

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--|--------------|---|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 1525 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | P077171 | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF-3 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | World Bank | |
| Project name | | Capacity-Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in Colombia | |
| Country/Countries | | Colombia | |
| Region | | LAC | |
| Focal area | | Biodiversity | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | Biodiversity focal area capacity development activities | |
| Executing agencies involved | | Alexander von Humbolt Institute (took over for the Ministry of the Environment). | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | None apparent. | |
| Private sector involvement | | None apparent. | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | January 6, 2003 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | August, 29, 2003 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | December 31, 2006 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | September 30, 2007 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| | Co-financing | | |
| GEF Project Grant | | 975,000 | 975,000 |
| Co-financing | IA/EA own | | |
| | Government | | |
| | Other* | | |
| Total GEF funding | | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Total Co-financing | | 2,787,839 | 2,787,839 |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 3,787,839 | 3,787,839 |
| Terminal evaluation/review information | | | |
| TE completion date | | 1/15/2008 | |
| TE submission date | | 12/13/2013 | |
| Author of TE | | A. Horst and W. Janssen | |
| TER completion date | | 01/14/2014 | |
| TER prepared by | | Dania Trespalacios | |
| TER peer review by (if GEF EO review) | | Joshua Schneck | |

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF EO Review |
|---|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Project Outcomes | S | S | Not rated | S |
| Sustainability of Outcomes | Not rated | L | Not rated | L |
| M&E Design | Not rated | -- | Not rated | S |
| M&E Implementation | Not rated | -- | Not rated | MU |
| Quality of Implementation | S | S | Not rated | S |
| Quality of Execution | S | S | Not rated | S |
| Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report | | -- | Not rated | S |

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This was an Enabling Activity project, with no direct environmental impacts. The goal of the project was improve the capacity of Colombia to meet the objectives of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, primarily through legislative reform, increasing knowledge and research capabilities, and creating awareness and open communication channels among relevant actors. While there was no direct impact on any biological system, and there were no explicit environmental objectives, the project should be seen as helping to further the overall goals of the Cartagena Protocol at its attendant global environmental objectives in promoting and ensuring biosafety practices are robust and widespread.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

This project aimed to enable Colombia to implement the basic objectives of the Cartagena Protocol, including the assessment, management and monitoring of the potential risks posed by trans-boundary movement of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including human health risks.

Immediate objectives included capacity building of ministries and key stakeholders (strengthening legal and regulatory frameworks, enhancing institutional capacity and creating effective communication strategies) to manage risks associated with the trans-boundary movement of GMOs.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were **no** changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 4.1 Relevance | Rating: Satisfactory |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|

This project intended to build Colombia's capacity to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which is an explicitly listed objective within the strategies of the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area. Therefore, project outcomes were highly consistent with the GEF's focal area strategies.

This project is consistent with Colombia's country priorities. Colombia has been involved in the formulation of biosafety mechanisms since 1991 and was a leader in the formulation of the Cartagena Protocol. The country's National Development Plan identifies the development of biotechnology products as a fundamental element, and calls for institutional capacity building to implement the Cartagena Protocol.

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 4.2 Effectiveness | Rating: Satisfactory |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|

The project had 5 major components:

- 1- Strengthening the legislative framework for Biosafety management in Colombia, including revision of legal instruments and establishment of the National Biosafety Council and implementing mechanisms.
- 2- Institutional capacity building in Biosafety, including training activities and publications.
- 3- Establishing a biosafety database system: The Colombian Biosafety Clearing House Mechanism.
- 4- Establishing a central laboratory for the molecular biology of GMOs, including two pilot research projects and activities of scientific cooperation with other research centers.
- 5- Establishing a Project Coordinating Unit within the executing agency that would lead and manage the project.

The project outcomes are commensurate with the expected outcomes. The project improved knowledge and communications on GMOs and biosafety issues between key stakeholders. It created a graduate program in biosafety on GMOs, established Colombia's Biosafety Clearing House, and established the Inter-institutional Laboratory for the Detection and Monitoring of GMOs. The project created a functional biosafety working

group among nine ministries and institutions. The TE claims that the project met or exceeded its development objectives, and thus gives the project a satisfactory rating.

However, the TE also states that the project did not fully achieve its performance targets regarding the development of new legal tools. The TE explains as the process of formalizing the inter-sectoral biosafety working group took more time and effort than expected, and thus fell short of finding unanimous agreement on how to define appropriate legal tools. (TE pg 4).

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 4.3 Efficiency | Rating: Satisfactory |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|

The TE notes that there was a slow start up, and that there were two requested extensions, but that most planned outcomes were either met or exceeded. There is no lengthy discussion of project setbacks. The project extension did not exceed a year. There is no discussion in the TE of financial issues. It seems that this project achieved its goals within its prescribed budget and close enough to its original time line.

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 4.4 Sustainability | Rating: Likely |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|

The project activities were designed to complement a longer-term national effort to strengthen Colombia’s biosafety framework. The project established a permanent inter-sectoral space in the Colombian administration for biosafety issues, including 9 biosafety working groups, 3 “competent authorities” and a Biosafety Focal Point.

