

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

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		601	
GEF Agency project ID		57025	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Monitoring System for the Galapagos Islands	
Country/Countries		Ecuador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Fundación Natura and World Wildlife Fund, WWF	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Fundación Natura: lead executing agency; World Wildlife Fund: technical assistance; Fundación Charles Darwin: executing partner	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 29, 1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 24, 1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 2001	
Actual date of project completion		June 20, 2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		.94	.94
Co-financing	IA/EA own	.65	.73
	Government	0	0
	Other*	0	0
Total GEF funding		.94	.94
Total Co-financing		.65	.73
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.6	1.7
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 30, 2002	
TE submission date		December 30, 2002	
Author of TE		Team leader: Gabriela Arcos	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Baastel	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Antonio del Monaco	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		July 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	n/a	n/a	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	n/a	n/a	ML
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
M&E Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS
Quality of Implementation	S	n/a	n/a	S
Quality of Execution	S	n/a	n/a	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objectives as stated in the project document are to promote the conservation of the Galápagos biodiversity through the establishment of a monitoring system to measure the well-being of the ecoregions of the Galápagos Islands. The Galápagos Islands are a globally important site for biodiversity, and the ecosystem faces threats from increasing tourism, overfishing, immigration from mainland Ecuador, and the threat of invasive species arriving with tourists and immigrants. Compounding these challenges is the fact that local capacity for monitoring is low, which limits conservation planning efforts.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development of the Galápagos monitoring system included several components, as listed in the project document:

1. Establishment of a monitoring system for fishing impacts, with the following outputs:
 - a. Participatory monitoring system of fisheries catch
 - b. Analysis of trends in fishing activities, coastal species, and benthic biodiversity
2. Establishment of biological monitoring, with the following outputs:
 - a. Indicators defined and tested
 - b. Annual summaries of: a sample of flora and fauna, new colonization of the most pristine larger islands, and introductions and distribution changes of a sample of the most harmful introduced species
 - c. Annual summaries of the status of key endemic species
 - d. Data compiled on possible causative factors and preventative measures
 - e. GIS and database systems set up for storing and analyzing data
 - f. Summary reports of monitoring results and correlations with causative factors
3. Establishment of tourism monitoring, with the following outputs:
 - a. Data collected on alien species near visitor sites
 - b. Systematize information on itineraries and tourist guides as part of the National Park Service's GIS
 - c. Quarterly polls on visitor satisfaction

- d. Analysis of tourism revenues
- 4. Establishment of monitoring of the socio-economic status of the local population, with the following outputs:
 - a. Systematize the indicators on population, agriculture, public services, etc. using GIS and database analysis
 - b. Develop research activities related to the monitoring systems (cost of living, consumption, quality of life, employment, and salaries)
 - c. Evaluate migration and the results of policies related to migration control
- 5. Building capacity among local stakeholders for compiling and using the monitoring information, with the following outputs:
 - a. Training of local institutions to develop monitoring management capacities and setting the basis for transferring project components
 - b. Training of community leaders and support for policy dialogues related to conservation
 - c. Support for the authorities of the Galápagos Marine Reserve, including dialogue activities, training, and presentation and dissemination of monitoring results
 - d. Transference of project components to key Galápagos institutions
- 6. Improving the flow of information to policymakers and the managers of the Galápagos ecosystems, with the following outputs:
 - a. Establishment of information exchange agreements and exploration of financing mechanisms for information exchange
 - b. Dissemination of monitoring information and project results through publications and a public information campaign
 - c. Information and support to participatory planning processes

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

No changes were made to the objectives or activities during project implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

This project contributes to GEF Operational Program 2, the objective of which is “the conservation and sustainable use of the biological resources in coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems.” The project contributes to the operational program’s outputs by strengthening institutions through training and monitoring systems, promoting sustainable use by collecting and analyzing data on threats and mitigation measures, and allowing for threat removal by implementing a monitoring system to detect threats. The establishment of the monitoring system is a key step toward effective conservation of the Galápagos ecosystems.

