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	1489
Project Title	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Mbaracayu Natural Reserve
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Agency	World Bank
World Bank ID	66225
Country	Paraguay
Project Status	Project Closure
Duration	3 years
CEO Endorsement	08/21/2002
Agency Approval	12/18/2002
Project Effectiveness	01/07/2003
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	Diego Paysse
TE Reviewer	Josh Brann
TE Peer Reviewer	Anna Viggh

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion		
Project Actual Completion	5/31/2007	
Project Completion Difference		Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	11/30/2007	
TE Submission to EO	11/30/2011	
TE Submission to EO Difference	48	Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	03/09/2012	
TER Submission to EO		
TER Submission to EO Difference		Months

Comments on Delays

Original project closing date from 2005 GRM: 11/30/2005

Four year span between TE completion and submission to the GEF EO.

2007 PIR: "Slow initial disbursements for the Project (due to lack of experience of the recipient with Bank/GEF procedures, as well as the organization and capacity building required among beneficiaries). Furthermore, the change in external circumstances in the region (particularly due to a major increase in soy bean production) has meant that the Project would not have used all of the funds allocated to it if it had closed on the foreseen closing date. An 18-month extension and some modifications of activities and budget were also required in order for the project to fully disburse and to achieve its objectives in the most effective way possible."

TE: "FMB's organizational team responsible for project implementation was weak at the outset, due to unexpected management changes that took place during the transition between project approval and effectiveness. As a result, project activities were delayed during the first 18 months."

Also, TE: "It is worth noting that there were significant delays during the first year and a half in implementation of Component 3, due to problems with the former technical assistance staff, which had to be reorganized. Once the new technical assistance team started to work, all activities involved in Component 3 were adequately implemented. A similar situation occurred with the reforestation sub-component. It started very slowly, but in the last year and a half major
drawbacks were overcome and activities were implemented as planned."

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US$)	973,513	973,448	99.99 %
Cofinance Amount (US$)	2,146,743	2,401,262	111.86 %
Total Amount (US$)	3,120,256	3,374,710	108.15 %

Comments on Cofinancing

The TE breaks down co-financing between the recipient and "others" with $722,391 from others, but does not specify these parties.

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework: 2 - Unsatisfactory

Project Objectives -

The "logframe" is standard for World Bank MSPs of this time period, in which the project summary at the beginning of the document lists the project objective, outcomes, and activities, with "indicators" included in a parallel column. This project document also includes an annex (Annex III, starting on pg. 55) labeled "Performance indicators and expected impact of project activities" which summarizes outcomes, activities, indicators and expected impact. However, detailed information is not provided, and baseline information is not detailed. In general, the indicators do not meet SMART criteria.

Comment on Changes

No modifications at the objective level. The TE notes that some sub-components were modified under each of the four components, which were discussed and evaluated at the mid-term review and approved by the World

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
1.1 Park boundaries. 1.2 Control infrastructure. 1.3 MBRN Management Plan.	1.1 The legal surveying of the 140 km reserve limits is completed, and adequate signaling is in place with signs per km (> 100 signs) as well as the reserve's boundaries well maintained and demarcated. 1.2 One existing control infrastructure is expanded and improved in the four control posts + the administrative headquarters at Jejui mi. 1.4 The current Management Plan is reformulated, participatorily with more than 100 stakeholders, giving special emphasis to externally-generated threats and issues	Consolidated management of Mbaracayú Reserve, particularly in terms of its ability to deal with external threats.			Sustained effective management of the Mbaracayu Reserve.	Globally significant biodiversity of the Mbaracayu Reserve and Jejui Watershed is conserved.	Edit Delete
2.1 Law enforcement. 2.2 Education on the legal framework. 2.3 Environmental awareness. 2.4 New FM radio for Mbaracayú region	2.1 Local authorities receive training in environmental legislation; 2.2 Paralegal volunteers are trained in environmental legislation practices to assist communities on legal matters; 2.3 A public awareness campaign is implemented. The existing Local Environmental Information Center, is expanded and improved; 2.4 A FM radio for the Mbaracayú area is created and operated by the FMB.	(b) Increased capability by local authorities and the local people to enforce environmental legislation			Biodiversity friendly sustainable use of natural resources in the Jejui Watershed.	Globally significant biodiversity of the Mbaracayu Reserve and Jejui Watershed is conserved.	Edit Delete
3.1 Improvement of the existing production systems; 3.2 Develop	3.1 Extension services will be provided to help 600 farmers to manage sustainably their	(c) Replicable production models for sustainable resource use adapted to the			Biodiversity friendly sustainable use of natural resources in the Jejui Watershed.	Globally significant biodiversity of the Mbaracayu Reserve	Edit Delete

