GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	10/16/06
GEF Project ID:	58		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:	WB_SAP: 6210; WB_PO: 16	**GEF financing:**	10 (Another $0.275Mn in PRIF)	No information
Project Name:	**National Biodiversity Project (Probio)**	IA/EA own:		No information
Country:	Brazil	Government:	Government Of Brazil, Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources: IBAMA	No information
		Other*:	Private & Public Entities	No information
		Total Cofinancing	10	No information
Operational Program:	STRM	**Total Project Cost:**	20	**19.53**
IA	World Bank	Dates		
Partners involved:		Work Program date	1-May-91	
		CEO Endorsement		
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)	12-May-96	
		Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2001	Actual: 12/31/2005
Prepared by: Divya Nair	Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: **5 yrs and 1 month**	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: **9 yrs and one month**	Difference between original and actual closing: **4 yrs**
Author of TE: Adriana Moreira		TE completion date: 06/21/2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: 07/27/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 month

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

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

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if	GEF EO

			applicable (e.g. IEG)	
2.1 Project outcomes		S	S	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	HL [1]	L	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation				U/A
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?   No. In the absence of specific studies on the outcomes of the sub-projects which constitute 72% of the project costs, the information provided is insufficient.
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

The project aims to assist the Government of Brazil to launch a program for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The rationale for GEF support was Brazil's status as 'probably the most biodiversity-rich country in the world' and acknowledgement that the Government of Brazil was the first country to officially endorse the CBD in 1992.

The GEF Project Document included two projects: the National Biodiversity Project (PROBIO) and the Brazilian Biodiversity Fund Project (FUNBIO). During preparation, it was decided to separate the two projects. The two projects were then submitted to the Bank's Board separately. PROBIO's objectives did not change.

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

The primary objective of the proposed project(s) was to assist the Government of Brazil to launch a program for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The project was expected to lead to: a) prioritizing of actions; b) facilitation of partnerships between the public and the private sectors; and c) to better disseminate biodiversity information and knowledge to agriculture, fishing and forestry sectors. (*Project Document 1995, pp. 12*).

The PROBIO project objective was specifically to:
1. promote **Biodiversity Assessments and Dissemination** (19% of total project costs at appraisal, actual 15%) for the generation and dissemination of diagnostic studies to identify priority actions for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; and
2. support **Model Biodiversity Sub-Projects** (72% of total project costs at appraisal, actual 67%) as demonstration projects that would test models and methodologies for sustainable use of biodiversity

(Project Document, Annex 12 Draft M&E Plan and IEG-TE Review)

Some major changes include:
- The project was extended by four years, these years were the period in which the project achieved its greatest results, in large part due to the changes made after the mid-term review, as well as to the consolidation of project teams and maturity of procedures and operations. (*TE, pp14*)
- While the original proposal for Sub-Projects averaged $500,000 each, the number of subprojects

---

[1] This was incorrectly marked as L in TE

was greatly increased and the average size decreased, to slightly over $300,000 for the first five subprojects and approximately $110,000each for the rest. The expected role of FUNBIO and PRONABIO was changed, too, to reflect the final design and capacity of these institutions. FUNBIO did not develop the structure to issue calls for proposals; rather these were issued by the PROBIO team, at times jointly with the National Environment Fund (FMNA), also within MMA. As per the TE, (pp10), these changes ultimately resulted in a successful subproject program.

- The design of the Biodiversity Information Network was modified to give much greater control to the Ministry of the Environment when it was found that under the management of the Andre Tosello Foundation, information was not shared willingly with all relevant actors. The database of Andre Tosello Foundation is now under MMA control, which has been more successful in collecting and sharing biodiversity information.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

<u>Institutional and legislative strengthening</u>:
- The project was fundamental in consolidating the government's Biodiversity National Policy and National Biodiversity Strategy and reorganizing the related institutional structure. It assisted the government in creating the National Biodiversity Law and established Priority Areas that were subsequently adopted by IBAMA and the National Petroleum Agency (TE, pp6).
- It was critical in promoting the creation of the Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests and Directorate for Biodiversity, based initially on the Project's Coordination Unit. These institutions are now responsible for the government's biodiversity program and catalyzing the discussion of biodiversity issues within the government. (TE, pp5) PROBIO offered an opportunity for many of the subproject executing institutions to increase their status on the national and international biodiversity scene, and in many cases to increase the scope and area of their work. It expanded the portfolio of many of the institutions involved in the project, increasing their technical capacity and their experience to interact (TE,pp7)

