

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3848	
GEF Agency project ID		609770	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Integrated Management of the Ilha Grande Bay Ecosystem	
Country/Countries		Brazil	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD SP-2; SP-3; SP-4	
Executing agencies involved		Rio de Janeiro State Institute of Environment (INEA) of the State Environment Agency (SEA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Committee for the Defence of the Ilha Grande (CODIG); and the Institute for Marine Research, Architecture and Renewable Resources (IPEMAR)	
Private sector involvement		Not available	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 15, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 31, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		July 29, 2016	
Actual date of project completion		March 31, 2019	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.1	.1
	Co-financing	.09	Not available
GEF Project Grant		2.3	2.3
Co-financing	IA own	.05	.05
	Government	25	40.58
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.4	2.4
Total Co-financing		25.05	40.63
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		27.45	43.03
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2019	
Author of TE		Michiel Meijer and Marcelo Gonçalves	
TER completion date		January 10, 2019	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MS ¹	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	ML
M&E Design		MS	--	MU
M&E Implementation		MS	--	MU
Quality of Implementation		MS	--	MS
Quality of Execution		S	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's goal is "to achieve, over the long-term, conservation and sustainable use of the BIG [Baia de Ilha Grande] Ecosystem and its associated terrestrial and marine biodiversity which is of global significance." The Global Environmental Objectives of the project are to:

1. Develop and implement a pilot IEM [Integrated Ecosystem Management] approach to the Bay;
2. Prepare and implement a financially sustainable biodiversity and conservation mosaic strategy and action plan to promote greater coordination and coherency among the Bay's existing conservation units;
3. Strengthen management of selected conservation units in BIG
4. Mitigate selected threats affecting the BIG Ecosystem [organic pollution from urban waste water and solid wastes associated with recreational marinas] and its ability to provide critical environmental "goods and services" including the conservation of biodiversity;
5. Increase public awareness and support for efforts to conserve the BIG Ecosystem; and
6. Increase institutional capacity in ecosystem-based environmental planning and management at the regional and municipal levels (TE pgs. 6-7; Project Document pg. 40).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not provide Development Objectives separate from the Global Environmental Objectives.

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

The objectives of the project were not amended during implementation, however there was a significant shift in project activities under Component 2 (Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Areas). The project originally intended to establish an executive body for the Bocaina Mosaic, however this was not feasible given that stakeholders were resistant to expanding the consultative role of the consulting council (TE pg. 31). As a result, planned activities under Component 2 were largely abandoned. The

¹ 2017 PIR

project decided to shift their efforts to developing the BIG2050 Initiative, which comprised of an environmental monitoring system (RADAR) and the BIG 2050 Challenge, which accepts proposals for initiatives or projects benefiting the BIG ecosystem (TE pg. 7). The project's results framework was not amended to reflect this shift in activities.

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 TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, assesses project relevance as **Satisfactory**. The project's objectives are consistent with GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic Program 2: *Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems*, as well as Strategic Program 3: *Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks*, and Strategic Program 4: *Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity*. The project's activities and results were also consistent with Brazil's policies and frameworks regarding biodiversity, including the National Biodiversity Strategy and National Biodiversity Policy (2002). Additionally, the Baia de Ilha Grande (BIG) Ecosystem was ranked as a high priority area for biodiversity conservation under the National Program for Biological Diversity (PRONABIO) (Request for CEO Endorsement pg. 11). Activities under Component 2 (Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Areas) were also consistent with Article 26 of the law establishing the National System of Conservation Units, which states that "when there is a set of conservation units of the same or different categories, juxtaposed or overlapping, and other public or private protected area, constituting a mosaic, the management of the whole will be done in an integrated and participatory manner" (TE pg. 21).

