

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		Oct, 6, 2006
GEF Project ID:	583		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$) ¹
IA/EA Project ID:	UNEP 109	GEF financing:	6.615	6.615
Project Name:	Implementation of Integrated Watershed Management Practices for the Pantanal and Upper Paraguay River Basin	IA/EA own:	0.175	0.175
Country:	Brazil	Government:	8.263	8.263
		Other*:	1.35	1.35
		Total Cofinancing	9.788	9.788
Operational Program:	9	Total Project Cost:	16.403	16.403
IA	UNEP	Dates		
Partners involved:	OAS (Organization of American States)	Work Program date		07/01/1998
		CEO Endorsement		08/27/1999
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Oct./1999 ²
		Closing Date	Proposed: May/2003	Actual: Dec./ 2003
Prepared by: André Aquino	Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco and Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 3 years and 8 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 4 years and 3 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 8 months
Author of TE: Raymundo José Santos Garrido:		TE completion date: 01/14/2005	TE submission date to GEF OME: 12/14/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 11 months

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation ³	Other IA evaluations if applicable ⁴	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	Excellent	U/A	MU

¹ According to the TE, "project's co-financing has been properly accomplished" (p.9) and "co-financing was provided appropriately in timing and amounts" (p.33).

² Data from TE (page 11).

³ The TE ratings are not aligned with GEF EO's policy, since it is based on a 5-point scale (1=Excellent, 2=Very good, 3=Good, 4=Satisfactory and 5=Unsatisfactory).

⁴ UNEP EOU review of the TE does present their own rating of project outcome, sustainability and monitoring and evaluation. They only present an assessment of the quality of the TE.

2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	Very Good	U/A	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	U/A	Excellent	U/A	U/A
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	MU	MU

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No. This TE has many shortcomings. By using a five-point scale to rate the project's and sub-projects' overall outcomes, the TE failed to follow GEF EO guidelines. The TE did not provide information on the actual project costs and did not address the issue of financial and environmental sustainability. The TE did not discuss M&E issues and the baseline and logframe indicators were not used to assess the project's outcomes. Finally, some assertions seemed partial and not based on evidence, especially with regard to the sustainability of the sub-projects.

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 overall objective is the Improved management of the Pantanal and Upper Paraguay River Basin. The goal is to support the incremental costs of measures identified in the Conservation Plan for the Upper Paraguay River Basin and integrate them into a watershed management program (WMP) for the basin that addresses the priority environmental issues within the world's largest wetland. No changes during implementation.

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

No distinction is presented between environmental and development objectives.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