<u>Creation of Knowledge and Partnerships that raised the profile of Biodiversity</u>: according to the TE (pp5) "PROBIO is widely recognized as one of the most successful environmental projects in Brazil."
- 900 priority areas for Biodiversity Conservation were defined under the project in participatory process, and have been widely adopted throughout the country by varied sectors. 120 Sub-Projects were completed and 24 were reported as continuing with government funds (TE, pp27)
- New models of biodiversity conservation were analyzed, implemented and disseminated. This process involved 284 institutions, including federal agencies, NGOs, academic institutions and the private sector and was accompanied by an extensive dissemination of biodiversity information generated through its activities.(TE, pp6-7)

<u>Innovative institutional mechanisms piloted:</u> PROBIO was instrumental in developing a number of operational and administrative mechanisms which have been adopted not only by Bank or biodiversity projects, but across all sectors in Brazil. For example, PROBIO was the one of the first projects to use a call for proposals for subprojects and consultancies. This mechanism, which is now widely used, had never been tested before. The project also pioneered innovative strategies for leveraging funds which have influenced how development projects have operated over the last decade. These strategies, developed largely in response to the fiscal constraints which limited project operations for most of the implementation period, allow the project to sidestep financing constraints and continue to achieve project objectives by accessing alternate sources of cofinancing. (TE, pp12)

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT
4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance	Rating: S

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The TE provides illustrations of PROBIO's contribution to each of Articles 6 to 20 of the Conference of the

Parties of the Convention on Biodiversity.

For example,
- CBD Article 6 (national policies and programs) - As per the TE , PROBIO supported the implementation in Brazil of public biodiversity policies as the primary implementation instrument of PRONABIO and the PPA Biodiversity Program; it obtained recognition of Biodoversity Priority Areas as a public policy instrument.

- CBD Article 7 (evaluation and monitoring of biodiversity) - As per the TE, PROBIO developed a method to identify Priority Areas for Biodiversity, supported a large number of Rapid Biodiversity Assessments in areas where biodiversity information was deficient, supported the revision of the National Lists of Species Threatened with Extinction, created the first National Diagnostic of Exotic Invasive Species, the first national 1:250,000 scale map of vegetation cover in all the biomes, and supported an important set of evaluations on genetic variability about selected groups of plants with economic value.

B Effectiveness	**Rating: S**

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

The project contributed to raising the profile of Biodiversity, and helped in identifying priority actions: this was followed by a number of environment legislations, the Protected Areas Law (2000), the environmental crime laws (1998 and 1999) and framework legislation on access to genetic resources and biotechnology. PROBIO was also influential in establishing the National Biodiversity Commission (CONABIO)(*TE,pp8*). The effectiveness of dissemination activities was enhanced by production of material and information that was relevant to policymakers, in a language understood by politicians, leveraged biodiversity conservation to the level of national policy. (*TE, pp9*)

The Sub-Project partnerships reported as fruitful:
- **Biome-Level Assessment:** The Sub-Projects are given a rating of Highly Satisfactory by the TE, PROBIO established 900 Priority Areas for Biodiversity Conservation of the key Brazilian biomes. Based on PROBIO`s approach, some governmental agencies have adopted the biome as their planning unit, and several agencies are using the maps for their development planning, these were also used by subsequent projects including Amazon Region Protected Areas and the proposed Caatinga and Cerrado biodiversity concept. 5 biome level workshops and additional workshops focusing on conservation and sustainable use were held.
- **Accelerated creation of Protected Areas**: With the identification of the Priority Areas for Biodiversity, the TE claims that PROBIO contributed directly to the accelerated creation of protected areas, both by the federal government and by state governments. In the period from 1998 to 2002, 5.7 million hectares of national parks were created by the federal government, and in the period from 2003 to June 2006 another 18.4 million hectares of conservation units (CUs) were created by the federal government, totaling 24.1 million hectares created between 1999 and 2006. (*TE, pp19*)

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	**Rating: MS**

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and**

did that affect cost-effectiveness?

Time over-run: This project arises from the GEF Pilot phase (Work Program Entry in 1991, effectiveness in 1996, closing in 2005); it exceeded its expected implementation duration by 4 years. This is despite being approved as an STRM.

