

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		206	
GEF Agency project ID		608	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Consolidation of the Banados del Este Biosphere Reserve	
Country/Countries		Uruguay	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		2- Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development Program for the Eastern Wetlands of Uruguay (PROBIDES)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Secondary executing agency	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		11/15/1997	
Effectiveness date / project start		11/19/1997	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		7/1/2001	
Actual date of project completion		10/31/2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.5	2.5
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	0.64	0.34
	Other*	0.36	0.97
Total GEF funding		2.5	2.5
Total Co-financing		1.38	1.31
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.88	3.81
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		11/4/2003	
TE submission date		11/4/2003	
Author of TE		E. Fuentes	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Siham Mohamedahmed	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Aaron Zazueta	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		05/14/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

*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	HS	N/A	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	L	N/A	ML
M&E Design	N/A	S	N/A	MU
M&E Implementation	N/A	S	N/A	MS
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	S	N/A	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			N/A	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project as stated in the project document is to consolidate the effective and sustainable conservation of this globally significant mosaic of habitats and its biodiversity through the successful implementation of land-use practices that serve both ecosystem conservation and sustainable economic resources use.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The core objective of the Project for the Consolidation of Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (BR) is to supplement the activities of the first stage of a two-phased intervention.

Between 1992 and 1995, a first phase of the GEF intervention was executed that focused on studies and training, and between 1997 and 2002 a second phase was undertaken – the consolidation phase. This evaluation regards only the last consolidation phase.

The development objectives as stated in the project document and the TE are to (1) Develop and adopt a comprehensive land and water use plan to ensure the ecological integrity of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, (2) Create policy frameworks and incentive and regulatory mechanisms to enable successful implementation of the Comprehensive Plan, (3) Establish effective system of public and private protected areas in the bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, (4) Develop biodiversity-friendly land-use practices and activities consistent with the Comprehensive Plan adopted by landholders, tourism entrepreneurs and other resource users.

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

During project execution it was decided to enlarge project area from 350,000 hectares to 3,850,000 hectares. The TE argued that by extending the area of the project, efforts that should have been spent in activities more close to conservation were lost.

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
----------------------	----------------------

The project is relevant to the GEF strategy, as well as to the national priorities. The basic focus of the objectives, invest in removing barriers to the conservation and sustainable uses of the biodiversity and strengthening the protected areas, is consistent with GEF standards. The project was approved within the framework of the Operational Program – 2, which addresses the biodiversity concerns of the coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems.

In 1992, the Government of Uruguay created the Programme for the Sustainable Development and Conservation of Biodiversity of the Banados del Este Biosphere Reserve (PROBIDES), as a consortium of the Ministry of Housing, Territorial Regulation, and Environment; The University of the Republic; and the Government of the Department of Rocha, where the Banados del Este Biosphere Reserve is located. Thus, project was also consistent with the other efforts being undertaken by the national government.

The Project also enables Uruguay to comply with its obligations as a member of the Biodiversity Convention, i.e. RAMSAR Convention on Wetlands (Bañados del Este are RAMSAR sites).

Finally, according to the PD, the project is highly relevant and of high priority. First, because it refers to wetlands of great value in terms of biodiversity . Second, the Banados del Este wetlands are being converted into rice-fields at an alarming speed, therefore, the time window available for action is limited.

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

The project effectiveness is satisfactory because, the project was successful in achieving all the objectives. According to the TE, most of the stakeholders mentioned that the most significant achievements of the project is the preparation and adoption of the Rocha Coastal Land Use Regulation, the Bañados Master Plan, the Regional approach as opposed to the more traditional fragmented (uni-

Department) approach, the demonstrations concerning the uses of native biodiversity and the training, awareness and education of the stakeholders.

However, although the protected areas act was one of the project objectives, and the project played a significant role in the process leading to its achievement, several stakeholders consider it to be a result of other more powerful forces albeit aided through project support.

