs such as osier (however the comments did not provide any detail as to whether small enterprise groups were producing and marketing osier products -- such as baskets). Originally, this review referenced the fact provided by the ICR that 115 rural communities located in highly disadvantaged zones benefited from 34 subprojects totaling US\$1.2 million.

While the above mentioned examples are appreciated, a more accurate accounting of scale and level of benefits would have been helpful to understand how the subprojects resulted in "more benign use"? This review also pointed to the fact that twelve grassroots organizations benefited from a process of institutional strengthening and that as a result of this process, eight organizations have legal status (four others are pending). Also that these organizations have their own strategic plan for community development and are improving their ability to manage resources. The ICR does not state how these organizations are "improving their ability to manage resources." The subprojects may have helped create social capital, promote strategic alliances, and create new structures in the zone, but again there is missing analysis of how the benefits of these subprojects contributed to the overall objective.

D) Strengthening of national biological monitoring capacity. (Modest). A monitoring system designed by PROBAP has been accepted by DAPVS and is being carried out in 19 of the 38 priority protected areas. AFE-COHDEFOR officially approved the creation of a Monitoring Unit within DAVPS. Computer database established with app. 100 entries on PAs; data collection and partial analysis accompanied by 37 reconnaissance overflights and 15 land trips; 32 organizations involved in exercises; 104 resource wardens trained in biological monitoring activities. However, despite the importance of park rangers as the principal driving force in the field behind this activity, nearly all of their contracts were not renewed at the end of the project (ICR p. 10). This reduced or eliminated field monitoring capacity. The project was not able to consolidate the monitoring component despite having executed tasks as outlined in the project document. The satellite images were purchased but were not used to create the monitoring baseline. Information generated was to have been placed on the website for public use but this did not occur. In summary, despite some successes, the project did not leave a functional and sustainable biological monitoring system to the country.

4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes 12/3 = 4

A Relevance

Rating: MS

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The projects outcomes were consistent with the GEF biodiversity focal area SP1 with the emphasis on building institutional capacity for management of the PA estate in Honduras, support for local communities and indigenous peoples to improve natural resource management. Although the overall outcome was less than expected which was largely due to factors beyond the projects control (see B)

B Effectiveness

Rating: MS

- **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)?**

The project outcomes are less than commensurable with the expected outcomes although they do still

contribute to addressing original problems that justified the intervention (see 3.2 above). The performance of the project was less than expected mainly because of the impact of Hurricane Mitch in 1998 which severely impacted Honduras and reduced government support for biodiversity (due to increased needs in other areas) and then in 2001 by Tropical Storm Michelle. Furthermore, these issues were compounded by the inability of the government partner – COHDEFOR to provide support to the project due to changes in personal and general institutional instability. At the end of the project US\$0.205 million of the GEF grant was cancelled because of lack of government capacity to utilize it effectively – unfortunately the money was supposed to be used to improve PA infrastructure. At the end of the project COHDEFOR faced crisis due to corruption and violence that broke out between conservation groups and the timber industry. Congress is presently discussing the proposed Forest and PA and Wildlife Law, which would eliminate COHDEFOR and DAPVS, while creating a cabinet level Min of Forestry and PAs with two main departments, one for forests and one for PAs. This proposed law remains under discussion.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: MS

- **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?**

Efficiency was impaired since the closing date of the Project was extended by 2.5 years due mainly to natural disasters, institutional instability and lack of follow-through by COHDEFOR, the main counterpart agency. Changes in government, with the consequent replacement of most civil servants within AFE-COHDEFOR, contributed to implementation problems. Second, the Government did not provide the required counterpart funding. AFE COHDEFOR also faced a crisis in 2004 stemming from corruption and violence that broke out as a result of confrontation between conservation groups and the timber industry. In the early years, there were also project management problems: A special 2000–2001 audit found several ineligible expenses. These were eventually resolved by replacing the project coordinator and restructuring the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) (see IEG ICR review).