This is explained in the TE as stemming from reorganization of MMA which complicated project administration, as well as cofinancing difficulties due to IMF-imposed fiscal restraints, election-related spending freezes, and changing government consultant regulations. The mid-term review addressed many of these issues through a restructuring of expenditure categories and guidelines, and of the project technical team. Due to these modifications and easing external constraints, PROBIO accelerated its rhythm after the mid-term review.

Impacts
• **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**   Yes it is likely to have impact, though there is a problem of attribution (i.e. it is difficult to measure the extent to which subsequent changes are due to this project that started in 1996).

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

A Financial resources	Rating: L
There are indications of government commitment to this project's outcomes that should ensure low financial risk. According to the TE, the government funded the last several months of implementation of the few subprojects that had not been finalized by project close with national financing and incorporated PROBIO as a program within Ministry of the Environment, Water Resources and the Legal Amazon. (TE, pp14)	

B Socio political	Rating: ML
- While the sustainability of project achievements and outcomes at the national level is "unquestionable" according to the TE, there is concern that "on the local level the results are more mixed", and this may pose a risk to sustainability. - An independent evaluation of subprojects conducted after project close, reported on by the TE, found that 93% of those surveyed felt the perspective of continuing the work begun under PROBIO was high or substantial. However, 53% also felt that the direct impact on communities related to the subprojects was moderate or low, a sign perhaps of the non-applied nature of many of the subprojects (*TE, pp14*). This may point to existing socio political risk at local levels.	

C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
According to the TE there are strong signs of government commitment, and at the close of project operations in December 2005, the Brazilian government agreed to incorporate PROBIO as a program within Ministry of the Environment, Water Resources and the Legal Amazon. - However the TE indicates that (pp14) continued reliance on technical and administrative staff with short-term contracts, rather than on long-term civil servants has caused a **continual overturn in project staff,** resulting in constant training of new staff and potentially less effective implementation than might have been possible with a consistent team. It is also reported that in the last years of the project this situation improved slightly with several nation-wide civil service exams, but the low salaries offered made it difficult for experienced staff to accept equivalent civil service positions, so turnover remained substantial. This presents institutional risk to outcomes. - Also, the project encountered funding disruptions related to spending freezes associated with federal elections during election years, the TE does not mention how this has been addressed in the long term.	

D Environmental	Rating: ML
The Brazilian government's commitment to further advance biodiversity conservation in the country seem	

apparent as per the TE.

According to the TE (pp14) the government has also agreed to update the list of 900 priority areas first established under PROBIO every 10 years in order to assure its continuing relevance to policy and planning.

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

A	Financial resources	Rating: HS
B	Socio political	Rating: U/A
C	Institutional framework and governance	Rating: HS
D	Environmental	Rating: S

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good
- **Extensive dissemination of biodiversity information** generated through its activities. The project financed the publication of 37 books, 32 book chapters, and dozens of technical articles, as well as workshops, videos, maps, school materials, brochures, and websites. 29 PhD theses were produced. Information was disseminated to policy makers, technical specialists, academics, students, and a wide range of interested stakeholders. (*TE, pp7*)

- **PROBIO bolstered the scientific research community** in Brazil, playing a role that has been recognized as critical in stimulating research and dissemination of information on Brazilian biodiversity and conservation strategies. (TE,pp6)

2. Demonstration
PROBIO was the one of the first projects to use a call for proposals for subprojects and consultancies. This mechanism, which is now widely used and had not been tested before (*TE, pp12*)

The Government has committed to updating the Priority Areas every 10 years. (*TE.pp6*)

Following from the subprojects, the TE mentions examples of demonstration as (*TE, pp10*):
- Endangered species list: PROBIO supported a review of the endangered species list; the periodic review of this list has now been assumed at the ministerial level; a thematic chamber has been created under CONABIO; a partnership between PROBIO and The National Environmental Fund supported management plans for 62 threatened species.

- Invasive species inventory: PROBIO supported a national inventory of exotic invasive species; a thematic chamber is being created under CONABIO; a partnership between PROBIO and FNMA supported plans for the management of 9 sub-projects.

- Habitat fragmentation: PROBIO's support is used as a basis for the establishment of ecological corridors.

- Pollinators: PROBIO's support is used as a basis to treat pollination as an ecosystem service.

- Buffer zones of protected areas: PROBIO's support changed the manner in which Brazil deals with buffer zones, so that Brazil now gives priority to socio-economic benefits for local populations that live in the areas surrounding protected areas.