Overall, the most significant outcomes of the project are:

- (1) The approval of a land use regulation for the Biosphere Reserve. The regulation protects 350,000 hectares of globally significant land that were approved as BR by MAB and UNESCO.
- (2) The Government of the Department of Rocha adopted the General Plan for the Regulation and Sustainable Development of the Atlantic Coast of the Department of Rocha which sets the rules governing coastal use.
- (3) The project strengthened certain public protected areas and promoted eco-tourism as a development option in the region by helping to establish and administrate an association of eco-tourism businessmen and also by providing assistance to a regional process aimed at reaching an agreement on an eco-tourism plan.
- (4) The project improved the general level of awareness among the public and lawmakers through organized forums, workshops and meetings with different local and national stakeholders and through the media.

On the other hand, the project involved several entities during its implementation including the Governing Board of PROBIDES. However, the Operations Advisory Committee, which was expected to enable the participation of NGOs, the private sector and key Ministries; and the Advisory Committee, which should have been composed of international NGOs, technical institutions, UNDP and universities, were never established preventing the formal participation of these stakeholders in the project. As a result some institutions with direct authority over the management of the areas to be protected such as the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP), the Ministry of Transportation and Public Works (MTOP) and the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment (MVOTMA) were not strongly active in the project.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

Overall, the efficiency of the project is Moderately Satisfactory.

According to the TE, although overall the project was implemented efficiently there was scope for improvement. Investments could have been made more cost-effective from the viewpoint of ensuring the conservation of a biodiversity of global importance had some expenditure decisions been undertaken. For instance, if instead of enlarging the working areas in order to prepare a Master Plan covering 3.85 million hectares, the efforts had been focused on the area originally set (less than 10% of

the surface it finally operated in), part of those funds could have been used for activities more closely connected with conservation. The State-owned protected areas could have been strengthened to a larger extent and endowed with more infrastructure works (access roads, more and better trails, more signalling, etc.), more educational activities could have been undertaken, or more work could have been done with producers interested in the uses of biodiversity, such as fishermen.

Moreover, the TE states that there were no great problems with the flow of funds for execution purposes, even though the total funds contributed were not as much as expected. However, the total execution time of the project underwent some changes, which increased from four to little over five years. This extension was justified because 48 months after the project had started, certain activities had not yet been completed and funds were still available from the project financed by the EU, which covered part of the operational expenses. Seen from a longer term perspective, as the TE team states that this extension to five years was beneficial because it enabled the project to follow up and contribute to the approval of the Coastal Land Use Regulation, which otherwise might not have been adopted, or the approval process may have taken longer.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The overall sustainability of the project is rated as Moderately Likely.

The Government is allocating \$ 85,000 from its regular budget to maintain the basic operation of PROBIDES. The UNDP has contributed \$30,000 in 2003 to supplement this maintenance and is helping in seeking new funding sources. Also a trust fund has been informally established and the project set a local committee to manage the revolving fund set by the GEF and EU project. The public reserves will be financed by the State and by admission fees, while the private reserves will be maintained by their owners. In addition, sustainable use practices of biodiversity are expected to be self-supporting. In the future, ecotourism income is expected to increase. Moreover, PROBIDES is preparing a sustainability strategy that ensures the continuity and expansion of the work carried out by the project.

On a socio political point of view, the TE states that the training and education provided to the NGO, stakeholders and several Governments Departments, has created leaders who actively participate in maintaining and extrapolating the actions which enable the continuity of the works actions undertaken in favor of the conservation of the Biosphere Reserve. As a result, a network has been created that connects concerned parties such as producers who engage in biodiversity friendly practices and owners of protected areas. The Project introduced the subject of Biosphere in primary school and in secondary school teacher training. The project improved the general level of awareness among the public and lawmakers through organized forums, workshops and meetings with different local and national stakeholders and through the media. PROBIDES is preparing a sustainability strategy that ensures the continuity and expansion of the work carried out during the completed Project stage.

However, the Operations Advisory Committee, which was proposed to enable the participation of NGOs, the private sector and key Ministries, and the Advisory Committee, which should have been composed of international NGOs, technical institutions, UNDP and universities, were never established preventing the formal participation of these stakeholders in the project. Some institutions with direct authority over the management of the areas to be protected such as the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP), the Ministry of Transportation and Public Works (MTOPE) and the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment (MVOTMA) were not strongly active in the project. This is a strong sustainability shortcoming given the importance for conservation and sustainable use projects to involve all stakeholders, including all key ministries from the beginning.

Finally, the Government of Uruguay passed the Protected Areas Act, which is in force for the entire country; however, the regulatory provisions that enable it to be implemented still have to be approved.

