

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 620		Review date: Dec 26, 2007		
IA/EA Project ID: 60474		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name: Sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas		GEF financing: 15.0		14.5
Country: Bolivia		IA/EA own:		
		Government: 3.03		0.81
		Other*: 25.66		21.16
		Total Cofinancing		21.97
Operational Program: 3, 4 & 12		Total Project Cost:		36.47
IA IBRD		<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved: National Service of Protected Areas (SERNAP) and Foundation for the Development of Protected Areas (FUNDESAP), executing agencies		Work Program date		March, 1999
		CEO Endorsement		November, 2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		April 2001
		Closing Date		Proposed: June 2006
Prepared by: Alejandro Imbach	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negy	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 62 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 62 months	Difference between original and actual closing: No difference
Author of TE: Not clearly identified. Apparently World Bank		TE completion date: January 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: October 2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 9 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

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	MS	N/A	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	N/A	N/A	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	N/A	N/A	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. It covers all required aspects and adequately substantiated findings and ratings.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to PAD the global environmental objective of the project was:
Promoting and integrating sustainable biodiversity conservation through integrated ecosystem management (OP12), with special focus on mountain ecosystems of the Andean region (OP 4) and forest ecosystems (OP3).

According to PIRs and TE there were no changes during implementation

- **What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to PAD the Development Objective of the project was:
To ensure the sustainable management of the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) by establishing and strengthening: (a) the legal, institutional and policy framework; (b) the management capacity at the protected areas and central levels; and (c) the SNAP financing mechanisms.

There are differences between this Objective presented in the TE and the one presented in the PAD and PIRs: *“Policy, financial, legal, and institutional frameworks and knowledge base established and strengthened for the long-term management and sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas”*.

The differences are not explained neither in TE nor in the PIRs but they do not seem substantive

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?**

The project outcomes are:

- 1 SERNAP policy, planning and management capacities strengthened,
- 2 Planning and management capacities of 10 protected areas strengthened,
- 3 Adequate legal and regulatory framework established,
- 4 Financial capacity of SNAP strengthened, and
- 5 Models for biodiversity management and monitoring in PAs developed and tested.

The six impact indicators of the Global Objective were:

1. An efficient management system is established for the SNAP (National System of Protected Areas);
2. A long-term SNAP Master Plan is developed within an appropriate legal framework;
3. The functionality of 10 protected areas has been achieved as measured by an increase in management effectiveness by 1.5 points on average and no PA less than 2 (based on the project’s protected areas scorecard methodology);
4. Operating Protected Area Management Committees have increased from 5 to 14;
5. SNAP Trust Fund (FUNDESNAP) is fully operational and its capital endowment has increased to at least US\$ 15.0 million;
6. Adequate legislation has been passed and is enforced to conserve biodiversity and protected areas within two years of project effectiveness.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

A Relevance

Rating: HS

Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?

The program's objective is consistent with the GEF operational strategy of promoting and integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, through consolidating and improving conservation efforts in all 22 protected areas of Bolivia, of which 10 priority areas will be supported by GEF. It is particularly relevant to the conservation of areas of global significance and to the in-situ conservation of biodiversity. It will also support the sustainable and equitable utilization of biodiversity through studies, pilots, and public/private sector initiatives.

In particular, the program responds to the objectives of the following GEF Operational Programs:

- Conservation and in-situ protection of biodiversity in mountain ecosystems of the Andean region, and sustainable use and management of these ecosystems (OP 4: Mountain Ecosystems)
- Conservation and in-situ protection of forest ecosystems in the Andean slopes, the Bolivian Amazon and in the Chaco areas. (OP 3 – Forest Ecosystems).

The proposed program is also consistent with Agenda 21 and the principles of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), to which Bolivia is a signatory, in that it supports: conservation of biodiversity; conservation of tropical forests; reduction of greenhouse gas emissions; maintenance of genetic resources; empowerment of main stakeholders; local participation in environmental management; strengthening of national capacity for establishing processes of sustainable development; and strengthening in-country scientific capacity in biological diversity issues.

B Effectiveness

Rating: MS

Are the project outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address?

Yes. The outcomes closer to the operation of the Project were achieved (functionality of 10 Protected Areas, full operation of the Protected Areas Trust Fund and the achievement of its expected capital level and tripling up the participatory management of Protected Areas).

The outcomes that were closer to political processes and more removed from Project control (Protected Areas Law approval by Parliament and SNAP Master Plan) were not fully achieved, but some remedial measures were taken.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: S

Was the project cost – effective? How does project's cost/time versus outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?

The Project was cost-effective in the sense that the expected products and most of the expected outcomes were achieved. There were no delays in Project implementation.