alternative livelihood options; 3.3 Marketing of local products; 3.4 Opening of the Mbaracayú reserve for tourism;	properties, promoting agro-forestry practices; 3.2 Alternatives for the existing production systems are developed, and demonstration plots implemented; 3.3 Assistance is provided for the design and implementation of five pilot programs for cooperative commercialization of local products; 3.4 Existing accommodation infrastructure will be enhanced and prepared for tourism.	needs of producers within the Jejui River Watershed				and Jejui Watershed is conserved.	
4.1. Development of land-use planning activities in the region; 4.2. Local empowerment; 4.3. Reforestation of the CARJ; 4.4. Environmental services; 4.5 Assessment of the CARJ baseline environmental situation.	4.1 FMB and the Paraguayan government agencies design and implement a land-use master plan for the CARJ; 4.2 Community-oriented development projects are designed, managed, and evaluated using a participatory approach. Workshops and public meetings are organized for the discussion of planning, productivity, policy, and legal issues; 4.3 Restoration and protection of the remaining forest patches outside the Mbaracayú Reserve. Demonstration plots are implemented; landowners are encouraged to implement private conservation initiatives; 4.4 Five signed agreements with private landowners for implementing conservation actions in their properties, including evaluation and promotion of ecosystem services provided by private forests. A regional Forest Sustainability	(d) Integrated land use planning and development practices adopted and implemented in most of the Mbaracayú region. Special consideration is given to protection and restoration of the remaining forest patches.			Biodiversity friendly sustainable use of natural resources in the Jejui Watershed.	Globally significant biodiversity of the Mbaracayu Reserve and Jejui Watershed is conserved.	Edit Delete

	Certification System is created and accepted by all partners; 4.5 A baseline inventory of present CARJ environmental situation is completed. A comprehensive database is available.						
		(e) FMB acquires the capacity to implement and monitor the proposed activities			Sustained effective management of the Mbaracayu Reserve and biodiversity friendly sustainable use of natural resources in the Jeju Watershed.	Globally significant biodiversity of the Mbaracayu Reserve and Jeju Watershed is conserved.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...							

Project Performance

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

Overall Project Rating: 5 - Satisfactory

Comment

Based on the summary of the below criteria, the project can be considered satisfactory. There was an extensive initial delay (apparently around 18 months) for the project to really get going (due to some management issues with the EA), but with an 18-month extension, it appears the project was able to fulfill the original expectations. However, the TE provides little insight on potential sustainability of the results. In the section on risks to project outcomes, the TE focuses on the capacity of the executing agency to continue its work, in which case it will carry on relevant activities building on the work already completed. However, for example, it would be helpful to have insight on the potential financial sustainability of the protected area, the potential sustainability of the agricultural and alternative livelihood results, and the work with the private land owners in the area.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes	Last PIR:	5 - Satisfactory	PIR: "The project has been completed and the grant was fully dispersed with satisfactory completion of grant objectives. All actions and indicators that were agreed upon in the revised implementation plan have been achieved and the full report of the project's objectives and outcomes will be presented in the Implementation Completion Memorandum, which is currently being prepared."
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	

