1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	2949
GEF Agency project ID	P100198
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-3
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	World Bank
Project name	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund Project - 2
Country/Countries	Global
Region	Global
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	SP 1 - Promoting Sustainability of Protected Area Networks SP 2 - Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Production Landscapes and Sectors SP 3 - Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species OP 1,2,3,4 - Semi-arid, Freshwater and Marine, Forests, Mountain OP 12 - Integrated Ecosystems
Executing agencies involved	Conservation International
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Lead executing agency; beneficiaries
Private sector involvement	Beneficiaries
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	October 29, 2007
Effectiveness date / project start	June 6, 2008
Expected date of project completion (at start)	December 2012
Actual date of project completion	December 31, 2014

Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		20	20
Co-financing	IA own	0	UA
	Government	0	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	25	UA
	Private sector	0	UA
	NGOs/CSOs	55	UA
Total GEF funding		20	20

Total Co-financing	80	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	100	UA
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	September 30, 2015	
Author of TE	Valerie Hickey	
TER completion date	January 2019	
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Cody Parker	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	-	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		MS	-	ML
M&E Design		-	-	MU
M&E Implementation		-	-	S
Quality of Implementation		MS	-	MS
Quality of Execution		MS	-	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to "achieve sustainable conservation and integrated ecosystem management in areas of globally important biodiversity, through consolidating conservation outcomes in existing CEPF regions and expanding funding to new critical ecosystems" (TE pg 7).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective was to "strengthen the involvement and effectiveness of civil society in contributing to the conservation and management of globally important biodiversity" (TE pg 7). The project intended to achieve its objective through four main components (TE pg 17):

Component 1: Strengthening protection and management of globally significant biodiversity;

Component 2: Increasing local and national capacity to integrate biodiversity conservation into development and landscape planning;

Component 3: Monitoring and knowledge sharing; and

Component 4: Ecosystem profile development and project execution.

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

There were no changes to objectives or activities, but the mid-term review revised the indicators to align them with the target values.

4. GEF IEO 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 was relevant to GEF's biodiversity focal area and its strategic priorities (SP). It was aligned with SP 1 in promoting sustainability of Protected Area networks, SP 2 in mainstreaming biodiversity into production landscapes and sectors, and SP 3 on prevention, control and management of invasive alien species. It was consistent with GEF's Operation Policy 12 on integrated ecosystem management. Furthermore, the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund Project – 2 was a follow-up to an earlier project to "provide strategic assistance and small grants to engage NGOs, community groups and civil society partners in responding to growing threats to species and habitats on a global scale" (ICR pg 1). The hotspots conservation approach of the project was a "highly targeted strategy for tackling the challenge of biodiversity loss at the global level. Since many hotspots cross national borders, the approach works to transcend political boundaries and fosters coordination and joint efforts across large landscapes for local and global benefits" (ICR pg 1). Thus, the TER finds the relevance of project to be Satisfactory.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE rated the project's effectiveness as substantial and assessed the effectiveness based on satisfactory results achieved against the outcome indicators. The project had four main components with one component to monitor and share knowledge. However, the TER assessed three components related to protection of significant biodiversity, strengthening stakeholders' capacity, and ecosystem profile development. Based on the assessment, the TER finds that the effectiveness of the project was Satisfactory as it achieved many of its targets, and in some cases surpassed them.

Component 1: Strengthening protection and management of globally significant biodiversity

Under this component, the project aimed to strengthen management of Protected Areas, support community initiatives, develop innovative financial mechanisms for sustainability, and have multi-regional priorities. As per the TE, the project provided support to 20 critical ecosystems, and launched investment programs involving civil society in conservation in nine new regions. The project was able to market itself as a brand and leverage partnership and additional resources by "attracting new donors to align their investments with the ecosystem profiles of a number of regions". The project also had a small grants facility that "through effective adaptive management has put in place systematic implementation support protocols, technical and quality review processes, and disbursement methods" (TE pg 25). For

4

regional implementation, the first phase of the project instituted a learning-by-doing consortium where locally based international organizations led a regional implementation team by partnering with locally based civil society organizations, and this approach was continued by this project with support from the project's Donor Council and Technical Working Group.

