Project Management Information System aagarwal5@thegef.org

To Do | Projects | Reports | Administration | Help | Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: GEF Project ID [ ] Select

<< Back to Project Edit Save Data

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	1377
Project Title	Santiago Foothills: Mountain Ecosystem Conservation
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Agency	World Bank
World Bank ID	70654
Country	Chile
Project Status	Project Closure
Duration	3 years
CEO Endorsement	09/18/2001
Agency Approval	9/26/2001
Project Effectiveness	09/26/2001
GEF Agency Execution Partners	(Select Execution Partners) Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	Robert Ragland Davis
TE Reviewer	Pallavi Nuka
TE Peer Reviewer	Baljit Wadhwa

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	10/31/2005	
Project Actual Completion	6/30/2006	
Project Completion Difference	8	Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	08/03/2006	
TE Submission to EO	11/30/2011	
TE Submission to EO Difference	63	Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	03/07/2012	
TER Submission to EO	03/07/2012	
TER Submission to EO Difference	0	Months

Comments on Delays

There is no information on project delays in the TE report.

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US$)	725,000	725,000	100.00 %
Cofinance Amount (US$)	459,400	1,028,015	223.77 %
Total Amount (US$)	1,184,400	1,753,015	148.01 %

Comments on Cofinancing

The project successfully leveraged funds beyond what was promised at appraisal. Funding came from government, private sector, and NGO sources and was critical to achieving results. The total estimated leveraged funds is US $1,028,015:
CORFO (lease, Quebrada Ramon)- $350,901; Aguas Andinas (lease, CEA)- $3 6,479;Colegio Giordano (reforestation)- $11,958; Casa Juventud (hats fo r students outing to foothills)- $934; Regional Government (goods and p ersonnel for sendero Chile Construction)- $70,323; Asociación (Mancomun idad) de Municipios Parque Collserola Barcelona - España(Expenses for Symposium)- $6,290; USDA Forest Service (Park Expert tohelp on Master Pl an)- $3,643; Aguas Andinas (infrastructure and construction of Env. Ed C tr.) - $228,102; University Finis Terrae (Studyon Connectivity) - $18,2 48; Empresa Sacyr (reforestation 40 ha)- $91,240; Empresa Sacyr (landsc aping CEA) $20,073; Military (helicopter transport)- $3,649; Empresa E lectrica (reforn 4 ha)- $9,124;(Mun. Barnachea) additional park guards - $177,051.

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework: 4 - Moderately Satisfactory

Project Objectives -

From the Project Document, the goal of the project is to protect, conserve, and restore in-situ a 12,900 ha area located in proximity to Santiago consisting of a representative example of a Mediterranean-mountainous ecosystem (i.e., the Santiago Foothills) and support the continued functioning of the ecosystem's ecological processes on which much of the city depends.

Comment on Changes

The specific objectives (outcomes) of the project were:
(i) improve the legal, institutional, and political groundwork required to create a conservation area in the Santiago Foothills;
(ii) develop conservation activities in the proposed conservation area;
(iii) promote among the urban populations an increased environmental awareness of the significance of this ecosystem, as a way to ensure the sustainability of the efforts; and
(iv) disseminate information on, and promote the concept of, mainstreaming mountainous ecosystems conservation efforts into urban planning process.

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
							Edit Delete
Add New Row...							