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?** Some of the projects outcomes in terms of engaging with local communities and indigenous peoples in the buffer zone areas seem to have the potential to change behavior over the longer term (= impact). However the lack of data in the ICR makes it difficult to accurately project the impact of the project

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: U/A
A PA fund was due to become operation in June 2006. Hence, it is too early to judge if this will result in financial sustainability or not.	
B Socio political	Rating: U/A
Although the project laid foundations for socio-political sustainability through decentralization of management of the PA estate, and building some capacity of local community and indigenous organizations these are only 'foundations'. The ICR provides little concrete evidence to substantiate the 'likely' rating.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: U/A
The project made some progress in this area through support to DAPVS and community organizations. However, the situation at project end, with policy (e.g., forestry law) changes still being discussed by government and uncertain institutional sustainability make it difficult to rate future sustainability.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: U/A
It is not possible to rate this given lack of detailed information in the ICR.	

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

A Financial resources	Rating:U/A
B Socio political	Rating: U/A
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating:U/A
D Environmental	Rating:U/A

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good - U/A
2. Demonstration - The project demonstrated some biodiversity friendly activities in the buffer zones but information on the precise aspects of these activities is not provided in the ICR
3. Replication – U/A
4. Scaling up – U/A

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE / Overall 6 / 3 = 2

<p>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</p>
<p>Annex 1 of the PAD appears more rigorous than the log frame developed for the ICR, however both lack measurable outcome indicators. The ICR's log frame could be strengthened by including an analysis of outcomes: most of the results reported are outputs such as management plans, demarcated territory, infrastructure construction, "carrying out" of sub-projects", and number of personnel trained. The ICR logframe currently has only one measurable outcome indicator.</p>
<p>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? Rating: U</p>
<p>Many of the project's investments and interventions were decentralized and executed by NGOs and grassroots organizations, however an M&E system is lacking that monitors and reports the outputs and short to medium term outcomes of the subprojects as they relate to the objectives of the project as a whole.</p>
<p>C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was there existing capacity or was this capacity built to implement the M&E plan? Rating: U</p>
<p>The ICR acknowledges the need for greater NGO monitoring efforts, particularly in relation to the unstable funding situation surrounding the resource wardens. The project was not able to consolidate the monitoring component despite having executed tasks as outlined in the project document. The satellite images were purchased but were not used to create the monitoring baseline. Information generated was to have been placed on the website for public use but this did not occur. In summary, despite some successes, the project did not leave a functional and sustainable biological monitoring system to the country.</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No</p>

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p>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>
<p>Coordinate conservation activities with land management projects. GEF operations demonstrate increased effectiveness when they are tightly coordinated with implementation mechanisms established by and for the underlying investment (Bank or other IA). The ICR reveals that PROBAP enjoyed a more productive period (1998-2001) when PAAR was engaged with policy dialogue with GOH and PROBAP was hence able to deal with the "practical issues of biodiversity conservation and NRM in the field (ICR. p. 15)."</p> <p>The involvement of local communities in the planning and implementation of sustainable resource management and biodiversity protection is important for the development of strategic protected area management plans in accordance with local needs, however NGO capacity/authority to implement these plans is lacking. Management plans will also require long term attention to ensuring full participation for adaptive management, evaluation, and updating.</p> <p>While partnership with NGOs and grassroots organizations is fundamental, a well structured and adequately supported national public institution is necessary to support civil society reform for more effective policy and regulations related to protected areas [fund], land rights of indigenous peoples located in protected areas.</p> <p>Projects that are co-managed require an articulation of clear written responsibilities in the project assessment document to ensure clear reporting, accounting and oversight.</p>

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.
N/A

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report / Overall = 3.4	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	4
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	3
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	2
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	4
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	4
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	3

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.

Yes:	No: X

Explain: Not recommended by IEG

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

N/A

Reviewer's comment: I agree with this TER.