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?

Overall, the actual cofinancing was higher than the amount promised at project start. Although government contribution was reduced by \$ 305,212, , additional contributions from other sources such as from Train Sea Coast, the farmers, the European Union, AVINA Foundation and several private donors, more than made up for the shortfall.. As a result, actual cofinancing was slightly higher than expected.

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 designed to be implemented in two phases in sequential order, however the project was implemented in an overlapping manner because of the additional time needed to approve laws and regulations of the first phase. As mentioned earlier, the Project under evaluation is the second and last phase . According to the Project Document, the Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve project would have duration of 48 months. In practice, the Project was executed between November 1st, 1997 and October 31st, 2002, i.e. over a period of 61 months.

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:

According to the TE, the participation of the stakeholders was not always as satisfactory as it could have been. For instance, the broad and representative Operations Advisory Committee, which was to enable the participation of NGOs, the private sector and key Ministries such as MGAP and the Ministry of Tourism, was never established, and this prevented important stakeholders from being formally involved.

The Advisory Committee, which should have been composed of international NGOs, technical institutions, UNDP and universities, was never established either, and this was another lost opportunity concerning the more formal attachment of important stakeholders.

Despite all of this, there was an effective dialogue with and involvement of the private sector (businessmen, farmers), NGOs, teachers belonging to the educational system, and the rural police, which set the bases and provide the roots to continue the Biosphere Reserve conservation work and to provide it with leverage.

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The M&E design at Entry is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

The PD contains an M&E plan. The project was to be monitored and evaluated following standard UNDP procedures, including yearly meetings of PROBIDES, UNDP, and the Planning and Budget Office of the Presidency of the Republic, as well as mid-term and final evaluations. As well, regular feedback from the main stakeholders was to be achieved through meetings of the Operations Committee. The Advisory Committee was to follow progress of the project, and recommend specific monitoring and evaluation visits by relevant experts. A monitoring and evaluation system was to be established to permit the measurement of biological indicators as a way of assessing project impact.

However, the PD does not contain a logical framework matrix. According to the TE, this is probably because when the project was approved this was not required. Although a list of objectives, outcomes

and activities did exist, there were no indices to enable a quick comparison of achievements and impacts.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The M&E implementation is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

Even though the PD did not contain a logical framework matrix, the project management was evaluated by Tripartite meetings and by an independent mid-term review. Additionally, UNDP played a major role in monitoring the activities and achievements, as well as regulating the disbursements. The MTR was used as a guide to imprint greater emphasis on the conservation and sustainable uses objectives during the second stage.

The Project Team took very much into account the objectives that were to be accomplished and the times available for that. In fact, it was in a Tripartite evaluation meeting that the decision was made to overlap the stages so as to finish on time with all the objectives, instead of having to wait until the first objectives were achieved in full. All these evaluations made it possible for the Project to come to an end having completed all the tasks.

However, the M&E implementation had some minor shortcomings; the Project did not establish a regular biological monitoring program, nor did it implement any systemic monitoring plans.

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 quality of project implementation is Satisfactory.

According to the TE, UNDP was chosen as the Implementation Agency because of its ties with the country's development and its capacity to bring together actors. The project sought to achieve social

and economic development with biodiversity. Therefore, UNDP was perceived to have a comparative advantage as the implementation agency. In the design of the Project, however, UNDP appears just as an observer at key management levels. The opposite occurred during the execution stage, when, as in other GEF projects, UNDP played a key role in facilitating execution of the project.

Early on in the Project, UNDP contributed as catalyser for agreements to be reached between MVOTMA and the Government of the Department of Rocha, and PROBIDES and other actors. UNDP provided a neutral meeting ground. UNDP also had a role to play in the Governing Board of the Project, in its capacity as observer monitoring the substantive interests of the project and especially those related with global benefits and project development. UNDP performed a monthly follow-up and oversight of the Project execution, emphasising activities, products and the achievement of objectives. UNPD managed the funds and monitored the use they were put to, within the context of the commitment with GEF. This role is significant, because PROBIDES does not have the status of a legal entity and could not have managed the funds. Finally, UNDP had a role in promoting and capitalizing the Project sustainability strategy. UNDP also contributed funds (\$30,000), which together with those from AEI (\$ 30.000) and from the Government of Uruguay (\$85,000), brought stakeholders together and helped them agree on a sustainability strategy which includes: conservation, improving local integrated management capacities, and social and economic development.

