

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	625		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	PO57027 PMIS 711	GEF financing:	0.725	0.725
Project Name:	Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Western Slope of the Serrania del Baudo	IA/EA own:	-	-
Country:	Colombia	Government:	0.1375	0.1375
		Other*:	2.09986	2.09986
		Total Cofinancing	2.23736	2.23736
Operational Program:	2, 3	Total Project Cost:	2.98736	2.98736
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Fundacion Natura	Work Program date		-
		CEO Endorsement		04/21/1999
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		06/24/1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2002	Actual: 12/2002
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 41 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 5 months
Author of TE:	-	TE completion date: 04/22/2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 09/21/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 17 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). 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 applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	-	-	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	-	-	MU
2.3 Monitoring		-	-	HS

and evaluation				
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	S

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

This TE is of satisfactory quality and good lessons are drawn. However it could have done a better job of providing evidence on the achievement or project objectives (as opposed to inputs and outputs).

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?**

According to the project brief, the project's objective was the "development of a strategy for the sustainable use of biodiversity in the western slope of the Serrania del Baudo, in a joint effort between governmental institutions and civil society, and for the benefit of the local communities"

There were no changes during implementation.

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

Both the Project Brief and the TE mention the following:

- Ecological and socioeconomic data and information concerning regional plans and projects available to local stakeholders.
- Set of indicators for decision-making concerning the sustainable use of the biodiversity developed
- Local stakeholders trained in legal and technical aspects for the sustainable use of biodiversity
- Communication plan implemented
- Policies and strategies for the sustainable use of biodiversity planned, agreed, and defined by local stakeholders
- Network of private protected areas established
- Local sub-projects for the sustainable use of biodiversity implemented and self-sustained.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

According to the TE, these were:

- Four model management plans for private nature reserves were prepared along with a watershed management plan
- The Rio Valle watershed management plan was prepared with the active participation of the Community Council and the Natura Foundation
- Key species conservation plans were prepared including the vegetation inventory in Juna and the marine tortoise conservation initiatives in Playita and Playa Larga which represent an integral part of the September Nature Reserve Management Plan
- Project supported preparation of 40 sustainable use sub-project proposals of which 13 are being implemented in fisheries, wildlife use, product processing, recycling and traditional local knowledge
- Two regional environmental data centers were established, The Nuqui High School and the Solanenas Women's Group are managing these centers
- Training was a key project activity and helped to ensure improved participation in local stakeholder decision-making
- Overall targets of communication were achieved

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**

Yes. As identified in the project brief, the project's area is located in the Choco Biogeographical Region, which is considered a threatened biota or hotspot because of its high levels of endemism and great diversity of ecosystems and species. Project outcomes were directed towards the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity, and although the project didn't achieve the objective of increasing the number of protected areas, it was successful in promoting the sustainable use of important natural resources such as fisheries.

B Effectiveness Rating: MS

- **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 TE mentions that not all project outcomes were achieved, including:

- Project failed to reach its target of 12000 additional hectares under protection
- The GIS was not completed due to a lack of technical, logistical and human resources necessary to manage it, and was substituted by the production of maps
- The 2 community environmental councils were not established since they were deemed to be redundant to the services provided by the regional data centers
- The webpage was developed towards the end of the project but it has limited use in the region because of lack of internet access among the region population
- The project did not work with indigenous communities as those communities chose not to participate, and focused its efforts on Afro-descendent communities instead.

Despite these shortcomings, the TE does list project outcomes for each objective.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: MU

- **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?**

According to the TE, the work dynamics was affected by the arrival of armed groups and violent events in the project area. Numerous meetings, events and workshops were cancelled or rescheduled. The situation of public order was a major factor in carrying out the projects. Population displacements, rural migration, unemployment, productivity declines and the overall level of personnel security affected the original baseline situation and affected overall project performance.