			TE: "The overall outcome rating is Satisfactory as there has been a very good level of achievements in almost all the TF development objectives. Although the commencement was slow in some activities, all major obstacles were overcome and the recommendations given in the MTR were adequately implemented."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Overall, and based on the below criteria, the project can be considered satisfactory. There was an extensive initial delay (apparently around 18 months) for the project to really get going (due to some management issues with the EA), but with an 18-month extension, it appears the project was able to fulfill the original expectations
Relevance	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No relevance rating provided in the TE. It states that the project strategy "has proven relevant to global, regional, and country priorities, as well as the Bank's sector strategy."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the information available in the project brief and the TE, there are no significant concerns about the relevance of the project.
Effectiveness	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No additional specific rating is provided with respect to effectiveness beyond the TE's overall outcome rating, as discussed above.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	According to the TE, the project completed almost all planned activities, and for some activities that proved infeasible, alternatives were found. Thus in terms of achievement of implementation indicators, the project was effective. There are few results-focused indicators at the outcome or impact level, but the TE does note that "The final Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) report submitted for this project resulted in a score of 90/90 – reflecting the successful implementation of the project activities in the reserve area, as well as its replicability for biodiversity conservation practices."
Efficiency	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating provided on this aspect. TE: "Throughout the implementation period, Moises Bertoni Foundation applied a very strict management quality improvement strategy under the supervision of a certifying firm. This effort resulted in a better organization with improved efficiency. Most activities were efficiently implemented according to their associated costs, implementation timing, and economic and financial returns."
	Agency	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.

	Review:		
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the information available in the TE, project efficiency can be considered satisfactory. According to the financial information provided in the TE, administrative and contingency costs totaled less than 5% of the project expenditure. The TE highlights multiple aspects of efficient project implementation, including the fact that the adjusted project activities were budgeted at or below the original anticipated costs for the corresponding original project components.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability	Last PIR:	NA - Not Applicable	At the opportunity to provide a rating on this aspect the PIR has indicated "Not applicable"
	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Likely	No rating is provided in the TE on sustainability, and there is little discussion on the issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	Little concrete information and data is provided on aspects related to sustainability. In the TE section most relevant to sustainability (section D.3) the TE focuses on the capacity of the executing agency to continue its operations, and gives general statements about ongoing and potential future activities.
Financial	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not extensively discuss sustainability, much less break it down to individual aspects of sustainability.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	See comments under overall sustainability
Socio-political	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not extensively discuss sustainability, much less break it down to individual aspects of sustainability.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	See comments under overall sustainability
Institutional and Legal	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not extensively discuss sustainability, much less break it down to individual aspects of sustainability.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	See comments under overall sustainability
Environmental	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not extensively discuss sustainability, much less break it down to individual aspects of sustainability.

	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	See comments under overall sustainability

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating is provided on this aspect, and little discussion is provided. TE: "Bank performance has been satisfactory in carrying out its specific responsibilities. There have been regular supervision missions, the Mid Term Review was properly executed and its recommendations were adequately implemented."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Little information provided in the TE on M&E implementation, funding and budget utilization.
M&E Design	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific discussion on this issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The project brief includes a "monitoring and evaluation plan" which provides a general description of the M&E activities to be undertaken, and discusses to some degree the responsible parties. This includes a mid-term and final evaluation. The logical framework and indicators aspect of the M&E design is severely lacking, and more concrete details should be provided on the other aspects, including funding.
M&E Plan Implementation	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating or discussion on this issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Little information provided in the TE on this aspect. The small amount of information provided (as quoted under the TE section for overall M&E, above), implies that there were no significant issues with this aspect.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating or discussion on this issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information provided in the project brief or TE on this aspect.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE provides brief summary statements indicating that the performance of the Bank and the borrower were both satisfactory.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.