To ensure sustainability of the newly established Inter-institutional Laboratory for the Detection and Monitoring of GMOs., the involved institutions—ICA, INVIMA and IAvH—assigned funds for 2007 and 2008 and are planning to reserve funds in the future specifically for this purpose.

Considering the high level of country support for this issue, and the establishment of permanent institutions (including those with a physical presence, like the laboratory) that will remain engaged in this issue, it seems there is a high likelihood that the impact of this project will continue into the future.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The amount of co-financing in relation to the size of the GEF grant, particularly when compared to other projects, was quite small. The co-financing amount was twice as much as the GEF grant. The level of co-financing remained stable between project start and end. The TE does not mention co-financing anywhere in the main text.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was extended by almost a year. The TE notes that there were 2 extension requests and one reallocation of the budget, but that these did not affect the project's outcomes.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

There was high country ownership in this project. The TE notes country ownership in discussing how this project is in line with country interests, but does not discuss the effect of country ownership on project outcomes and sustainability.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 6.1 M&E Design at entry | Rating: Satisfactory |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|

According to the Project Brief submitted for CEO Endorsement (Project Brief pg 25), the monitoring and evaluation component of this project would be based on indicators presented in the project logframe. The Project Coordinating Unit was to prepare monthly status reports that would be used to fine tune implementation strategies and schedules of the project components, and it was also charged with developing a monitoring system, including quarterly revisions of operative results.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 6.2 M&E Implementation | Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory |
|-----------------------------------|--|

The TE refers to the M&E plan described in the Project Brief, and explains that “A table of the resulting key output and outcome indicators and achieved results is displayed in Annex 2.” (TE pg 3). However, Annex 2 is not found in the TE. The main text of the TE contains just one reference to M&E activities, and does not address their implementation of other results. The PIRs of 2008 and 2005 also do not detail how or if M&E activities were carried out. It is possible the M&E implementation of this project was satisfactory, but without any evidence or information documenting this implementation, the rating given here is marginally unsatisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 7.1 Quality of Project Implementation | Rating: Satisfactory |
|--|-----------------------------|

The World Bank was responsible for helping to establish the executing agency, the Project Coordinating Unit, which was a new entity within an existing institute, the Humbolt Institute. The TE reports that the performance of the executing agency was stellar, which in part must be due to satisfactory work on the part of the World Bank. The 2007 PIR reports that the World Bank had two supervising missions, in May and July of 2007. It seems the World Bank closely supervised this project.

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 7.2 Quality of Project Execution | Rating: Satisfactory |
|---|-----------------------------|

It seems that the Project Coordinating Unit performed in a satisfactory and timely manner, including activities related to administrative procedures, disbursement, report writing, and formulation of annual work plans. In addition, the PCU organized and successfully conducted several additional activities that have helped the project to achieve more in-depth results and international recognition. The TE notes that “the PCU’s outreach efforts

are exemplary, demonstrated by the numerous achievements that exceeded their original commitments and expected targets and the additional activities conducted.” (TE pg 9)

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE lists several specific lessons learned from this project:

1. Inter-sectoral collaboration and dialogue among key stakeholders were both crucial for efficient project implementation.
2. Combining workshops on biosafety protocol with an in-depth academic program on biosafety was advantageous.
3. Information communication was very important. The use of multiple channels- publications, online database, courses and workshops, participation in conferences- all helped contribute to the success of the project.
4. Broad inclusion of stakeholders is desirable, but may be complex and time consuming, and thus the logistics and politics of this endeavor should not be underestimated.
5. A cost-benefit economic analysis is crucial from the beginning stages.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE recommends that the FSP and MSP multi-country projects under preparation related to biosafety constitute an ideal opportunity to continue the efforts commenced in Colombia, and thus should make use of the capacities generated throughout this project to ensure continuity of efforts.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

| Criteria | GEF EO comments | Rating |
|---|---|----------|
| To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? | The TE lists the expected outcomes in detail, and then reports on the progress of each one, assigning an achievement rating to each individual outcome. | HS |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | The report is internally consistent. The TE backs up all claims with relevant information and examples, thus the ratings seem well substantiated. | HS |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The TE section "Risk to Development Outcome" discusses the likelihood that the outcomes of the project will survive the project life and have a future effect. | HS |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | The lessons learned are well understood, but they are not placed in project context. They are presented in general language, thus it is not clear which project activities or components drew what lessons. | MS |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The TE does not contain a section detailing financial information. Total amounts are listed on the first page, but they are not broken down by activity. | HU |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | The TE only mentions the M&E component once, refers to an Annex 2 that is not found anywhere in the TE, and does not discuss or even summarize the results of the project's M&E systems. | HU |
| Overall TE Rating | | S |

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f)$$

$$.3(12) + .1(12) = 4.8 = S$$

10. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

This TER was completed using:

- *Project Appraisal Document (CEO Endorsement Rev) 2/5/2003*
- *Project Implementation Review (PIR) 6/30/2007*