The TE also mentions that the project was extended by 4 months due to the delayed arrival of the first and second payments, which resulted in an increase in service and technical assistance costs.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**
- Although the TE does not include any specific information on the impact of the project's outcomes in the status of biodiversity, it does mention that it was very successful at enhancing awareness of the need for a holistic approach to the issue of managing biodiversity. Increased awareness of the importance of biodiversity, together with successful implementation of sub-projects for the sustainable use of biodiversity and preparation of management and conservation plans do have a potential to achieve impacts in a longer 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: ML
<p>The TE identifies that the most challenging aspect of sub-project sustainability will likely be financial. Market development in the project area is weak and very few communities are at the level of economic development which permits market forces to operate so as to generate profitable and marketable surpluses.</p> <p>On the other hand it mentions that resources have already been secured in order to support follow-on activities in the project area over the next few years.</p>	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
<p>As mentioned in the GEF Secretariat review sheet, the project plan was quite ambitious and unlikely to be fully sustainable once the GEF support ends. That being said, the project had a significant, and, most importantly, positive, impact on local communities. The TE acknowledges that the fact that the project benefited from the background and acquired experience of the executing agency made it possible to forge ahead in improving the working conditions of local groups and associations, assessing the activities of local groups, boosting the income of local organized groups, and in particular, enhancing awareness of the need for a holistic approach to the issue of managing biodiversity.</p> <p>The TE also points out that the indigenous communities chose not to participate in the project. This is of significant importance because, according to the project brief, even though they only represent 4% of the population in the Serrania del Baudo, they occupy 65% of the territory. It also states that some sectors of the black communities were unwilling to accept the project's land use planning and management strategy component because the start of the project coincided with the process of collective land titling in the region. The constant presence of armed guerrilla groups also undermine socio-political sustainability as the TE mentions that this results in population displacements, rural migration, unemployment, productivity declines and contributes to an overall level of lawlessness and high crime.</p>	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
<p>The TE was concludes that the project succeeding at producing agreements, alliances and networks, increasing the capacity of local institutions. But is also mentions that the policies regarding collective territorial management and the ongoing process of land titling were a risk to project's objectives.</p>	
D Environmental	Rating: MU
<p>Although the Project brief identifies that agriculture expansion is one of the main causes of the areas' deforestation, the TE does not provide any information on that subject. The Project brief also mentions that the planned implementation of many development projects in the pacific region (ports, roads, industrial poles) is a threat to the conservation of the region's biodiversity.</p>	

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: L
D Environmental	Rating: NA
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: ML	

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good
<p>A webpage for the dissemination of the project's principal outputs and objectives was put online at the same time as the TE was completed. Also, the project created two environmental data centers, with a collection of over 350 documents concerning the environment, institutions, legislation, general collections, videos and reference documents in each center.</p>
2. Demonstration
-
3. Replication

-
4. Scaling up
-

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

<p>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)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rating: HS</p>
<p>According to the TE, the M&E of project activities was a three-tier process: one level was the technical team comprised of local technical experts and field coordinators; the second was the beneficiary groups themselves; and the third was monitoring and follow-up by the Bank. It also concludes that the existence of clear guidelines and procedures for monitoring project implementation and budgetary management were very important elements of the project.</p>
<p>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?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rating: HS</p>
<p>The TE states that there was a participatory preparation of decision-making indicators; and that 3 local groups have developed 30 indicators for analyzing their progress and arriving at decisions, based on environmental, economic and organizational criteria. The TE specially mentions that recommendations from the Mid-term evaluation resulted in the project focusing more on activities with the best potential for success, and providing them with training, communications and capacity-building.</p>
<p>C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rating: S</p>
<p>The project brief shows that budget for M&E activities were planned mostly under objectives 1 and 2; and the TE makes no mention of any lack or shortage of funding regarding M&E activities.</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?</p> <p>Yes. This project considered the identification of indicators for decision-making concerning the sustainable use of the biodiversity as one of its main outcomes. Therefore many activities were focused on developing these indicators, using a highly participatory methodology and providing training to the relevant stakeholders.</p>

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p>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?</p>
<p>The TE mentions the following lessons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In communities with limited technical and managerial capacity, training at all levels is essential - Establishing a strong link between traditional economic activity and sustainability is more likely to lead to increased community involvement in project activities - Advanced computer based data systems such as GIS may be of limited value in communities that have no capacity to collect the required data or to interpret it - Projects working with communities with little experience in data collection/management need to design simple but relevant systems which communities feel comfortable using - When training is viewed as a process designed to assist in the data management, there is a higher probability of local acceptance - The support of local stakeholders working in municipalities, councils or other state bodies is

based on recognition of project achievements. For example the women's recycling group received support from the local government, in the form of a storage shed.

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.

No additional information was available to the reviewer.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report

	Ratings
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? In general the assessment of project's outcomes and achievement of objectives is superficial. For example the TE fails to explain why the indigenous communities chose not to participate in the project, and if (or how) that affected the project's outcomes.</p>	MU (3)
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Some of the evidence found in the PIR2003 is more complete than the evidence presented in the TE. For instance, the TE estimates that more than 5000 people were reached by the communications plans (around 40% of the area's population) but does not provide convincing evidence or methodology to support this statement. In addition it does not include ratings.</p>	MS (4)
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE assessment of the project sustainability includes description of project activities that promoted sustainability and of special project circumstances that could hinder it. As for the exit strategy, the TE states that follow-up activities are going to be funded by other donor organizations such as WWF, Plan Pacifico and the IDB.</p>	S (5)
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes. The TE includes a very comprehensive and useful list of lessons.</p>	HS (6)
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes.</p>	HS (6)
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? It presents a concise assessment of M&E systems of both project implementation of activities and management.</p>	S (5)

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: Other funding sources have already been secured to continue implementing project activities. It is expected that the continuing M&E of these activities will provide an assessment of the project impact.

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

Project brief, PIR2003, GEF Secretariat Review Sheet