The project is also relevant to Ecuador’s national priorities. Several plans, laws, and executive decrees in the mid- and late-1990s recognize the conservation of the Galápagos as a priority not only for ecosystem management, but also for social development. These policies include the Ecuadorian Environmental Plan in 1995, the Social Development plan in 1996, Executive Decree #245 in 1997, and the Galápagos Special Law in 1998.

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

On the whole, the project was effective in creating a “functioning monitoring system to help the monitoring of the biodiversity and the conservation of the different species of the Islands,” which was previously lacking (TE, page 18). The project satisfactorily met its objectives and reached a wide variety of institutions and stakeholders with the creation and integration of the system, but there were some weaknesses noted below.

For component 1, establishing a monitoring system for fishing impacts, the project allowed for the monitoring of hundreds of additional fishing trips as they entered port in each island, and information on more than 100 marine species was obtained with special detail for commercially-fished species. For component 2, establishing biological monitoring, the project was able to track and eradicate two instances of species introduction and monitor other critical species, as well as detect climatic trends such as an increase in El Niño events. Reports and studies based on the monitoring data were published in scientific journals and disseminated to authorities and donors. The results for component 3, establishing tourism monitoring, were somewhat weaker because “Direct biological monitoring by CDF [Charles Darwin Foundation] of sites visited by tourists within the archipelago was limited” (TE, page 20). However, a register of tour guides was designed, which allowed the park service to reprogram tourist itineraries away from crowded areas. Regarding component 4, establishing socio-economic monitoring, people in national agencies were trained in the use of GIS and GPS systems, and a GIS with was delivered to the municipalities and other institutions. Several surveys on income, gender, public opinion, and agriculture were executed and studied, with the results and recommendations published and delivered to policymakers.

For component 5, strengthening capacity in the compilation and use of monitoring data by stakeholders, the evaluation report states that the Charles Darwin Foundation, the Galápagos National Park Service, the Tourism Chamber, and two municipal governments “improved their capacity to collect, process, and exchange information and their equipment allows them to cover their basic needs” (TE, page 21). On the

other hand, the capacity of the Galápagos National Institute “could not be developed” and “it was difficult to guarantee that all the target institutions mentioned were going to be fully capable to carry out monitoring by themselves” (TE, page 21). Few of the targeted institutions had either the hardware or the staff needed to compile and analyze data, and they were reluctant to dedicate the necessary resources. Technical and financial support was also provided to the Provincial Directorate of Education for Educative Reform, but badly prepared teachers and a negative attitude toward conservation made improvements difficult. Still, significant improvements were made, especially for the Charles Darwin Foundation, the Galápagos National Park Service, the Tourism Chamber, and two municipal governments.

For component 6, improving information flow to policymakers and park managers, Fundación Natura assisted the Galápagos National Institute with producing a plan that was later approved by the government of Ecuador, which “sets the guidelines for the delivery of information from all public institutions to the planning unit of the INGALA” (TE, page 21). Information from the project was disseminated to all project stakeholders as well as translated and distributed internationally by the World Wildlife Fund.

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

There were two financial management problems in the first year of project implementation: “payment of local taxes from the Special Account,” and “delay, lack of accuracy and insufficient support documentation in financial reporting by the Charles Darwin Foundation,” which in turn caused a delay in reporting by Fundación Natura (TE, page 5). The Charles Darwin Foundation also had trouble with reporting implementation progress (PIR 2002, page 1).

These issues were resolved in the second year of project implementation, but caused a six-month extension of the project’s closing date. Also, the final PIR reported delays in the capacity-building component for local organizations because “local institutions needed stronger assistance than initially anticipated” (PIR 2002, page 1). Remedial action included additional training in data collection and processing, but as noted in the Effectiveness section, not all institutions made significant improvements.

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

The two crucial factors for this project’s sustainability were 1) the capability of stakeholders to continue monitoring activities on their own, and 2) the will of stakeholders to continue monitoring activities. On the whole, this project built significant capacity among a variety of stakeholders and contributed to the necessary changes in policy and planning to integrate monitoring activities.

Financial sustainability: Likely – The Charles Darwin Foundation and the Galápagos National Park Service will use their own funds to continue managing the monitoring of the biological and tourism databases.