Project Performance

Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments

Overall Project Rating: 6 - Highly Satisfactory

Comment

The project has successfully achieved the specified objectives, made progress towards realizing environmental impacts, and taken steps to ensure the sustainability of outcomes. Project outputs were commensurate with expected outputs and in some cases exceeded the initial targets. Project implementation surpassed expectations in terms of involvement by stakeholders, amount of funding leveraged, and the quality of outputs delivered. The project team has ensured sustainability of outcomes through an formulation of an exit strategy and it has taken measures to secure funding for continuation of some activities (i.e. monitoring, environmental education center) beyond the completion date.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes	Last PIR:	5 - Satisfactory	Progress towards achieving the grant objectives has been evaluated as satisfactory. To date, agreements on conservation activities have been signed with 7 ladowners, covering 6,141.32 ha. 12 workshops have been held, with the participation of over 500 people. A Master Conservation Management Plan is in the advanced stages of design. To date 3,200 students and 137 teachers have participated in project activities. Restoration is underway on pilot plots, and results are being monitored. 35 km. of trains have been built, and signs are ready to be installed. The first refuge is ready to be put in place. It is considered that these results, and more, contribute positively towards reaching the PDO.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Progress toward achieving the grant objectives has been evaluated as satisfactory in order to protect, conserve and restore in-situ a 12,900 ha area located in the Mediterranean-mountainous ecosystem (ie Santiago Foothills) and support the continued functioning of the ecosystem's ecological process on which much of the city depends. (Note area was upgraded to 13,352 ha during implementation)
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	The project has successfully achieved the specified objectives, made progress towards realizing environmental impacts, and taken steps to ensure the sustainability of outcomes. Project outputs were commensurate with expected outputs and in some cases exceeded the initial targets. Project implementation surpassed expectations in terms of involvement by stakeholders, amount of funding leveraged, and the quality of outputs delivered. The project team has ensured sustainability of outcomes through an formulation of an exit strategy and it has taken measures to secure funding for continuation of some activities (i.e. monitoring, environmental education center) beyond the completion date.

Relevance	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	This project promotes conservation of biological diversity with emphasis on Mountain Ecosystems (OP-4) and Forest Ecosystems (OP-3). Chile qualifies as an official recipient of GEF funds having ratified the CBD in 1994. The project's objectives are well aligned with national prioritiesChile's Environmental Policy for Sustainable Development, prepared by the National Environmental Commission (CONAMA), highlighted the responsibility of the State to adopt actions and measures to conserve the country's ecosystems, species and genetic resources. The development of Santiago's metropolitan area is governed by the Metropolitan Santiago Master Plan (PRMS), which classifies the Santiago Foothill ecosystem as an "Ecological Conservation Area," a special land use designation for those areas to be "preserved in natural condition, in order to ensure and contribute to environmental balance and quality." CONAMA considers that the successful incorporation of Santiago's Foothills into the sustainable development of the metropolitan area would serve as a model for the conservation of other fragile mountainous ecosystems in proximity to urban areas and could prove relevant to other cities, both in Chile (e.g., Temuco, Chillán, Valparaíso, Coyhaique) and the region (Bogotá and Quito, Lima).
Effectiveness	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Progress on each of the components has been rated as satisfactory.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project has successfully achieved intended outcomes and made significant progress towards environmental objectives. Actual outputs were commensurate with, and in some cases, exceeded expected outputs. The TE report rates all components of the project as having been 'satisfactorily' completed. A conservation area in the Santiagio Foothills has been created through zoning regulations, conservation agreements with landowners, and amendments to the Metropolitan Plan. The project has developed key conservation activities in thepropos ed conservation area of the foothills including development of a Conservation Plan for the Santiago Foothills, pilot work on revegetation and recuperation of the environment in s elect sites, and other infrastructure improvements. The project promoted an increased environmental awareness of the significance of this ecosystem among through student/teacher trainings, construction of an environmental education center, and multi-media
	Terminal Evaluation:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	

Efficiency			The cost of the GEF contribution was $725,000, total co-financing was $ 474,177 and leveraged funding amounted to $1,028,015. The ratio was 1 (G EF): 2.1 (local funding). Given the high contribution of local funding, and the high-quality results of the project, the cost - effectiveness of the intervention is considered highly satisfactory.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	Based on information in the TE report project has delivered high quality outputs in some cases exceeding expectations. All activities were completed according to schedule and the leveraged funding exceeded the appraised amount