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

This TER assesses project effectiveness as **Moderately Satisfactory**, and this TER concurs. Although the project achieved its objectives under Components 1 (Planning, Policy, and Institutional Strengthening) and 4 (Public Environmental Awareness and Communication), moderate shortcomings were apparent under Components 2 (Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Areas) and 3 (Threat Analysis, Mitigation,

and Monitoring and Enforcement). Due to challenges establishing an executive body for the Bocaina Mosaic, planned activities and results under Component 2 were abandoned. As an alternative, the project developed the BIG2050 Initiative, comprising of an environmental monitoring system (RADAR) and the BIG 2050 Challenge, which accepts proposals for initiatives or projects benefiting the BIG ecosystem (TE pg. 7). The TE indicates that while the BIG2050 Initiative strengthened project outcomes under Component 1 (as a policy tool), Component 2 (as a robust monitoring tool), and Component 3 (as a mobilization and awareness raising tool), the Initiative was not sufficient in itself to achieve the expected outcomes under Component 2 (improved integrated management of the Bocaina Mosaic and Conservation Units) (TE pg. 30). Furthermore, the project's results framework was not amended to reflect the shift in project activities, making it difficult to measure the outcomes of the BIG2050 Initiative.

The project's achievements, by component and outcome, are provided below:

Component 1: Planning, Policy, and Institutional Strengthening

Outcome 1.1: Improved inter-agency coordination in support of Ecosystem-Based Management of BIG Ecosystem

Outcome 1.2: Improved policy framework in support of Ecosystem Management principles

Outcome 1.3: Evidence of increased "mainstreaming" of Ecosystem-Based Management principles in SUPBIG [Regional Office for BIG] and other relevant public and private sector institutions

Expected outputs contributing toward these outcomes included: (1) Establishment of a permanent, financially sustainable, public forum for addressing issues of common concern that affect the ecological health and productivity of the BIG system; (2) Development and adoption of long-term, multiple phase strategic plan that will safeguard and promote the ecological restoration of the BIG Ecosystem; (3) Four policy studies addressing policy gaps/failures contributing to non-sustainable production/economic practices in BIG; (4) Decentralization of environmental permitting procedures to BIG municipalities; and (5) Increased institutional capacity in INEA (State Environmental Institute), SUPBIG and other relevant public and private sector institutions. By project end, a public forum, the Watershed Committee, had been established and was financially sustainable. A Watershed Management Plan was also developed (although it had not been finalized by project end) and progress had been made on integrating the Plan with Coastal Economical Ecological Zoning (ZEEC). Additionally, legislation addressing policy gaps (i.e. regulations regarding marinas; mariculture; bilge water separation; etc.) was developed and adopted. The Angra dos Reis and Paraty municipalities had also taken on environmental permitting by project end. The TE also notes that all planned activities for institutional strengthening were implemented with public and private sector institutions (TE pgs. 35-36).

Component 2: Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Areas

Outcome 2.1: Improved integrated management of ecosystems of global importance in the Bocaina Mosaic

Outcome 2.2: Improved management effectiveness of existing, participating Conservation Units (CUs) in BIG

Outcome 2.3: Increased abundance of indicator species and diversity of global importance

Expected outputs contributing toward these outcomes included: (1) Completion of a Bocaina Mosaic strategy and action plan; (2) Creation of a sustainable financing mechanism that covers the operational costs of the executive secretariat and selected conservation units; (3) Preparation/updating for conservation unit management plans; (4) Increases in staff in individual BIG conservation units; (5) Expansion of at least one conservation unit beyond the base area (of no less than 24,000 hectares); and (6) Creation of at least one new marine conservation unit in BIG. As noted above, activities related to strengthening the Bocaina Mosaic (strategy and action plan and financing mechanism) were abandoned. By project end, three conservation unit management plans had been finalized and adopted. Additionally, the management effectiveness of the protected areas was improved, as reflected by their METT scores (GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools). The TE also notes that there was a substantial increase in conservation unit staff (TE pgs. 36-38). However, expected outputs regarding the expansion of conservation units in the BIG ecosystem were not achieved by project end (TE pg. 39).