- Supported the federal and local governments in the establishment of better policies for the Pantanal and the Upper Paraguay River Basin. As a result, the natural resources are receiving greater consideration in public policies and programs. For example, the project provided input data for decision-making at federal (ANA and SRH) agencies, influencing the preparation of plans such as the National Water Resources Plan, or feeding existing databases, such as the National Waters Information System. States agencies have also increased their concern for environmental matters, as exemplified by the proposal for integrated environmental management of solid waste involving 19 municipalities.
- Promotion of institutional capacity to deal with environmental issues. Results include the following: creation of Taquari River Source State Park; the definition of area and strategies for the implementation of the Pantanal-Cerrado Ecological Corridor; and creation of the Mato Grosso do Sul System of Conservation Units.
- Promoted scientific knowledge that shed light on the main causes of environmental degradation in the Upper Paraguay Basin through project demonstration, studies and data generation. The following could be mentioned as outputs: the forecasting flood model to be used in the extreme event alert system and the creation of a Geographic Information System to support managing and monitoring activities as well as the reduction of trafficking in wild animals... The TE, however, does not indicate results of the promotion of scientific knowledge.
- Promoted the participation of an increased number of stakeholders in water management, providing stimulus for the creation of the Basin Committee of the Upper Paraguay by the National Water Resources Council.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes	Rating: MS
A Relevance	Rating: MS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain <p>The TE itself did not explore the relevance issue. It only stated without any justification that "133. The project fulfills the goals of the GEF Operational Program #9 International Waters Integrated Land-Water Multiple Focal Area Project component. The actions and results of the project are consistent with the principles of the GEF in relation to the main cross-cutting issues such as land and soil degradation. This is a major issue in the Pantanal and relates to the Integrated Planning and Management of Water Resources that is of direct interest to UNEP's Environmentally Sound Management of Inland Waters (EMINWA)."</p> <p>The outcomes are consistent with the IW Program Strategy. However, even though an international waters project, it only had activities in one country and only a limited influence on neighboring countries. Not much progress was made in regard to the coordination of activities among Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay, even though a 2002 Secretariat Managed Project Review stressed this issue. On pg. 32, the TE states that there is an incipient but sound movement towards the coordination of activities among Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay, but no further information is provided.</p> <p>The Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) is not mentioned in the TE. The TE indicates that future Joint Implementation Arrangements between countries are more likely in the future, but it has not been achieved during the project implementation.</p>	
B Effectiveness	Rating: MU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? <p>The outcomes presented in the TE do not comprise all expected outcomes in the prodoc logframe, especially in regard to 'improved environmental functioning of the Upper Paraguay river through preservation and protection of the river system'. The TE indicates more evidence that the other two outcomes have been achieved: a) Improved individual capacities and 3) Improved public awareness and stakeholder participation. Regarding stakeholder participation, however, the TE should have provided more concrete evidence on how the population is participating in environmental policies. In concluding, the project seems to have built capacity in the public sector and among civil society for dealing with environmental issues and to have influenced environmental policies. It is not clear, however, how these results led to environmental improvements in the Basin.</p>	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: MU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness? <p>The TE does not discuss the issue of cost-effectiveness directly. On pg. 27, it states that "The project also offers value for money in terms of protection of globally important endangered resource units, e.g. the Pantanal.", but does not discuss how exactly these resource units were protected. Moreover, the outcome 'improved functioning of the Upper Paraguay river' does not seem to have been achieved.</p> <p>On the other hand, implementation arrangements seem to have been positive. The TE draws attention to a problem faced by project at the outset due to a change in the government's partner agency and highlights that the implementation team managed to overcome this problem rapidly,</p>	

“leading an outstanding implementation, with good disbursement rates and flexible adaptive management” (TE, p.33). Hard facts for these statements, however, are not presented. The TE also stresses that co-financing has been properly accomplished, but it does not provide the numbers.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

Impacts were not presented. However, the TE asserts that the outcomes achieved by the project, including institutional capacity, awareness among stakeholders and increased participation in policy formulation, will benefit the region in the long-term.

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

A Financial resources	Rating: U/A
The TE does not substantiate with evidence the ratings for sustainability given to the subprojects. It does not mention any kind of income generating activity or market transformation, focusing rather on the institutional changes achieved by the project. Moreover, by claiming that the region ‘still needs support to carry out many of the actions identified by the sub-projects experience’, it casts some doubts on the sustainability of the GEF project outcomes.	Rating: ML
B Socio political	Rating: L
Throughout the TE, it is stressed that the increased awareness for environmental concerns, the enhanced institutional capacity to deal with environmental issues and the more encompassing participation of different stakeholders in policy formulation and implementation will likely lead to socio-political sustainability.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
In the states of MT and MS, the TE indicates that the project created the institutional capacity and awareness that are likely to guarantee continued institutional support for the project’s goals. At the federal level, the TE points out that ANA and SRH are currently developing the National Water Resources Plan and the Pantanal SAP based on knowledge created by the project, which indicates ownership of the project results and likely institutional sustainability. However, the fact the Basin Committee for the Upper Paraguay has not yet been created may also indicate an institutional problem at the federal level. Moreover, the TE offers no evidence of the institutional sustainability in Bolivia and Paraguay, whose engagement was expected in the Steering Committee.	
D Environmental	Rating: ML
The fact that the Ministry of Agriculture “seldom takes the initiative to develop a sustainable development program” is an important environmental risk. However, the TE says that ANA is dealing with this issue. Details are not provided.	