The World Wildlife Fund planned to continue the monitoring of migration to the Galápagos and allocated a grant for an education campaign to discourage migration.

Sociopolitical sustainability: Moderately Likely – There are several moderate sociopolitical risks to the continuation of monitoring. Although awareness of conservation increased and more Ecuadorians became actively involved in monitoring and conservation activities, the attitudes of galapagueños toward restricting their activities (such as fishing, logging, or bringing over family members) for the sake of conservation did not change, with around 60% of people accepting the restrictions (TE, page 11). Also, only 36% of galapagueños were aware of the Galápagos Special Law governing regulations of island life. The TE notes that some stakeholders were reluctant to cooperate with others and feared exposing their weaknesses to others. The fisherman also worried that relaying information about themselves would negatively impact their independence. If these stakeholders resist information sharing, then the effect of monitoring will be weakened.

Institutional sustainability: Moderately Likely – The project made significant strides toward increasing institutional capacity as well as contributing to the creation of policies that promote the continuation of monitoring and information sharing, but some gaps remain. In particular, the capabilities of the Charles Darwin Foundation, the Galápagos National Park Service, the Tourism Chamber, and two municipal governments were increased for collecting, analyzing, and exchanging information. The TE states that “policy makers’ and local stakeholders’ decisions are increasingly based on the information provided by the monitoring system” and cites examples where it was used for setting fishing quotas, deciding on patrolling areas, and inspecting new species. The project contributed to the development of the Regional Plan, which mandated information sharing among stakeholders and the Galápagos National Institute. However, information sharing was hindered by poor telecommunications technology in the islands, and the capacity of the Galápagos National Institute “could not be developed” and the obstacles raised by the weak educational system were not overcome (TE, 26).

Environmental sustainability: Not applicable – Since this is a project to establish monitoring systems, environmental changes are not a factor in 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?

Unable to assess. The TE reports the planned and actual co-financing and the origin of the funds, but not the use to which they were put or why the actual co-financing is greater than the amount stated in the project document. Also, the amount of planned co-financing as listed in the TE differs from the planned co-financing in the project document (TE, page 5).

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 afore-mentioned problems with financial reporting and implementation progress reporting by the Charles Darwin Foundation caused a six-month extension of project activities. However, the issues were resolved by the end of the second year of implementation. The delay did not negatively affect project outcomes or sustainability; all outcomes were achieved satisfactorily except for the capacity-building component, which exhibited weaknesses unrelated to the reporting issues and delays.

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:

Country ownership is a factor in the adoption and continued use of the newly-created monitoring system. Local and national institutions had to find the monitoring useful and to their benefit in order for the activities to continue under their direction. As stated in the Sustainability section, the TE reports that “policy makers’ and local stakeholders’ decisions are increasingly based on the information provided by the monitoring system,” which would indicate a degree of ownership and integration into institutional decision-making.

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 monitoring and evaluation plan as stated in the project document only states that “Natura will report regularly to the Bank on project execution” and that performance benchmarks were in the process of being developed (project document, page 14). The project document therefore does not have a developed M&E plan, nor does it state a dedicated budget for M&E. The TE states that “detailed performance benchmarks were developed during the preparation phase of the project” but does not provide detail on the design or indicators. An institutional assessment was carried out during the project preparation phase, but this assessment failed to note and account for the weaknesses of some of the project’s targeted institutions. Other than the institutional assessment, the project did not appear to have baselines, which would have improved the capacity-building plan for Galápagos institutions. The TE states that detailed benchmarks were developed during the project’s preparation.

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

There were some problems with M&E implementation, although the project was able to adapt to the obstacles discovered. The Charles Darwin Foundation had difficulties in reporting implementation progress, writing anecdotal reports without clearly linking planned activities with the actual activities completed. In addition, “this project did not anticipate the need to implement databases for the register of monitoring activities” (TE, page 7). On the other hand, the TE states that Fundación Natura provided reports to the World Bank on project execution, and an “internal evaluation took place to assess overall performance and achievements, and to analyze prospects for long-term project continuity and follow-up” (TE, page 25). The PIRs report that adaptive changes were made to take into account the discovery of the capacity limitations of the Galápagos National Institute as well as the difficulties regarding education.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The TE rates the World Bank’s mid-term supervision of the project as “necessary” and “very helpful” for correcting problems and delays (TE, 28). But the TE also says that a supervision mission should have been undertaken at the project’s beginning to orient managers.