Component 3: Threat Analysis, Mitigation, and Monitoring and Enforcement

Outcome 3.1: Reduction in pollution loading in BIG

Outcome 3.2: Improvement in environmental quality in BIG marinas

Expected outputs contributing toward these outcomes included: (1) Preparation and implementation of municipal waste water pollution plans in two BIG municipalities; (2) 20% of marinas licensed; (3) Development of dynamic computer model representing BIG ecosystem structure and processes; and (4) Development and implementation of an environmental quality monitoring program in BIG that includes adoption of biological indicators. By project end, the municipal waste water pollution plans were developed, however implementation of the plans was incomplete in regard to sewage treatment. The TE also notes that the licensing of marinas was ongoing but incomplete by project end. The TE does not address the development of a computer model, however the development and implementation of the RADAR environmental system was completed by project end (TE pgs. 39-40).

Component 4: Public Environmental Awareness and Communication

Outcome 4.1: Increased public awareness and support for the protection and restoration of the BIG Ecosystems

Expected outputs contributing toward these outcomes included: (1) Development of a Public Awareness and Communication Strategy; and (2) Implementation of that Strategy. The TE indicates that these outputs were achieved by project end, resulting in an increase in awareness of the BIG Ecosystem, and the BIG2050 Initiative (TE pg. 41). However, neither the TE nor the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) indicate whether the targets set out in the results framework were achieved.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TE downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The original project end date was July 29, 2016, which was extended until March 31, 2019 in order to complete project activities. The TE indicates this lengthy extension was largely due to shifting efforts away from establishing the Bocaina Mosaic executive body and toward the BIG2050 Initiative (pg. 29). The TE notes that it took some time for the project monitoring system to detect issues with stakeholder support for the original project activities under Component 2 (pg. 39). The project had already devoted resources to developing the Bocaina Mosaic strategy and action plan, as well as creating a financing mechanism for the executive body, when the stakeholders notified the project in 2016 that they were not interested in continuing with these activities (TE pg. 32). Although the project pivoted to the BIG2050 Initiative, the objectives under Component 2 were not achieved. The TE also notes that there were delays in implementation due changes in FAO regulations and procedures which led to “slow decision making at FAO on whether or not certain activities or expenditures would be allowed, as well as contracting procedures” (pg. 11).

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

The TE assesses project sustainability to be **Moderately Likely**, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

The TE assesses the sustainability of financial resources as **Moderately Likely**, and this TER concurs. The TE indicates that the partner institutions (State Environmental Institute, Rio de Janeiro State University, Angra dos Reis Municipality, and Paraty Municipality) have adopted the project activities as part of their mandate, which should ensure a minimal level of financing (TE pg. 44). Additionally, a fund for financing the BIG2050 Initiative was in the process of being set up at project end. The TE indicates that a number of organizations had contacted the project about financing the BIG2050 Fund, including the Fundação Boticário, a foundation linked to a large cosmetics producer and retailer in Brazil (TE pg. 45). On the other hand, the Rio de Janeiro State Government, a key partner and co-financer of the project, experienced a recession following the 2016 Olympic Games. The TE notes that the situation was slowly normalizing by 2018, however it could prevent further financial support from the State Government in the near future (TE pg. 44).

Sociopolitical

The TE assesses sociopolitical sustainability as **Moderately Likely**, and this TER concurs. The TE notes that the “level of buy-in and ownership of the stakeholders involved in the project is quite high.” The TE indicates local community members were motivated to participate in the Watershed Committee and other project activities (TE pg. 44). Support from the Rio de Janeiro State Government was also strong during implementation, as evidenced by their significant co-financing of the project (\$22.3 million) (TE pg. 50). A new state government was in place at project end, however, and their environmental

priorities were unclear. Additionally, the TE indicates that the environment is not a priority for the Federal Government, which could threaten the sustainability of project activities such as environmental licensing and the establishment of Conservation Units (TE pg. 44).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Moderately Unlikely**, which this TER upgrades to **Moderately Likely**. The TE notes that “legislation and regulations have been adopted with support from the project, which will have lasting impacts on the quality of the environment and sustainable development” (pg. 45). The Watershed Committee was also functioning by project end, and the Watershed Management Plan was in the process of being finalized. The TE also indicates that the municipal sanitation plans were in place (pg. 45). Additionally, the municipalities had taken on environmental licensing by project end.

Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability as **Moderately Unlikely**, and this TER concurs. The TE does not directly address environmental sustainability, but it does indicate environmental risks regarding sanitation. Although municipal sanitation plans were in place by project end, their implementation was incomplete and contamination levels in the water were high at project end (TE pg. 9). The TE indicates that a considerable amount of co-financing (\$14 million) was spent on potable drinking water rather than sewage infrastructure and treatment. Additionally, many local communities were still dependent on septic tanks, which were not regulated (TE pg. 35).

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?

Actual co-financing (\$40.63 million) exceeded expected co-financing (\$25.05 million) by approximately 62%. The Rio de Janeiro State Government provided over half of the co-financing (\$22.3 million), in part due to utilizing IDB and World Bank loans for protected areas and natural disaster warning systems (TE pg. 50). The Angra dos Reis Municipality contributed \$17.2 million, whereas the Paraty Municipality contributed only \$.02 million, significantly less than the \$10.14 million confirmed at CEO Endorsement (TE pg. 51). \$14 million of the co-financing provided by the municipalities was used for potable drinking water rather than sewage infrastructure and treatment (TE pg. 35). The TE indicates that as a result, Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) values had not been reduced by project end, which was an objective of the project (pg. 11)

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 32 months, from July 29, 2016 until March 31, 2019. The TE indicates that this extension was necessary to complete project activities, in particular those related to the BIG2050 Initiative, which was not anticipated in the original project design. The project had to abandon activities related to the Bocaina Mosaic governance, as these activities were not well received by the project partners and beneficiaries (TE pg. 29). The TE indicates that the project was slow to detect issues with the initial strategy and adaptation to a new strategy took time (pg. 39). TE indicates that while the BIG2050 Initiative strengthened components of the project, it did not allow the project to achieve expected outcomes under Component 2. The TE also notes that delays were experienced due to changes in FAO regulations and procedures (pg. 11).

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:

The TE indicates that the "level of buy-in and ownership of the stakeholders involved in the project is quite high" (pg. 44). Examples of buy-in include the active participation of local community members in the Watershed Committee, as well as the BIG2050 Initiative. The TE also indicates that the institutional partners of the project (State Environmental Institute, Rio de Janeiro State University, Angra dos Reis Municipality, and Paraty Municipality) have "internalized project results well... since these results are linked to their institutional mandates" (TE pg. 44). It should be noted however, that stakeholders were not invested in key activities under Component 2 related to establishing an executive body for the Bocaina Mosaic, which ultimately affected the achievement of project outcomes.

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 TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory**, which this TE downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The results framework provided in the Project Document is logical and hierarchical, however there are too many objectives identified given the size and scope of the project. The TE notes that the indicators provided in the results framework are generally SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely), however this TER disagrees. Indicators provided at the objective level,

for example, are particularly weak: *Political and public commitment to support a second phase of the BIG program*; and *Legal documentation demonstrating the creation and operation of a permanent and financially sustainable body to support the Secretariat of the Bocaina Mosaic and the implementation of the Mosaic Strategy and support for selected Conservation Units*. Additionally, targets were not provided for all indicators.

The Project Document does include a detailed M&E Plan, which includes M&E activities, responsible parties, timeframe, and budgeted costs (pgs. 25-29). An overall M&E budget of \$94,060 was provided for in the Project Document, which was appropriate for this project (pg. 29).

