

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 202		Review date:		09/22/2006
IA/EA Project ID: 580		at endorsement (Million US\$)		at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name: Conservation of Biodiversity in the Lake Titicaca Basin		GEF financing:		3.11
Country: Regional (Bolivia –Perú)		IA/EA own:		U/A
		Government:		0.89
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing		0.89
Operational Program: 2, 4		Total Project Cost:		4
IA: UNDP		<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved: Bi-national Authority of Lake Titicaca Basin (ALT)		Work Program date		02/01/1995
		CEO Endorsement		01/15/1997
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		12/04/98
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
Prepared by: Ines Angulo		Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco		Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 60 months
				Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 76 months
				Difference between original and actual closing: 16 months
Author of TE: Sra. Amalia Cuba, Sr. Eduardo Quiroga		TE completion date: 09/2005		TE submission date to GEF OME: 06/05/2006
				Difference between TE completion and submission date: 9 months

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

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

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation ¹	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	-	MS	-	U
2.2 Project	N/A	-	-	U

¹ Rating options were Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), and Unsatisfactory (U).

sustainability				
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	-	U	-	HU
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

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

No. The TE acknowledges that they did not receive all the necessary information needed in order to make a comprehensive assessment of the project, and that the time that was assigned for this task was not sufficient (pg. 9).

Some of the Annexes, as described in the TE, appear to have very interesting and relevant information on the project, but they were not included in the copy available for this review.

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

No

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

Conserve and sustainably use the biodiversity of the Titicaca-Desaguadero-Poopo-Salar de Coipasa Water Basin (TDPS) through the design and implementation of community-based conservation, sustainable use and restoration activities, and through the development of a Biodiversity Management Plan.

There is no mention of changes in the TE.

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

According to the TE, the original objectives were focused on (i) defining and implementing sustainable management pilot projects for the 3 main threatened habitats (*titora* reed, *thola* bush, *bofedal* peat bog) and 3 endemic species (suri, pisaca and giant frog); (ii) capacity building for local communities and municipal governments; and (iii) strengthening the management of protected areas.

In November 2002 the project was reformulated based on the recommendations made in the Mid-term Review (which found that the project was too focused on sustainable development and not enough on biodiversity conservation):

1. Acceptance of Biodiversity Management Plan by stakeholders as a valid framework for guiding biodiversity conservation activities at bi-national level.
2. To strengthen the Titicaca Lake Autonomous Authority's (ALT) institutional capacity to execute the Biodiversity Management Plan
3. To strengthen the institutional capacities of regional and local governments, grassroots organizations, and other institutions responsible of implementing activities considered in the Biodiversity Management Plan.
4. To develop participatory and collaborative management models for biodiversity conservation, achieving an equitable distribution of costs and benefits.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

• **What were the major project outcomes and impacts, as described in the TE?**

The weak project design, lack of an adequate log-frame, and emphasis on compliance at an activity level, resulted in little awareness of project's outcomes and impacts as described under effectiveness below.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance

Rating: MS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain 	
<p>During the first phase, the project objectives were not completely relevant to GEFs objectives. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some project's activities were purely development-oriented and without obvious global benefits. • The project focus heavily biased towards commercialization of biological resources (often without tangible benefits for the ecosystems in question). <p>After the Mid-term Review, the project was completely restructured to focus on components that could produce sustainable global benefits within the project's lifespan. From that point on, the project was more aligned with OP4 strategies (trying to improve local stakeholder participation, capacity building of local governments, etc).</p> <p>The TE concluded that, overall, the omission of identifying extreme poverty as the fundamental problem in the area resulted in the project's failure to tackle its main objective: biodiversity conservation through participatory management.</p>	
B Effectiveness	Rating: U
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	
<p>According to the TE, the Mid-term Review heavily criticized the project's limited sustainability, insufficient actions geared towards institutionalizing laws and regulations for species management, limited stakeholder participation, weak technical capacity of hired staff, and inexperienced project management.</p> <p>For example, by the time the project ended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Biodiversity Management Plan was still in the review process. • An ALT Biodiversity Unit was created but had no approved budget or work program. • Some participatory and collaborative management models for biodiversity conservation were implemented but none had an M&E system in place to assure their effectiveness or sustainability. 	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: HU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	
<p>The TE explains that since the project lacked an M&E system to measure progress towards objective achievement, it is not possible to determine the project's overall efficiency. This review finds that there is enough evidence to show poor cost-effectiveness, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project logical framework was introduced late in the design process and changed considerably after the Mid-term Review. • The system of project implementation, based mainly on hiring individual consultants to be in charge of the multiple planned studies (more than 30), required a long and labor-intensive administrative effort. • There were a large numbers of unconnected scientific and technical studies that delayed on-the-ground interventions. • The technical team (who were in charge of developing and executing Operational Plans) changed 3 times in Bolivia. • Original duration of the project was 5 years (end of 2003), but after the Mid-term review this was extended until April 2005. 	
Impacts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? - No. The TE mentions that if the activities implemented during the project were continued, 	

they could potentially lead to desired outcomes in the future.