4.1.2 Impacts

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

Four of the six impact indicators of the Global Objective were achieved:

1. An efficient management system is established for the SNAP (National System of Protected Areas);
3. The functionality of 10 protected areas has been achieved as measured by an increase in management effectiveness by 1.5 points on average and no PA less than 2 (based on the project's protected areas scorecard methodology);
4. Operating Protected Area Management Committees have increased from 5 to 14;
5. SNAP Trust Fund (FUNDESNAP) is fully operational and its capital endowment has increased to at least US\$ 15.0 million;

Two impact indicators were not achieved fully: the approval of the Protected Areas Law by Parliament and the SNAP Master Plan. The lack of a Protected Areas Law has been addressed to some extent with sectoral regulations that have improved the management of protected areas by SERNAP. However, the impossibility to convert staff will pose a risk to an effective management in the medium and long term. Hopefully the proposed Master Plan will be compatible with the vision of the new administration and will become a tool for long-term planning.

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. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources	Rating: 3
What is the likelihood that the financial resources will be available to continue the activities that results in the continuation of benefits?	
<p>Today, the vast majority of SNAP's funding comes from donors; the national treasury contributes only about 3% of the system's funding. Historically, most donor funding has come in the form of projects. While this has allowed the creation and strengthening of the SNAP, it creates a potential long-term problem in terms of meeting the recurrent costs of the systems, threatening its sustainability. The FUNDESNAP Trust Fund was created to help fill this gap: by taking in donations and investing them, it can convert a short-term flow of money into a long-term one.</p> <p>The Protected Areas Trust Fund administered through FUNDESNAP has been successfully established and is currently operating with a capital endowment of US \$ 15 million, the capitalization goal has been met. In the management of its capitalized funds, FUNDESNAP has achieved an average annual income in the last four years of 6.19%. The capitalized and extinguishable funds have allowed FUNDESNAP to finance 31.5% of the basic costs of ten protected areas (about 50% of the national protected areas).</p> <p>While the current levels do not ensure sustainability of the system, the fact that it exists and it is providing a significant contribution means that there is a sustainable process in place. Under this scenario, it is expected that in the coming years, with only about 30% of the recurrent costs of 50% of the national protected covered, the minimum staff and equipment required, the SNAP will be operated on the lowest and basic level.</p>	
B Socio political	Rating: 3
Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes?	
<p>The participatory processes set in place in 14 Protected Areas in the form of Protected Area Management Committees in addition to the increased participation of civil society organizations in the management of Protected Areas seem enough to avoid the social risks.</p> <p>The situation is more difficult to assess in political terms due to the highly dynamic political processes in the country and the fact that different social sectors have interests in the resources conserved as Protected Areas.</p>	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 3
Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits?	
<p>The lack of a Protected Areas Law has been addressed to some extent with sectoral regulations that have improved the management of protected areas by SERNAP. However, the impossibility to secure PA staff will pose a risk to an effective management in the medium and long term.</p>	
D Environmental	Rating: 4
Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?	
None	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
Several outcomes (more well managed PAs, participatory management mechanisms, a sustainable funding mechanism, etc.) are public goods developed through the Project
b. Demonstration
Some of the outcomes were developed for some PAs and used as demonstration for other PAs and for other civil society and local organizations (e.g. participatory management mechanisms)
c. Replication
There was replication in some outcomes (e.g. participatory management) as they extended from 5 to 14 Protected Areas across the National System (SNAP)
d. Scaling up
The up-scaling was achieved to some degree through the approval and operation of several internal regulation instruments. The higher level effort in the form of a new Protected Areas Law was not achieved during the Project life.

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

A. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale):	S
<p>PAD includes a good M&E plan. It provisions for establishing an M&E Unit within the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), The PCU was expected to establish a project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to routinely track and report on project performance through quarterly, and semi-annual reports. Annual work plans was to be formulated each year with specific milestones and deliverables. At the local level, the PA management committees were to assist in the formulation of annual work plans and will provide feedback on the overall activities of PA management. The M&E plan also details a system for tracking project performance through measurement of changes in the specified indicators and reporting on project performance.</p>		
B. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale):	S
<p>The system for monitoring and evaluating project performance was implemented very much as described in the PAD and functioned well in keeping implementation on track and focused on resolving critical issues impacting the achievement of desired outputs and outcomes. As per the design of the system, the indicators identified in the Project Design Summary (Annex 1 of the PAD) were reported on by the Project Coordinating Unit, were discussed by regular supervision missions, and were the focus of the assessments conducted as part of the Mid-Term Review and the final Evaluations done at the end of the project.</p> <p>A scorecard methodology was designed and applied to rate the management of each PA and provide a reference point for understanding the level of improvement due to the project. This rating system has provided a useful tool to evaluate the impact of the project as well as the quality of the management of the protected areas that have been supported by the project. This method was applied every year to measure the achievements reached by the project in terms of attaining certain management standards.</p> <p>The methodological concept was taken from the Parks in Peril Program of The Nature Conservancy, based on which the management indicators were prepared and especially adapted to the Bolivian circumstances.</p> <p>At the same time, the project did not succeed in taking all the steps needed to articulate, measure and inform the Management Committees and other stakeholders regarding the indicators of biodiversity and of the current and projected future resource use patterns by communities in each Protected Area. It is necessary to address the issue of the limited capacity of SERNAP to continue operating the biodiversity monitoring system.</p>		
C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?		
<p>UA. The M&E budget was included as part of the Project Coordination Unit and there was not a disaggregated budget for that unit in the Project document. The total budget for Component 1 (where the PCU is included) was 2.8 Million in a total of US 15 million, equivalent to 18.7% of the budget.</p>		
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?		
<p>UA. No mention is made in the TE about this issue being a problem or a constraint.</p>		
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? YES		
<p>The M&E System was well designed and implemented, resulting in the expected information and reports on both project performance and results.</p>		