	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	There is not enough information available to make a qualified assessment of this parameter.
Quality of Implementation - IA	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	TE: "Bank performance has been satisfactory in carrying out its specific responsibilities. There have been regular supervision missions, the Mid Term Review was properly executed and its recommendations were adequately implemented."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	This is difficult to assess in light of the cursory nature of the TE. Based on the information available, it appears the World Bank performed adequately. The level of detail and quality of the TE however leaves an open question on this matter.
Quality of Execution - EA	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	TE: "FMB's performance has been satisfactory in carrying out its expected programs and responsibilities. There were some organizational problems during the first year and a half, which were efficiently corrected. After adjusting the organization accordingly, the entire project budget was completely disbursed and financial and physical targets were attained for the most part."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	There is not enough information provided in the TE on this aspect to make a qualified judgement. It appears that there were some significant issues with project execution during the first 18 months of the project, but that these were subsequently addressed.

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:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating is provided on this aspect. The TE does not discuss this issue at length, but briefly states that the project strategy proved relevant to the local and national needs. Also, TE states: "Project outcomes are likely to be sustained after Project completion. FMB [the executing organization] is a well organized, technically staffed, and adequately funded organization. There are no major political and institutional pressures on FMB and governmental/departmental officials have given, and will likely continue to give, strong support for its most important activities."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	

			Based on the information in the project brief and the limited information in the TE (see comments in TE section on this parameter), this aspect appears to have been satisfactory.
Financial Planning	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating is provided on this aspect.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE does not provide extensive information on this, but indicates that this aspect was handled appropriately, particularly with regard to the fact that the project was extended 18 months and there were numerous subcomponents that were modified.
Preparation and Readiness	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating is provided on this aspect. According to the TE, there were some management issues with the EA that affected the initial startup and implementation of the project.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	According to the TE, "FMB's organizational team responsible for project implementation was weak at the outset, due to unexpected management changes that took place during the transition between project approval and effectiveness. As a result, project activities were delayed during the first 18 months. For future projects, the overall importance of effective management leadership should be recognized as critical, even when a strong support staff is present and thorough project design/preparation
Stakeholders Involvement	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating is provided on this aspect. The TE briefly discusses various project activities that involved a range of stakeholders.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project activities apparently engaged a wide range of stakeholders. The TE discusses project activities involving local community members (farmers), local large private land owners, PA staff, local government, and teachers and schoolchildren
Need for Follow Up	Terminal Evaluation:	No	No significant issues are highlighted in the TE in this regard.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	No	No significant issues identified in this regard.
	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	Detailed information is not provided, but the TE indicates that the project included a focus on working with women's groups, particularly with respect to alternative income opportunities (medicinal plants, cosmetics, etc.)

Gender Mainstreaming	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	No	It appears that there were some activities that included a focus on gender issues, and involvement of women's groups, but it can hardly be stated, based on the information available, that there was any significant degree of gender mainstreaming
Effects on Local Population	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	The project provided agricultural extension services to improve existing production systems to 630 families. It is also noted that microcredit activities were implemented with groups of farms and women
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	No further comments than those listed in under the TE comments section on this parameter. The local population benefited through the provision of agriculture technical services, and through development of micro-credit programs.

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	As discussed above under effects on local population, the project provided technical agricultural extension services to 630 families, and supported development of a micro-credit program benefiting dozens of stakeholders. According to the TE, "In Villa Ygatimi, there has also been an important improvement regarding diversification that was accompanied by a substantial improvement of farm net incomes from US$ 720.00 per year in 2004/05 to US$ 790.00 per year in 2005/06 (as reported in a recent study carried out by FMB based on a well designed survey of
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	No further comments beyond those summarized in the TE comments section of this parameter,
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
Democratic Governance	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.