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

The quality of project execution is rated Satisfactory for the following reasons.

The executing agency in this project is PROBIDES (formed by the Universidad de la Republica, the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment, and the Government of the Department of Rocha), cattle raisers, rice growers and businessmen in the tourist industry which operate in the BR, NGOs and the rest of the civil society present in the area. PROBIDES, however, does not have the status of a legal entity. During the execution of the Project, and to the extent that it decided to enlarge the coverage area from 350,000 hectares to 3,850,000 hectares, the Governments of the four additional Departments that are within the same watershed were incorporated.

The PD included two important stakeholder participation mechanisms; an operations committee and an advisory committee. The Operations Committee, which was chaired by PROBIDES, have an advisory role and bring together the NGOs, public and private productive sectors and Government agencies (Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries and Ministry of Tourism). According to the TE, it seems that stakeholders as significant as the private sector (which holds 90% of the property) and the ministries mentioned above should have been part of the Steering Committee and should not have been left at a second level in the advisory committee. It is surprising to see that the Ministry of Transportation and Public Works, responsible for water management, was not present. It is also striking that the Ministry of Defence has not participated in the Project, given that it owns land in the area.

There is no precise explanations in the TE and in the PIRs for this lack of involvement. However, the TE mentions that despite the lack of involvement of the stakeholders mentioned above, a dialogue was maintained with and actual involvement existed of the private sector (businessmen, farmers), NGOs, teachers belonging to the educational system and the rural police.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There is no precise environmental impact mentioned in the TE.

The TE states that the Project was successful in attaining its goals for protecting the biodiversity of the wetlands in the Biosphere Reserve, in the 350,000 hectares that were approved as the Bañados BR, in 1976 by MAB and UNESCO. Moreover, among the supplementary productive and environmentally friendly activities, the following have been realized: ñandú breeding farms (at present there are more than 140 farmers engaged in this activity), shrimp farms bred by local small-scale fishermen, fish processing to achieve an added value, better fishing practices by establishing sheltered areas (where no fishing takes place); organic farming and honey production.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

According to the TE, the Project has been highly successful in promoting eco-tourism as a development option in the region, as well as other alternatives to the traditional ones that are beneficial to the environment and biodiversity. The Project has provided technical support to dairy farmers, rice growers and cattle raisers so that they could set aside part of their estates to be private protected areas devoted to eco-tourism.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems,

including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The Project has achieved training, impact in the field and awareness building in stakeholders and of the civil society. According to the TE, the dissemination of information concerning the objectives and achievements of the Project through publications, meetings, workshops and the media was excellent.

The project improved the general level of awareness among the public and lawmakers through organized forums, workshops and meetings with different local and national stakeholders and through the media, where more than 100 articles about the reserve have been published. As a result, a network has been created that connects concerned parties such as producers who engage in biodiversity friendly practices and owners of protected areas. In addition, the project introduced the subject of Biosphere in primary school and in secondary school teacher training.

A significant medium for participation is the Foro de la Costa, which was organized to discuss the Coastal Land Use Regulation with different community stakeholders (both public and private). This forum made it possible for the interests of the different stakeholders involved being collected and incorporated, thus facilitating the consensus building required for the approval.

b) Governance

The approval of a land use regulation for the Biosphere Reserve protects 350,000 hectares of globally significant land that were approved as BR by MAB and UNESCO. According to the TE, by approving the regulation the threats posed by unregulated development and the construction of roads will be reduced. This regulation will also define the protected areas and increases the possibility of establishing new areas.

The Government of the Department of Rocha adopted the General Plan for the Regulation and Sustainable Development of the Atlantic Coast of the Department of Rocha which sets the rules governing coastal use.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impact was reported in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been

mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The PD did not specifically mention spheres in which the project should be replicated, probably because when it was approved this was not a requirement. However in practice this occurred.