- Species surveys and inventories: PROBIO's support was influential for the adoption of rapid assessments of biodiversity by MMA (this methodology was used by NGOs only before the project).

• Local policies: In several cases, including subprojects in Rio de Janeiro and Rio Grande do Sul states, subproject results were incorporated successfully into municipal public policy supporting conservation objectives.
3. Replication Same as 2: PROBIO was the one of the first projects to use a call for proposals for subprojects and consultancies. This mechanism, which is now widely used and had not been tested before (*TE, pp12*)
4. Scaling up • The National Petroleum Agency officially adopted the same Priority Areas in its guidelines for licensing oil exploration for the entire country, and two calls for proposals have already been issued under these guidelines. The National Forestry Agency has also adopted these priority areas in their planning processes.

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

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities) **Rating: U**
As per the Project Document, the expectation was that the Biome level workshops and the national Biodiversity Network "will be fully integrated into the M&E process by providing baseline data on the current status of species and communities, and identifying and maintaining data on target areas and indicator species and communities." (Annex 12 Draft M&E Plan) The TE however, makes **no mention of these baseline indicators** as having been followed-up. The Project Document mentions (pp14) that "PRONAIO has established M&E guidelines for sub-projects and the program as a whole", that a Technical Committee be set up to review progress at completion and Mid-Term. The TE lessons include mention of the fact that 'the monitoring of subprojects should include not only financial and operational matters but also technical issues, and should result in more focused support and guidance for the subproject implementers.' There is no information provided on how the 144 subprojects were monitored. The TE Annex 1 includes a Log Frame Matrix, as required, which generally follows the spirit of the above mentioned performance indicators, however it **insufficiently reports the outcomes of the project.**
B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure? **Rating: U/A**
Information on M&E is missing from the TE. M&E system was weakened by the significant delays in the project implementation. According to the IEG's TE-Review, the Institutional indicators are inadequately designed in terms of measuring capacity and the indicators set out for Biodiversity Impact are overly-ambitious. The latter include such indicators as "decreased biodiversity loss, deforestation, poaching and protected areas encroachment" yet there is **no monitoring framework** established at the project level equipped to measure and report up on these project level goals that may or may not be achieved through the subprojects.
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? **Rating: U/A**
There is no mention in the TE of a budget for M&E.
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No.

4.5 Lessons
Project lessons as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?
- Consensus-building strategies: as per the TE, one of the key features for the success of this project was its inclusive nature. In setting priorities, PROBIO established a unique process which involved bringing together a diverse group of actors including the academic community, using robust scientific data to build consensus around the problems, priorities, and strategies for action. These consensus-building strategies were also used by many subprojects at a local level, for example to bring together communities, researchers, and conservation experts to discuss the creation of new protected areas. Today the innovative PROBIO process is recognized and is being replicated in Brazil and the world. (TE,pp6)   - Removal of 1 to 1 cofinancing requirements for each transaction (in order to allow 100% GEF financing of specific activities) can increase flexibility under difficult fiscal constraints and allow a project to be implemented with greater efficiency. (TE, pp 18)   - Subproject selection methods : While there were initial challenges with the pre-definition of the first subprojects, the government team incorporated the lessons learned to ensure that subproject selection methods were transparent and followed national priorities, and arranged workshops to explain these procedures. (TE, pp16)   - Monitoring of subprojects: should include not only financial and operational matters but also technical issues, and should incorporate focused support and guidance for the subproject implementers. (TE, pp 18) Also, as mentioned by the IEG-TE Review, it is important for a project with numerous sub-projects to ensure a level of coordination and over-sight at the project management level.   - Government support: The government became a primary supporter of the project, with many different governmental organizations incorporating PROBIO's results into their policies and programs. The government has also been exceptional in guaranteeing the sustainability of the project's achievements, by funding the subprojects that had not finalized work by project close, agreeing to update the list of 900 Priority Areas every 10 years, and absorbing PROBIO as a regular MMA program. (TE, pp16)

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

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

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report. The TE is overall clear and candid. However, there is no information provided on how the 144 subprojects were monitored.	Ratings

The TE Annex 1 includes a Log Frame Matrix, as required, however it insufficiently reports the outcomes of the project.	
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	MU
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	S
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	MU
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	U

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.	**Yes:**	**No: X**
Explain: while the report is clear and well-argued, it is unable to link the outcomes to the project.		

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

Project Document (1995), PIR 2005