The project was well-designed, except for the lack of baseline data. The TE states that the timeline of the project was too short to draw conclusions about biodiversity trends, and “it would have been more realistic to predefine possible causative factors of already detected trends (e.g. the El Niño phenomenon, fisheries, tourism, transportation, agriculture, roads, etc.) and clearly specify which of them would be followed up during the execution of this project” (TE, page 8).

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

There were some minor problems with project execution, especially by the Charles Darwin Foundation. The Foundation was responsible for the aforementioned financial difficulties and reporting problems, as well as a delay in producing indicators that lasted until the end of the second year of implementation. Senior scientists at the Foundation admitted that this was related to the organization's weakness regarding monitoring activities (TE, 7). The Charles Darwin Foundation was also reluctant to share their monitoring data. However, these problems were largely overcome by the end of the project; the Foundation produced a 5-year plan at the end of the project's second year and signed cooperation agreements with other stakeholders. There were no problems with the conduct of Fundación Natura; their part in execution was satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

Although it is difficult to determine the project's long-term impact on biodiversity, small positive changes are noted in the TE. Two introductions of goats were removed, with many more invasive species detected and programmed for removal. Also, the monitoring of tourist activities has allowed authorities to lessen tourist impact on the islands, and the monitoring of fishing has allowed authorities to set and enforce quotas to reduce overfishing.

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.

Unable to assess. Research on socio-economic indicators was conducted during the project, but there was no time-series assessment of the project's impact.

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* - Building capacities was integral to the project's goal of creating a monitoring system, and it was a success. The capabilities of the Charles Darwin Foundation, the Galápagos National

Park Service, the Tourism Chamber, and two municipal governments were increased for collecting, analyzing, and exchanging information. The TE states that the monitoring system increasingly became the basis for organizations' decision-making.

b) *Governance* - The project contributed to the Regional Plan on sharing information and prioritizing education in the Galápagos, which was approved by the Ecuadorian government. The President also passed regulations to limit migration to the islands based on the socio-economic research conducted by the project.

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 were reported in the TE or PIRs.

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 monitoring system designed by the project will be “the basis for the design of the monitoring system that will be developed within the Conservation of Biodiversity in Pastaza MSP” (TE, 24). The design and methodology of the monitoring system will also be analyzed for replication in two protected areas under the National System of Protected Areas project.

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 states that “only an independent party without stakes in local politics, projects, governing instances and in the close-knit social and institutional fabric of the Galapagos can attempt to execute monitoring in the most objective possible way” (TE, page 28).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE recommends that institutional assessments continue during a project's implementation phase, not just at the beginning, in order to assess the effectiveness of the project's strategy for improvements. Baseline data would have improved the project's design, and regular monitoring and evaluation can help uncover and correct failures.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE does not give ratings. The TE's detailed descriptions of each sub-component were very useful for determining the outcomes of the project. Longer-term impacts are less clear and were rarely discussed.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is not internally consistent; the detailed explanations of project outcomes seemed to differ from the summaries presented. The planned cofinancing as stated in the TE is different from the amount stated in the project document, which appears to be an error in the TE.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Although as a whole the TE contained adequate information to analyze project sustainability, the actual section dedicated to sustainability was thin and lacked explanations of causal linkages. There is no discussion of the results of the project's internal evaluation on project exit and follow-up.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned do not describe actual lessons learned, but instead describes the unexpected problems encountered by the project. The TE rarely gives suggestions for addressing these problems in the future.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes the disbursement schedule, the amount of funds dedicated to each of the 6 outcomes as stated in the project brief, and the planned versus actual co-financing. It lacked actual per-activity costs and explanations for the difference in co-financing between planned and actual amounts.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Like in project sustainability, the TE's section on the project's monitoring and evaluation systems were vague and not very useful. However, the report as a whole contained sufficient information to make an assessment of the project's M&E.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional information used.