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

A Financial resources	Rating: U/A
There is no mention of any follow-up activities to this project.	
B Socio political	Rating: U
Local communities were not involved in the project from its inception; and even their participation during the second phase was very weak. This constitutes a high risk towards the project sustainability, especially considering that they are the main users of the biodiversity that the project is trying to conserve.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: U
Based on the information presented in the TE, this review finds that the lack of coordination that existed throughout the project between the ALT offices in Peru and Bolivia, between the ALT offices and UNDP, and between the project and the Ministries in both countries, had a negative effect on the ALT and its capacity to ensure the sustainability of the project achievements. Other possible risks mentioned are the current redefinition of the limits of the Reserva Nacional Lago Titicaca, the lack of transparency of the protected area tariff system, and the little understanding that local communities have of the procedures of the national agencies responsible for natural resources management.	
D Environmental	Rating: U
No information is available on the TE, but the PIR2003 mentions that sewage treatment in the main lakeside urban centers is a risk to the area's biodiversity.	

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

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

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good
Results from various studies on the 3 selected habitats and species resulted in improved knowledge about their geographical distribution, conservation status, carrying capacity, etc.
2. Demonstration
Some of the data produced by the studies on fish species has been used by the Ministry of Production in Peru to develop a Fishery Management Plan for Lake Titicaca.
3. Replication
None mentioned
4. Scaling up
None mentioned

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

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)	Rating: HU
According to the PIR2003, M&E plan was not practicable since indicators were not well chosen to define desired advance on objectives, and many of their target values were arbitrarily set. The TE states that the information produced by the studies of the area	

<p>ecosystems and species were not used as a baseline to establish the new indicators for the M&E system as recommended by the Mid-term Review.</p> <p>The TE also found that the structure of the M&E system did not identify who was responsible for implementing the M&E system.</p>
<p>B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rating: HU</p>
<p>The TE found that the project did not implement any systematic or structured M&E system, and that there was no evidence of follow-up of results of the pilot project implemented during the first phase.</p> <p>The Mid-term Review observed that UNDP's monitoring of the project was insufficient and their reporting was largely based on the project's own interpretation of advancement.</p>
<p>C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</p> <p>Rating: HU</p>
<p>According to the TE, no specific funds were assigned to M&E.</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?</p> <p>No.</p>

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</p>
<p>Lessons mentioned in the TE include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The importance of having an adequate M&E system: the cost of establishing and implementing an M&E system are lower than the costs resulting from a lack of feedback and information needed for decision making. - National Execution (NEX) of UNDP projects require intensive focus on capacity building of national and local officers in charge of project execution. This important issue needs to be acknowledged and included in the project's budget and schedule. - Projects that are implemented in areas occupied by indigenous communities should take into account the increasing demand for the recovery of ancestral rights related to the management and control of natural resources.

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

<p>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</p> <p>In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.</p>
<p>-</p>

<p>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</p>	<p>Ratings</p>
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p>	<p>MS</p>

The TE clarifies that due to the lack of a functioning M&E system there is not enough evidence available to accurately assess the project's achievement of objectives. However, the TE includes an assessment of finished products in Annex 7 (which wasn't included in the copy of the TE reviewed)	
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? The TE rates the project design, stakeholder participation in the project's design, and outcomes as "Marginally Satisfactory", while at the same time concluding that the project didn't tackle the main cause of biodiversity loss in the area, had weak stakeholder participation, lacked a proper M&E system, and was therefore unable to assess the achievement of objectives. At the same time, the TE admits that it is difficult to assess the project's level of achievement of results due to its lack of systematic progress reporting.	MS
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? It concludes that there are "serious doubts" regarding the sustainability of the project's benefits, and stresses the problems caused by the lack of involvement of local communities.	S
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons presented are very general and many should be categorized as conclusions or recommendations.	MS
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? No. The TE only includes information on expenses from 1999 to 2003, and it explains that the UNDP and/or local organizations did not provide them with the necessary information to assess costs per activity or actual co-finance used.	U
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes. It assesses the projects' failure to design and implement a required M&E system and the negative consequences of this important omission.	S

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes:	No: X
-------------	--------------

Explain: The project failed to accomplish its objectives and have an impact on the conservation of Lake Titicaca's biodiversity. It also was very weak in promoting stakeholder participation, jeopardizing the sustainability of achieved outputs.

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)
PIR 2003