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

The TE provides a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for M&E Implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The Midterm Evaluation (2015) indicates that the project hired an external consultant to design an M&E system, however the evaluation found no evidence of its implementation (pg. 13). The TE does indicate that this M&E system was adopted by the Project Management Unit, however the project implementation reports (PIRs) do not reflect any changes. The PIRs are detailed, however the indicators reported on are the same as those in the Project Document. A significant weakness in M&E implementation was that the project did not revise the results framework when the project strategy changed in 2016. As the TE indicates, the original results framework was not appropriate for monitoring the aspects of the project that changed, and it was therefore difficult for the project to capture the outcomes of the BIG2050 Initiative (pg. 30).

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 TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for the quality of project implementation, and this TER concurs. The lead GEF agency for the project was the Food and Agriculture Organization of the

United Nations (FAO). The project was designed as the first phase of a 15-25-year approach to create an enabling environment, institutional arrangements, and public support for mitigating threats to the biodiversity of the BIG Ecosystem (TE pg. 22). The TE indicates that the project design was, on the whole, relevant to the country context. However, the initial intervention strategy did not take into account the institutional and political risks to establishing an executive body for the Bocaina Mosaic, which was a significant component of the project (TE pg. 31). The Management Response to the Terminal Evaluation acknowledges that the failure to deliver results under Component 2 “may well be the consequence of insufficient analysis during the project preparation phase” (pg. 3). The project did eventually change its strategy, and the TE indicates that the BIG2050 Initiative was one of the most effective components of the project (pg. 34). As noted above, however, the project team did not amend the results framework to capture the results of this change in strategy. The TE also notes that FAO’s technical and operational support was adequate, however internal changes to regulations and procedures did result in some delays (pg. 33).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for the quality of project execution, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The executing agency for the project was the Rio de Janeiro State Institute of Environment (INEA) of the State Environment Agency (SEA). The Project Management Unit (PMU) included a National Director and Project Coordinator from the INEA, as well as FAO consultants filling the Project Manager, Technical Assistant, and Administrative Assistant roles (Midterm Review pg. 11). The Midterm Evaluation indicates that the INEA lacked the staff to implement project actions at start-up, however this improved over time (pg. 12). Additionally, the Midterm Evaluation notes that project implementation was affected by the lack of communication between the technical and administrative levels of the project, and in particular, with FAO/Brazil (pg. 13). The TE does not directly address whether communication improved over time, however it does note that overall, the PMU “demonstrated capacity for adaptive management, maximizing the achievement of outputs within reach and adapting others in order to continue to contribute to the expected outcomes of the project” (pg. 41).

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 does not indicate any environmental changes that occurred by project end. The TE does indicate that Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) values had not been reduced by project end. The TE posits that this in part due to municipalities prioritizing potable water over sewage infrastructure and treatment (pg. 35).

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.

The TE does not indicate any socioeconomic changes that occurred by the end of the project.

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

By project end, a Watershed Committee was established, and a Watershed Management Plan was in the process of being finalized. The TE notes that management plans for three Conservation Units had been finalized and adopted. Additionally, the management effectiveness of the protected areas was improved, as reflected by an increase in their METT scores (GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools). The TE also notes that there was a substantial increase in conservation unit staff (TE pgs. 36-38).

At the municipal level, sanitation plans were in place, although they had yet to be implemented. Additionally, municipalities had taken on environmental licensing. Another key result of the project was the BIG2050 Initiative, a component of which was a robust environmental monitoring system (RADAR) (TE pg. 45).

b) Governance

The TE indicates that legislation addressing policy gaps was developed and adopted (pg. 36). The 2017 Project Implementation Report specifically notes that the Mariculture Standard for Licensing was approved by the State Environmental Institute’s (INEA) Council Board of Directors and sanctioned by the State Environmental Council (CONEMA) on August 11, 2015. Additionally,

the Standard for Licensing Marinas and the Standard for Nautical Structures was approved by CONEMA for the Rio de Janeiro State (pg. 9).

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.

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts that occurred by the end of the project.