Component 2: Increasing local and national capacity to integrate biodiversity conservation into development and landscape planning:

Under this component, the project intended to build capacity of national and local stakeholders in order to better to integrate development and biodiversity conservation. As per the TE, the project provided grants to 691 civil society organizations located in 20 hotspots covering 81 countries to participate in biodiversity conservation programs that were guided by the project's ecosystem profiles. During the project, 14,211,118 hectares of key biodiversity areas were under strengthened protection and management, and 1,448,860 hectares of new protected areas was created at project completion. Due to the project's support, 4,531,206 hectares of production landscapes were being managed for biodiversity conservation or sustainable use. This component was very successful in achieving its targets.

Component 4: Ecosystem profile development and project execution:
Under this component, the project created an ecosystem profile for each hotspot and as per the TE, it was "key in developing the strategic baselines to guide determination of appropriate investment levels to maximize the impact of the work under Components 1 and 2" (TE pg 9). The project engaged civil society members in the ecosystem profiles to build robust hotspot conservation strategies which proved to be excellent tools for building networks and parallel funding streams in investment regions. For example, the Mava Foundation and Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation adopted the Mediterranean Basin hotspot profile, while the McKnight Foundation and the Margaret A. Cargill Foundation adopted the Indo-Burma hotspot profile. According to the TE "the opportunity that the ecosystem profiles offer to work off a common approach, deliberated and agreed upon from the ground up, has helped crowd in further investments and expand the potential for success and sustainability" (TE pg 9).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE gave a moderate rating to efficiency of the project, and the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating based on time and financial management. The project allocated GEF grant funding of $20 million to investment in ecosystem operations for subprojects. Although the TE stated that other donor financing was allocated for operations and monitoring, it did not provide details on the materialized co-financing amount. The TE also mentioned that the implementation was staggered and suffered with delays in initiation of work at hotspots. During mid-term review "it was determined that disbursements had suffered a 17 month delay due to the limited disbursement ratio for sub-grants (26%) financed by the GEF grant" (TE pg 7).

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately Likely

The project had issues of conflict that affected the project's ability to invest in certain hotspots, but to strengthen the institutional capacity it involved civil society stakeholders from the beginning of implementation. However, the TE did not provide any assessment on financial sustainability. Given the information available, the TER concurs with TE's rating and provides a Moderately Likely rating to sustainability of the project.

Financial: The TE did not mention risks to financial sustainability.

Socio-political: The project faced conflict-related risks in the Eastern Afromontane and the Mediterranean Basin that hindered the participation of civil society groups in the program and also affected the project's ability to invest in certain countries. Although this risk was mitigated by proceeding to implement project activities in other hotspots, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating to socio-political sustainability.

Institutional and governance framework: The project engaged civil society stakeholders in the ecosystem profiling process of each hotspot, strategic investment analysis, grant proposal development and project design processes, and actual implementation which has "strongly reinforced the capacity of grantees,
many of whom may not have had access to funding and for whom the CEPF support has honed skills that can serve in future to source additional financing support" (TE pg 17). Thus, the TER gives a Likely rating to institutional sustainability.

Environmental: The TE did not mention risks to environmental sustainability.

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?

Although the project was supposed to receive $80,000,000 in co-financing from Conservation International, the McArthur Foundation, and others, the TE did not provide any information on co-financing including whether or not it materialized.

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 faced delays due to disbursement issues and late initiation of work across hotspots which led to a project extension of 24 months, but the TE does not mention if the delays affected project 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:

As this was a world-wide project, country ownership cannot be assessed.