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations 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?

Project Design

It was useful to take a long term (15-year) perspective in project design, as this resulted in a well focused project which addressed the priority first steps in reaching longer term goals. Any new operation should keep the vision of a long-term strategic framework provided by the Master Plan

Articulation of natural and social capitals

Sustainable biodiversity and natural resources management models for protected areas and their buffer zones were developed and implemented by communities with assistance from SERNAP. These models were successful in promoting sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation because they: (i) built on and adapted existing community livelihood practices, natural resource use patterns, cultural values and other socio-economic conditions; (ii) were consistent with protected areas management goals; (iii) responded to communities' priorities; and (iv) were relatively simple and easy to replicate. The success of these activities on a local, community level underlines the potential of these initiatives to meeting system objectives while helping Bolivia to become a producer of goods and services associated with its environmental capital. Further actions should be implemented to consolidate this type of activities and to strengthen the existing social networks

List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Articulation

Planning instruments for the long-term management of protected areas must be clearly articulated to national development plans and agendas in order to incorporate sustainable biodiversity management as a key element for national and local development. The initial stage of implementation of the Master Plan should consider specific strategies to secure such linkages

Poverty, land tenure and biodiversity conservation

The implementation of the Master Plan in a next phase should give priority to the following (i) aspects: i) supporting institutional development at various levels (national, departmental and municipal); (ii) supporting administrative decentralization without hindering the development of the central government; (iii) respecting Bolivia's particular cultural and ethnic diversity; (iv) ensure that conservation and sustainable use initiatives result in local benefits, and (v) relate natural resource management to rural development

Biodiversity monitoring

Given the limited capacity of SERNAP to continue operating the biodiversity monitoring system, it is highly recommended the development of new strategic alliances with other institutions to secure the data collection, processing and analysis and leverage additional resources to maintain the updating of the databases and the generation of relevant information.

Government Commitment and Sustainability

The project helped to finance the protected areas staff on a decreasing basis, at the project closing, such staff was fully covered with the protected areas fund. SERNAP and FUNDESAP must continue their joint efforts to implement the Strategic Financial Plan to secure the contracting of additional staff for an improved management of the SNAP. The implementation of the SFP will reduce SERNAP's dependence on international cooperation to finance SNAP's recurrent costs and will allow to direct donor's support to other strategic investments.

Administrative and Project Management Aspects

The success of the project depended greatly on the continuity of the project technical staff. The missing component was continuity of SERNAP's management which produced delays on project implementation and continuous interruptions on the development of the most relevant planning tools such as the Master Plan. In the future it is important the sector Ministry secures as far as possible the stability of the head of SERNAP and provides a space for better policy and operational coordination.

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 document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.
None available.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	5
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	5
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	5
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	5

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. 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, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
The borrowing agency (a national counterpart) and a NOG of borrowing country gave the 27% and 85% of the total amount committed (Annex 3 – Project Costs and Financing , pg 41 TE report). During year 2003, the fiscal crisis and initial changes in SERNAP Directors had a negative impact on project implementation and key activities were delayed. The project financial gap was solved with the decision to finance 100% of expenditures; however institutional instability and overall conflictive social and political context continued to negatively affect implementation. Towards mid-2004 and during 2005, and despite continued changes in SERNAP Directors, implementation came back on track, allowing the completion of the most important aspects of the project, however validation and implementation of strategic planning tools such as the SNAP Master Plans was not possible due to time constraints during the final execution stage, resulting in lack of achievement of that result.
Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
The Project was completed as per the schedule.

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: The evidence presented by the TE is well substantiated.

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

1.	Project Appraisal Document for CEO Endorsement, November 2000 (620 PAD.pdf)
2.	Project status report 2004 (620 PIR 2004.doc)
3.	Project status report 2005 (620 PIR 2005.htm)
4.	Project status report 2006 (620 PIR 2006.htm)
5.	Project Document for WP, 1999 (Parts 1, 2 & 3)