- (1) The Project currently being design for the Uruguay river by the Comisión Administradora del Río Uruguay (CARU – Administration Commission for the Uruguay River) has applied to PROBIDES for advice, in order to replicate its experience in the design and implementation of this new project.
- (2) Another example is the project on Esteros de Iberá in Argentina, which is taking PROBIDES as a model.
- (3) The Ministry of Tourism has incorporated “El Uruguay Natural” as the emblem for the promotion of tourism. The development of eco-tourism experiences in the areas covered by the Project contributes to build-up the image of natural tourism in Uruguay.
- (4) UNDP is using the experiences gained from the project to prepare another tourist development project based on nature in northern of Uruguay.

According to the TE, regarding the technical experts who participate in the Project and the capacity for them to become vehicles for the replication of the Project elsewhere, the following observation can be made: two of the technical experts are now working for Governments of Departments, three are now working in a national project and one is working in the Esteros de Iberá project. The experiences and the staff of the Project have also been useful for the formulation of the Rio de la Plata Maritime Front project with Argentina.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The following lessons are given in the TE:

- (1) It is important that in projects that address Biosphere Reserves, the private sector and the key ministries regarding territorial management participate from the very beginning. In general, it is not sufficient to have the ministries of the environment involved.

- (2) Basic or semi-basic studies may seem to be necessary, but they should not be the core of the Project and should be focused on fulfilling knowledge needs for management purposes.
- (3) The publications that are most useful for biodiversity conservation sustainable uses projects are field guides, management plans, dissemination and information brochures, guides as to how things should be done, rather than scientific or technical publications.
- (4) Projects with multiple components that target preservation, sustainable uses and awareness may form a network that is easier to sustain than individual initiatives
- (5) Projects needing changes in the laws and legal provisions concerning land use may require eight or more years before their objectives are attained.
- (6) Biodiversity conservation/management projects have different needs during their execution stage. Sometimes staff is hired with the expectation that it will be there for the entire duration of the project, and this introduces flexibility and may incur cumbersome management that is more closely tied to the staff than to the achievement of certain goals agreed upon before project execution commences.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE:

- (1) It seems important that PROBIDES management formally incorporate more local stakeholders and more stakeholders linked to the productive sector
- (2) If PROBIDES were to have the status of a legal entity, it could be the direct recipient of projects and operate in a more agile manner. Additionally, PROBIDES could have a greater presence and insertion in Montevideo and thus speed-up any formalities whenever this is necessary.
- (3) It seems that PROBIDES has completed a stage of its development, and instead of thinking about an institutional project that would cover all its interests, it might be more interesting for PROBIDES to become a type of umbrella providing support and management to several projects on the subject of conservation and development.
- (4) The University could develop a more organic linkage with PROBIDES, so that it is institutionally committed. In order to achieve this, its involvement must go beyond having a representative in the Governing Board.
- (5) Similarly, the Governments of the Departments and MVOTMA could also develop closer and more effective ties with PROBIDES.
- (6) When the regulatory provisions of the Protected Areas Act are adopted, PROBIDES and the Ministry should give top priority to the areas included in the Bañados del Este BIOSPHERE RESERVE in its restricted definition, i.e. 350,000 hectares.
- (7) When the regional planning discussions start, it would be important to also consider giving priority to the protected areas in the broader Biosphere Reserve, i.e. 3,850,000 hectares, and that the lessons learnt from the Project be put to good use concerning the convenience of having buffer zones around them.

10. 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 provides marginally satisfactory report on the outcomes and achievements of the project. The TE does not attempt to assess the status of biodiversity in the Reserve before and after the project. The impacts of the project are not detailed enough.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE list outcomes as an indication for project sustainability but it does not explicitly relate these outcomes to sustainability. For instance, the TE lays great stress on the relation between training and education and project sustainability without assessing the implications of training on sustainability. Also Not all ratings were provided.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE poorly discusses project sustainability and its exist strategy. The TE also uses a rating of satisfactory rather than using the rating of likely or unlikely as suggested by the GEF M&E Unit Guidelines for Terminal Evaluation Reviews.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE provides some lessons of broad applicability that are supported by evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE provides actual project cost (total and per objective) and discusses the difference between the total fund in the project document and final fund available for the project. However, the TE does not present a breakdown of costs per GEF and co-finance.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E implementation is briefly discussed, and the M&E design is not mentioned. More details, and justification would have been useful.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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