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability	Last PIR:	4 - Likely	The arrangements for sustainability are rated Satisfactory. The Sustainability Plan is complete.
	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Likely	The overall outcome (and its Sustainability) is Rated Likely. The arrangements for sustainability are rated Satisfactory. Sustainability depends to a large degree on (a) government support and participation for conservation, (b) public awareness of the foothills area, and (c) institutional and legal provisions that can provide a formal means for protection.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely	Based on the information in the TE report, there are no significant risks to sustainability. Through extensive stakeholder involvement the project has built up strong socio-political support, and overcome institutional and legal barriers to establishment of a conservation area. Financially, the project has already secured funding to continue some project activities and has plans to apply for further funds that would ensure longer term sustainability.
Financial	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided. Not assessed along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely	The project leveraged significant financing during implementation and garnered strong local and regional government commitment to maintaining the conservation area. The PIU (PROTEGE) continues following the project under its own financing The PIU's exit strategy includes investigating opportunities for market-based instruments, such as payments for environmental goods and
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	

Socio-political			No rating provided along this dimension. "The project has interacted with and achieved a high-level of support through municipal governments, CONAMA, MINVU, MAG and the Intendencia in particular. Their involvement is helping to ensure sustainability" "The project conducted extensive outreach .... and helped bring positive attention to the work, necessary for building consensus on the development of an approach to conservation. In particular, the media campaign was essential in winning the support of the mayors of the municipalities of Santiago. The long-term approach to environmental education in the area can help to foster increased awareness of the citizens to protect and enhance the conservation of the foothills.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely	The project is strongly supported by municipal and regional governments and has garnered strong public support through it's outreach campaign. There appear to be to negligible socio-political risks to sustainability.
Institutional and Legal	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided along this dimension. "During the project, Protégé worked w ith government agencies in the formulation of draft laws, regulations a nd formal decrees to ensure that sustainability of project actions"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely	Although some of the legislative measures establishing the park still have to be formally adopted, no institutional and legal risks were identified.
Environmental	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided. Not assessed along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely	No environmental risks were identified.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Monitoring and Evaluation is rated Satisfactory
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on information in the TE report and the final PIR, M&E activities were implemented according to plan. A MTR was carried and recommendations instituted by the project team.
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided. Not assessed.

M&E Design	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project's M&E plan (Project Document) was part of the 4th component. The budget included a separate line for implementation of the M&E plan. The M&E plan includes a description of reporting requirements, guidelines, and it identifies both the MTE and TE. The M&E plan also includes a logical framework with objective (GEO) and outcome (called 'outputs'; correspond to specific objectives) level indicators, means of verification, and assumptions. The indicators used for the GEO do meet SMART criteria, while the outcome level indicators are largely output indicators
M&E Plan Implementation	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided. "Good electronic M&E system database established in the PIU. M&E." "The monitoring and evaluation system is still working and adding to the database and provides for continual monitoring and reporting on project results."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on information in the TE report and the final PIR, M&E activities were implemented according to plan. A MTR was carried and recommendations instituted by the project team.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided. Not specifically assessed.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The Project Document's budget included a separate line for implementation of the M&E plan. According to the TE report, M&E activities were carried out. This would imply that the budget was utilized

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Project management, Financial management, and Procurement rated S
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	This rating is based on the average of quality of implementation and execution.
Quality of	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	

Implementation - IA			Bank Performance: Rated Satisfactory; The Bank carried out two supervisions per year. These were frequently o nly by the Task Manager, who holds degrees in both Biology and Forestry and has formal training in protected areas management. Also, in the cou rse of implementation, the following specialists participated; procurem ent assistant, financial management consultant, and FAO Biodiversity Sp ecialist. The FM specialists also provided annual reviews of audit repo rt on a timely basis. In addition, the LCR GEF Coordinator visited the project in 2005.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on information in the TE report, the Bank has provided good oversight for the project. has been Financial management has been satisfactory. All project funds have been disbursed, and all financial reports and audits were completed on schedule. Procurement has followed Bank guidelines. Project results were monitored closely through follow-up on reports and through regular
Quality of Execution - EA	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Project management, Financial management, M&E, Counterpart funding and Procurement all rated S. "Project management has been effective in implementing project activities efficiently, constructing relationships to promote project activities, involving stakeholders in the project, and disseminating results."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	Based on the information in the TE report and the final PIR, the quality of execution was highly satisfactory. The quality of outputs, particularly under the outreach component was "world class." There was no turnover in project staff during implementation. The project team cultivated excellent relations with stakeholders and formulated an exit strategy which will help ensure sustainability of outcomes. Project M&E activities were carried out as planned. From the final PIR: "This project was recommended to the CMU for a site visit. It is a very high quality project, and should be reviewed for replication in other areas. It is especially unique in that it addresses the concerns of biodiversity conservation adjacent to a growing urban center. The Bank looks forward to the closure report for lessons learned." From the TE report:"These accomplishments came through diligence in execution, tenacity and excellent diplomatic, interpersonal and public relations skills which were particular assets of the team."