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 indicate any adoption of GEF initiatives 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 provides the following lessons learned (pg. 55):

1. The experience with the Bocaina Mosaic demonstrates the importance of a better understanding of policies, legislations involved and of a thorough stakeholder analysis, where the potential role of each stakeholder is made explicit, based on its essential characteristics and attributions, avoiding implicit assumptions.
2. Projects should not take on roles belonging to institutional mandates of project partners, as happened with the executive secretariat of the Bocaina Mosaic being presided by consultants contracted by the project.
3. The Bocaina Mosaic problems also demonstrate that interinstitutional cooperation should have a clear added value for it to succeed. Conservation Unit managers did not see the need for cooperation with other CUs or other types of protected areas and maroon communities.
4. Expenditure by co-financing should be sufficiently specified. Municipal co- financing was spent on sanitation, but not on the kind of sanitation (sewage treatment implementation) that was relevant to the achievement of the project results and outcomes. Unlike in IFI financed projects, in GEF financed projects (i) projects should not depend on high levels of co-financing for the achievement of important results and (ii) outcomes which are 100% financed though co-

financing are out of project control. While IFIs have strong control on the use of co-financing (IFI disbursement is conditional to co-financing and project supervision, safeguards and financial management rules compliance apply to co-financing), GEF projects do not benefit from the same management instruments and therefore the project could never influence neither the achievement of targets or the quality/efficiency of the works.

5. Public Private Partnerships, such as the ones sought by the BIG2050 Initiative to establish its fund, can effectively reduce the vulnerability of projects and their results to uncertain politics and availability of public funding.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pg. 54):

1. To **FAO**: Difficulties encountered by the evaluation team in evaluating co-financing and project expenditure suggest that future projects would benefit from a real time financial monitoring system, as far as possible.
2. To **FAO**: When significant changes are made to project outputs over the course of implementation, these should be documented in a structured way (e.g. through inclusion in the logical framework) and adequate new indicators and outputs should be developed and obsolete ones abandoned, in order to maintain project logic. This will facilitate posterior monitoring and evaluation activities.
3. To **FAO**: All project documents for evaluation should be made available in an organized manner at the beginning of evaluation process, before field mission and in accordance to the project logical framework.
4. To **FAO and GEF**: Ensure as much as possible in future projects that co-financing is directly linked to specific project outcomes and that its activities and expected outcomes are under the control of the project.
5. To **State Government**: to apply the successful model of the BIG2050 Initiative for other areas in Rio de Janeiro State, preferably as a whole, or parts of it (RADAR, "Challenge", the use of PPPs)
6. To **FAO and GEF**: Future projects aimed at biodiversity conservation and/or supporting protected areas would benefit from a thorough analysis of what can be effectively accomplished with available funds and the onsite reality of the threats and issues being addressed. They should have a deep understanding not only of the relevant policies and laws but also of the many stakeholders involved.
7. To **FAO and GEF**: Analysis of METT scores should not be limited to the overall as a proxy to project success and impact. Analysis should consider the different elements of the Tool and be associated, when possible, to further evidence as a means to be verified. Casual correlations should not be made as a way to increase project impacts.
8. To **FAO and GEF**: Gender and other cross-cutting issues should always be considered in new projects. Not considering should be specifically justified.

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 TE contains a thorough assessment of the project's outputs and outcomes. A more systematic assessment of the project's achievements at the objective and impact levels would have been helpful (the TE focuses on intended impacts and potential impacts).	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence presented is complete and convincing and the ratings are well substantiated, particularly regarding project effectiveness.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The adequately assesses some aspects of sustainability (financial; sociopolitical), however it doesn't provide much evidence to justify other ratings (institutional frameworks/governance; environmental)	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes co-financing information but not actual project costs.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not adequately assess M&E Design, in particular there is no analysis of the results framework other than noting that it was not amended to reflect changes to the project.	MU
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).

Management Response to the TE (2019); Midterm Evaluation (2015)