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 had provisions to collect baseline data, a results framework with targets and indicators for monitoring, semi-annual supervision missions, mid-term review and terminal evaluation. The M&E was to be undertaken at hotspot ecosystem and program levels, by the project Secretariat and CEPF Grant Directors, and by grantees. The project also provided GEF's biodiversity tracking tool, Protected Area management effectiveness and biodiversity impact assessment tools for individual projects. However, the Results Framework was "heavily output and process-oriented, not outcome-oriented. As a result, the Results Framework does not provide [any] indication of how to aggregate impact in support of the PDO (social level) and GEO (sustainable conservation and ecosystem management)" (TE pg 11). During project restructuring, the M&E results framework was modified, and three key indicators were revised to better realign with project objectives. Taking into consideration the M&E design weaknesses highlighted above, the TER gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to M&E design at entry.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE stated that the restructuring and revision of the results framework allowed the project to assess the impact of investments more closely. Although two intermediate indicators were monitored, two other intermediate indicators were not tracked by the M&E team. The project submitted results reports annually, carried out participatory assessment at each hotspot, and conducted a mid-term review which introduced additional safeguards requirements and revised the GEF grant's disbursement. The project also required grant recipients to complete final project reports including details on investment results

and lessons learnt. As the project seemed to have carried out M&E implementation adequately, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating.

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: Moderately Satisfactory

The World Bank was the implementing agency of the project and the TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to quality of implementation. The World Bank performed well in terms of ensuring quality of project at entry, provided clear operational guidance and criteria to support implementation, and responded well to adaptive management needs. However, there were issues with quality of implementation as there was a change of the task team leadership three times during the project. The TE also mentioned that there were very few supervision missions and only five field visits to the new hotspots conducted during implementation. It said supervision fell short "with regard to the Project's aim of fostering strategic links with other relevant Bank operations in the regions" (TE pg 19). Considering the shortcomings in supervision, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: UA

The TE assigned a Moderately Satisfactory rating to quality of project execution but did not provide an assessment of the role of Conservation International as the executing agency. The TE stated the Board of Directors of Conservation International maintained fiduciary responsibility for the program, while the project secretariat provided oversight and reporting for the program. Due to the limited information available in the TE, the TER is unable to assess the quality of project execution by Conservation International.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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.

The TE mentioned that as a result of restoration of degraded ecosystems, the project was able to secure "1.2 billion tons of carbon globally, which translates into 120.5 tons of carbon per Project hectare" (TE pg 17).

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.

As per the TE, the project's cash and non-cash incentives have helped to increase the annual income of 349 families from 11 villages (TE pg 17).

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: As per the TE "a Civil Society Organizational Capacity Tracking Tool was designed to assess the organizational capacity of civil society organizations involved with the CEPF including, environmental NGOs, community-based organizations and academic institutions. The tool is applied in all hotspots and measures the capacity of individual CSOs to effectively plan, implement and evaluate actions for biodiversity conservation" (TE pg 11).

b) Governance: The TE stated that "institutional strengthening has occurred against a full project cycle framework, from initial participation in the ecosystem profiling stage and its strategic investment analysis, to grant proposal development and project design processes, through to actual implementation. This has strongly reinforced the capacity of grantees, many of whom may not have had access to funding and for whom the CEPF support has honed skills that can serve in future to source additional financing support" (TE pg 11).

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 impacts have been observed.

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 TE does not mention GEF initiatives adopted at scale.

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 TE provided the following key lessons (TE pgs 22-23):

a) Bringing grantees of hotspots together could offer an opportunity to exchange ideas and strategy moving forward through the lens of a landscape vision.
b) Developing standardized results framework at the hotspot level could be complementary for the ecosystem profiling exercises at ex post stage.
c) Decentralizing work could strengthen local ownership of conservation efforts and have effective outreach to a wider set of civil society actors.
d) The World Bank's comparative advantage of being an incubator of innovator should be utilized, but during the project the Bank's "role was largely limited to that of a pass-through mechanism and to provision of quality and compliance assurance" (TE pg 22).
e) For long term impact, engagement must build on the learning process with a step-by-step approach, nurture synergies between small grants and national development objectives, and have long-term financing for ongoing project investments.
f) The project hotspots investments should be aligned with national or local investment opportunities.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE has not provided recommendations.

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 IEO 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 report contained adequate information on impacts, but the effectiveness of the project was not assessed as per the outcomes. This made it difficult to assess outputs generated through outcomes.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is largely consistent in its ratings with the evidence presented.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provided very brief assessment of sustainability and did not provide information on GEF's criteria of sustainability.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learnt are well substantiated with evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides summary of project costs but did not include information on materialized co-financing.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE gave ratings as well as an explanation of the M&E process	S
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).

The TER did not use any additional sources.