Agency Specific Project Criteria

Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Government commitment is rated Satisfactory.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project has experienced a high level of country ownership at the local and regional levels. Seven municipalities are formally involved in the conservation effort and the project succeeded in striking agreements with seven private individual landholders for conservation of the foothills. The project team also effectively worked with the government to ensure consensus in the development of laws, regulations and draft laws
Financial Planning	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Financial Management: Satisfactory
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project's proposed budget was adequate for the activities envisioned. The additional leveraging has contributed to the high quality outputs, and ensured sustainability of outcomes.
Preparation and Readiness	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided. Not assessed.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project objectives were clearly formulated in the project document and achievable with the given resources. The choice of executing agency was appropriate given the level of co-ordination required among the different municipalities. The Project Document itself is also amongst the best written and conceived for an MSP.
Stakeholders Involvement	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Public involvement is rated S.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project evinced a high-degree of stakeholder involvement and consultation.
Need for Follow Up	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Nothing in the TE report indicates a need for follow-up.
Gender Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	

			Not mentioned in TE report. Not part of the project design.
Effects on Local Population	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	"The project conducted extensive outreach through personal encounters, videos, workshops, radio and television newscasts , posters, folders and workshops. The quality of the media was high and helped bring positive attention to the work, necessary for building co nsensus on the development of an approach to conservation. In particula r, the media campaign was essential in winning the support of the mayor s of the municipalities of Santiago. The long-term approach to environm ental education in the area can help to foster increased awareness of t he citizens to protect and enhance the conservation of the foothills."
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	Extensive outreach efforts and construction of an environmental education center have contributed to increased awareness about conservation issues among the local communities.

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Not part of project design.
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Not part of project design.
Democratic Governance	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Not part of project design.

Progress to Impact

Progress to	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO	3 - Significant Progress	

Impact	Review:		The project has made significant progress towards realization of environmental impacts through (i) establishment of a park and formulation of a park management plan, (ii) habitat restoration at pilot sites, and (iii) increased awareness of conservation and biodiversity issues

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	Knowledge exchange : Rated Substantial; In addition to workshops and media presentations, "The project has a well developed web page for the duration of the project that is used to transfer information on lessons learned and other project information. The project disseminated results to both international and national institutions in workshops in Chile, Bolivia, Spain and South Africa, exceeding the target of three reports distributed."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project carried out extensive outreach efforts to communicate project goals and also to increase general awareness about conservation.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	Development / strengthening of institutions: Rated Substantial. "A number of measures implemented by the project provide increased capacity of the institutions to manage the Santiago Foothills"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	Project activities have resulted in the adoption of legislation, signing of conservation agreements, and development of policy frameworks to support the creation of a the Santiago Foothills Park
Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	Client's policy / program implementation : Rated Substantial. "The project had a substantial impact on the client's program implementation, as it strengthened their capacity through the development of new tools (such as the Master Conservation Plan, the inclusion of the foot hills in the Plan Regional de Desarrollo Urbano (PRDU) and potentially through proposed amendments to the Plan Regulador Metropolitano de Santiago (PRMS) and a Proposed Amendment to the Ley General de Urbanismo y Construcción (LGUC) and its respective Ordenanza (OGUC) "
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The Master Conservation Plan developed in consultation with seven municipalities and the public will govern activity within park boundaries.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	"Within the project area, habitat restoration activitiesin se lected pilot areas (e.g., exotic species removal, re-introductionof nat ive vegetative cover, soil restoration) will be supported as a wayto pr ovide critical field-tested results needed to support futurerestoration efforts in the conservation area"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project demonstrated the effectiveness of new methods of habitat restoration.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	No mechanisms were mentioned the TE report or in the Project Document.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	Replicability: Rated Likely "The Santiago Foothills Park provides an ideal opportunity to replicateb oth the strategy leading to its creation and the means to support itslo ng-term financial sustainability to other relevant peri-urbanecosystems in both Chile and the region. A number of other growing urban areas in Chile are characterized by their proximity to fragile ecosystems both in Chile and in the region."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	No evidence of replication during the project's lifetime. Clearly the project does have potential for replication elsewhere in the country, and the the client has explored a second possible project with CONAMA and the Bank to conduct similar conservation activities in other peri-urban settings in Chile.
Upscaling	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO	N - No	