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

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

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good – Increased awareness about the environmental impacts of different activities in the Pantanal and public agencies’ capacity developed.

2. Demonstration – The project seems to have had an important demonstration role. According to the TE, the project raised awareness among different levels of the government and agencies about the need to take concrete measures to prevent the perverse consequences of some activities on the environment. Moreover, the knowledge generated is used in other interventions,

such as the Pantanal Program of the Ministry of Environment (even though the TE does not give further information on how this process is happening).

3. Replication – The TE emphasizes that the project has been a mutual collaboration with the IDB Pantanal Project. However, it is not clear whether specific sub-projects are going to be replicated by the government or other donors.

4. Scaling up

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/A

Not discussed in the TE. The evaluator rates the project's M&E as 'excellent', however it does not provide any more information other than 'Organization of American States (OAS) maintained close monitoring and permanent evaluation of the sub-projects works and outputs'. The logframe indicators and baseline data were not discussed either.

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

Not discussed in the TE.

C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?

Rating: U/A

Not discussed in the TE.

Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? U/A

4.5 Lessons

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?

Most of the lessons learned presented by the TE did not indicate findings that could be generalized and applied in different GEF projects; they were rather criticisms to some negative aspects of the project. However, some of the lessons can be useful for future GEF interventions:

- The number of sub-projects is a project has to be kept to a manageable number. This project would have benefited from a more limited number of sub-projects.
- Dialogue has to be a permanent characteristic of the Project management. In this case, meetings with all sub-project coordinators were held periodically;
- A well-prepared manual to guide the coordinators in elaborating standardized reports was formulated and this facilitated communications and broader understanding of the full set of project activities.

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.

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	Ratings EO	Ratings UNEP EOU
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE presented a detailed description of the outcomes achieved by each of the 44 sub-projects and used a methodology to rate them according to 9 criteria. However, some assertions seemed inconsistent with the information provided and not based on evidence. On page 18, for instance, it is asserted that "(T)his Evaluator is even very confident that some of the sub-projects exceeded the expected results, which is corroborated by various favorable scores showed on the mentioned Table 2." This table and the Annex on Evaluation of Sub-projects, nonetheless, do not provide evidence that the outputs generated by project led to the expected outcomes. Moreover, the logframe indicators are not used anywhere in the TE. Directly congratulating the OAS team for an 'exceptional performance' in the execution of the project is not a good practice either, calling into question the independence of the TE.</p>	MU	MS
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated The TE does not present evidence for many of its assertions, especially regarding stakeholders' participation and institutional capacity building. It does not provide enough evidence on environmental outcomes achieved with the project either.</p>	U	MU
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Even though the TE presented a rating for sustainability of each component, it did not substantiate that with concrete evidence.</p>	MU	MS
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons learned are well presented. However, sometimes there is a mixture of recommendations for the future, negative aspects of the projects and lessons learned.</p>	MS	MS
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? This issue is not covered at, except for the assertion that co-financing has been properly achieved.</p>	HU	U
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? M&E is not dealt with at all.</p>	HU	HU

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:
X

No:

Explain: Since the TE asserts that the knowledge produced and capacity development achieved would lead to policies beneficial to the Upper Paraguay Basin, it would be interesting to analyze in the long-run whether these new policies really occurred, and if so, whether they had an environmental impact in the Basin.

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

Final Evaluation Report of the "Implementation Of Integrated Watershed Management Practices For The Pantanal And Upper Paraguay River Basin" – GF/1100-99-16", UNEP/GEF Project Document, UNEP EOU Quality Assessment of the Pantanal TER, PIR 2005

23 August 2006