Progress to Impact

Progress to Impact	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	The project successfully completed most planned activities, and notes that the project has contributed to the effective protection of the 64,400 hectare protected area that was the focal point of the project. No specific biodiversity impacts were identified, though the TE indicates that through long-term planning the threats to the biodiversity in and around the protected area have been reduced.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to Assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Significant Progress	One significant aspect is that the TE notes that the project contributed to the achievement of a 90/90 METT score for the PA. It is not clear under what methodology or how objectively the METT was completed, but if the PA does in fact have a 100% score for management effectiveness, then the targeted region would be well on its way to the achievement of intermediate states, and then on to impact achievement

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	Project component 2.3 focused on environmental awareness, and was successfully implemented. Under another project component, a biodiversity database was also established for the protected area and associated watershed.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	According to the TE, 105 teachers were trained, with activities held at 20 educational centers, involving 1382 students. An environmental information center was also launched. Other activities included a public awareness campaign and radio broadcasts over a 6 month period.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The project component 2 included activities on improving law enforcement, and improving education on the legal framework. Paralegal volunteers were trained in environmental legislation practices to assist communities on legal matters. Four training events were held, and three seminars were held for training 20 community leaders
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	No further comments than those included under the TE field for this parameter.
Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The project contributed to the development of a micro-credit facility in partnership with Foundation Paraguay.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.

	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project contributed to the development of a micro-credit facility in partnership with Foundation Paraguay.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The project included some pilot and demonstration activities on alternative livelihoods, agricultural extension, reforestation, and marketing of locally produced products.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See comments under TE section above.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	As previously mentioned, the project contributed to the development of a micro-credit facility in partnership with Foundation Paraguay.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See comments in TE section above.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	TE: "The Project has generated very useful lessons and an original methodology that are replicable in other sectors and regions facing similar problems to those present in the Alto Paraguay region."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	The TE identifies aspects of the project that could be replicated in other areas, but does not provide any indication that this will happen. The main potential for this is for the executing agency to continue with its work, and apply the lessons and experiences from this project in future work. There is no data provided to verify the likelihood of this occurring.
Upscaling	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	Not discussed in the TE.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	Not discussed in the TE.
	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	

Mainstreaming			The project contributed to reforestation of 230 hectares on large private farms surrounding the PA, contributed to the improvement of local agricultural practices, and carried out work on land-use planning with local authorities.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See comments in TE section for this parameter.

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
Environmental Stress Reduction	Terminal Evaluation	Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	According to the TE, through the efforts of the project, improved monitoring and enforcement of the protected area, including regular aerial monitoring, has led to a reduction in the incursions into the reserve.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	The TE notes that improved management capacity of the protected area (through improved monitoring and enforcement) has led to a reduction in threats to the reserve. However, no concrete data is presented to support this conclusion.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
	Terminal Evaluation	Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Unintended	According to the TE: "A deforestation monitoring study of the basin applied by the GIS of the Foundation	Edit Delete

Environmental Status Change					from 2003 onwards, showed the annual rate of deforestation in the basin decreasing consistently over the last three years. In 2003/04, that rate was 2.1% (3,546 hectares) and it dropped to 2% and subsequently to 1.6% (2,641 hectares) in the two following years. "	
		Add New Row...				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
Socioeconomic Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	TE: "Productivity and commitment in the watershed population increased substantially. In the Britez Cue region, crop diversification highly improved since 2004/05, where cotton accounted for more than 70% of the total cropping area to the current situation where sesame accounts for 48%, cassava for 21%, and cotton for only 14%. In Villa Ygatimi, there has also been an important improvement regarding diversification that was accompanied by a substantial improvement of farm net incomes from US$ 720.00 per year in 2004/05 to US$ 790.00 per year in 2005/06 (as reported in a recent study carried out by FMB based on a well designed survey of the farming community). "	Edit Delete

		Add New Row...			
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	GEFEO Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
Arrangements for Impact M&E	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**	**Comments**		
		Y - Yes	The TE does not indicate that any arrangements are in place for impact monitoring. However, it is noted that the protected area applies a GIS and satellite image-based system for monitoring deforestation in the protected area, which could presumably be drawn upon in the present to obtain further and up-to-date information on impact level results. The executing agency also apparently carries out some monitoring of the watershed, at least at the time of project completion.	Edit Delete	
		Add New Row...			