	Review:		No evidence of scaling up in the TE report or the final PIR.
Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	Conservation issues have been mainstreamed into local plans and policies through project

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document					
Environmental Stress Reduction	Terminal Evaluation	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	10% increase, over 3 years in woody vegetation cover on pre-selected and measured pilot areas.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	Measured increase in vegetative cover during project lifetime.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
Environmental Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		N - No			No evidence of change in environmental status.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
	Terminal Evaluation	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		N - No			No mention of change in socioeconomic status.	Edit Delete

		Add New Row...				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
Socioeconomic Status Change	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		N - No			No evidence of change in socioeconomic status.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
	Terminal Evaluation	**Visibility**	**Comments**			
		N - No	No mention of impacts monitoring.			Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
Arrangements for Impact M&E	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Comments**			
		N - No	The project did not develop a system for monitoring biodiversity.			Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Overall, the TE report provides a detailed and consistent assessment of project achievements.
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE report provides a comprehensive assessment of project outcomes as measured by the indicators (specified in the log-frame). Actual outputs under each component are also compared to expected outputs.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in TE report to assess.
Sustainability	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	

Assessment			The TE report provides a detailed assessment of sustainability along socio-political and institutional dimensions. A clearer assessment of financial and environmental risks to sustainability would add to the overall picture of sustainability.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The lessons and recommendations are comprehensive and drawn from the evidence presented on project implementation.
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The co-financing assessment is clear and comprehensive. The disbursement summary is inconsistent with the final PIR and with the report of the total grant amount. Also missing is a breakdown of project costs by component/activity.
M&E Asssessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The implementation of M&E activities is described at various points in the TE report. More detailed and comprehensive assessment of M&E (incl. design, budget, etc) would improve the quality of the report.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The outcome assessment is based on the indicators and targets specified in the log-frame. Actual outputs are compared to expected outputs.
Consultation with Stakeholders	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in TE report to assess.
Compliance with Guidances	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in TE report to assess.
Compliance with UNEG Norms	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	N/A for WB MSPs.
Addressing of ToR requests	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No ToR.
Independence of Report	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in TE report to assess.

	Review:		

Lessons & Reccomendations

Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Stakeholder Involvement		The project recognized the value of using a multidisciplinary approach given the complexity of conservation efforts in peri-urban settings. A variety of skills were needed for the development of the Master Conservation Plan as well, which is in itself a multi- disciplinary tool for management includes social, biophysical,esthetic, economic and legal perspectives.	Edit Delete
Stakeholder Involvement		Identify the key decision makers for involvement in the project in all sectors and ensure their participation.	Edit Delete
Other	Outreach	The outreach aspect of the project was extraordinary and its media campaigns were world class. This helped to sensitize the public to conservation concerns which were very near to them both in physical and environmental aspects. The effectiveness of the campaigns were an important aspect of the project's success.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Other	Project design	The high quality work performed under this project demonstrates the possibility of making important impacts with small and medium size projects. In many cases, it is not so much the size of the intervention,but the design and preparation of the project, its supervision and support by the Bank during execution, and the dedication of the implementing agencies and the stakeholders which make the difference.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

<< Back to Project Edit

Save Data

A product of the Global Environment Facility