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Based on the criteria below, the TE scores a combined rating of 3.5, which provides a moderately satisfactory rating. However, the TE is far from adequate as an independent and objective evaluation of a GEF project. Apart from perhaps the financial assessment, no other aspect of the TE should be considered good practice
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE provides a comprehensive assessment of outcome achievement, and does provide evaluative evidence to support conclusions on a number of issues. For some aspects there is a lack of evaluative evidence. There is an assessment for each project outcome, by indicator, though most indicators are at the output level - number of meetings held, people trained, booklets produced, etc. On a number of aspects there could be more detailed information presented
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information is provided on the TE

Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The TE does not provide an adequate assessment of sustainability aspects. It briefly discusses risks to project outcomes, but focuses almost solely on the capacity of the executing agency to continue its work. There are multiple open questions about sustainability, and the TE does not discuss individual aspects of sustainability.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The TE includes a short section on lessons (1-2 lessons), and provides one recommendation. These are based on the experience from the project, but are not detailed or supported with specific detailed information.
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE provides an assessment of actual project costs, broken down in a detailed manner.
M&E Asssessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The TE provides limited information on M&E aspects of the project. It briefly states that there was adequate oversight from the World Bank and that the mid-term evaluation recommendations were implemented.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	To the extent that outputs are included in results, the TE and the project are adequate on this aspect. The TE provides an indicator by indicator assessment of results, primarily outputs. However there needs to be a significant improvement in the results framework and indicators for the project, to focus on at least the outcome level
Consultation with Stakeholders	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information is provided on the TE
Compliance with Guidances	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Inadequate information to make an assessment.
Compliance with UNEG Norms	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information available to make an assessment.
	Agency	NA - Not Applicable	

Addressing of ToR requests	Review:		No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	TORs not provided.
Independence of Report	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE assesses results by indicators, which provides an objective assessment. However, in highlighting certain key results, the evaluation does not provide an adequate perspective on the extent and significance of the project's contribution to the identified outcome and impact level results, which leaves the impression that the project is trying to take credit for more than it is due. Clearly the project produced the identified outputs, but for other more significant results it is not always very clear. This is not to suggest that the project did not make a significant contribution, but the TE does not provide adequate evidence to make this assessment. In addition, the inadequate assessment on sustainability makes it unclear the extent to which an objective assessment was provided.

Lessons & Reccomendations

Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Stakeholder Involvement		18 The most significant positive lessons learned from the success of the Project are those related to the way constructive relations were developed between small farmers, indigenous communities, and commercial landowners on the one side and FMB technical staff on the other, regarding natural resource conservation, improvement of disposable farm income, and environmental issues. These relations were developed primarily through extensions service training activities, public awareness campaigns, and community-focused participatory workshops. The development of effective links between market intermediaries, small farmers, indigenous communities, and technical staff of FMB provided an excellent framework to diversify cropping, reduce market risks, improve farm income, and apply proper resource use techniques adequate to conserve natural resources. The Project also supported an appropriate environment to develop in the communities with a sense of ownership of the environmental issues affecting the Mbaracayú Reserve and the River Jejuí basin.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Other	Operational - Project Management	TE:"FMB's organizational team responsible for project implementation was weak at the outset, due to unexpected management changes that took place during the transition between project approval and effectiveness. As a result, project activities were delayed during the first 18 months. For future projects, the overall importance of	Edit Delete

		effective management leadership should be recognized as critical, even when a strong support staff is present and thorough project design/preparation has taken place."	
Add New Row...			

<< Back to Project Edit

Save Data

A product of the Global Environment Facility