

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	836		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion (Million US\$)</u>
IA/EA Project ID:	73195	GEF financing:	25.00	25.00
Project Name:	Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF)	IA/EA own:	25.00	
Country:	Global	Government:	25.00	
		Other*:	25.00	
		Total Cofinancing	75.00	75.00
Operational Program:		Total Project Cost:	100.00	75.00¹
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		06/30/ 2000
		CEO Endorsement		11/07/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		01/01/2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 01/01/2006	Actual: 07/30/2006
Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing:	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing:	Difference between original and actual closing:
Soledad	Anna	60 months	67 months	7 months
Author of TE:		TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF OME:	Difference between TE completion and submission date:
Karen Luz		06/18/07	06/19/07	0 month

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

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	S	U/A	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	L	U/A	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	S	U/A	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	U/A	S

<p>Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?</p> <p>YES.</p> <p>It complies with all GEF-EO guidelines for TE requirements, it is clearly written, and substantiation as well as examples are provided in each case. The TE presents an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievements of project objective; the evidence presented was complete and convincing and ratings were well substantiated. In addition, the TE presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes. The lessons and recommendations listed in the terminal evaluation report are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the portfolio and future projects.</p>

¹ According to the TE, * an additional \$36.2 million was spent through March 31st and attributed to other partners for a total of \$111.5 million. (\$89.8 million in grants).

Moreover, the TE included the actual project costs and actual co-financing used. In the same manner, the report presents an assessment of the quality of M&E at entry and during implementation.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? YES
According to IEG's evaluation report, the relevance of the design of the CEPF grant-making approach has also been called into question in two other areas: on the conflict of interest that was inherent in the original Bank agreement concerning Conservation International's role as a grantee, and the significant amount of grant financing that has been directed toward international NGOs, including CI, as opposed to local and national NGOs.

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 the project documents, the Global Environmental Objectives were "to enhance biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within each ecosystem funded by CEPF". This would be measured against relevant biodiversity indicators to be selected for each ecosystem profile. Intermediate key performance indicators include the following: (i) biodiversity is conserved in a verifiable manner; (ii) the intended/articulated impact of each recipient organization is increased; (iii) the ability to monitor and measure impact and performance of each recipient organization is improved; (iv) at least 5 actors change policies or practices to be more compatible with biodiversity conservation as a result of information generated from CEPF investments; (v) at least one additional partner added that provides US\$5 million per year; and (vi) better consideration of ecological considerations important for each hotspot in the World Bank's country dialogue.

Changes: According to the TE, the GEO and indicators were never formally revised with Board approval. However, by the time of the first ISR, the project goal had been refined to the more precise GEO that has been used during project implementation: "The conservation of ecosystems in 19 globally important hotspots, protecting or enhancing the multiple benefits provided by them to agriculture, forestry, water supply and fisheries, and other sectors critical to the Bank's contribution to poverty alleviation."

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

According to the project documents, the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund is a small grants program housed in Conservation International. Its objective is to "provide strategic assistance to NGOs and other private sector organizations for the protection of selected vital ecosystems in World Bank member countries that have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity."

According to the project document, the project aimed at supporting a partnership (the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, CEPF) between the GEF, the World Bank, Conservation International (CI), bilateral organizations, private donors, governments and local communities. It was targeted to assist conservation and sustainable use activities in 21 of the 25 most important "hot spots" in the planet. These areas harbor a disproportionately large amount of terrestrial biodiversity (potentially up to 70 percent of total) in relation to their size, are under substantive threat, and require urgent attention.

According to the TE, there were no changes to development objectives during implementation.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

According to the TE, most hotspots reported accomplishments in the following areas: strengthening biodiversity corridors; creation and/or expansion of protected areas, including private and community-managed areas; strengthening protected areas management; fostering cooperation among stakeholders, including creating new networks among partners; civil society capacity-building and increased civil society engagement in conservation; promoting sustainable development practices; increasing scientific knowledge/biological monitoring; identifying long-term financing; and building conservation awareness. Examples of specific results include the following:

Protected areas: As of March 2007, CEPF had contributed to the creation or expansion of 9.4 million hectares of protected areas in 15 countries, a very significant achievement in some of the most globally important areas for biodiversity on earth. Many existing protected areas also came under improved management as a result of CEPF investments, including 559,000 hectares in the Caucasus Region and some 325,000 hectares in Northern Mesoamerica.

Mainstreaming: Agro-forestry systems and organic agriculture were adopted by 25% of private land owners around the Una Biological Reserve in Brazil's Atlantic Forest; in the Guinean Forests of West Africa hotspot, 1,700 Ghanaian farmers received training in sustainable cocoa production and agroforestry practices around Kakum National Park; and in Northern Mesoamerica, more than 242,000 hectares in the Sierra de las Minas Biosphere Reserve in Guatemala are under improved watershed management as a result of a water fund payments for environmental services program.

Unintended outcomes: Participation in CEPF may have encouraged and certainly reinforced a strategic shift in CI's

own approach to conserving biodiversity worldwide. In 2004, CI formally committed to re-grant substantial portions of its annual budget to partners in recognition of the need to engage many other civil society groups in conserving biodiversity.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

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

<p>A Relevance</p> <p>The project was, and continues to be, highly relevant to the global development objective of biodiversity conservation. CEPF was targeted to key regions of global biodiversity importance, as identified through CI's hotspot methodology. In addition, the approach of working through civil society groups is widely acknowledged as an important element of conservation strategy in countries which often lack adequate budget, capacity, and in some cases, political will for conservation.</p> <p>According to the Global Program Review, CEPF was conceived as an <i>additional</i> financial mechanism to help countries implement the Convention on Biodiversity. Implementation of its first phase has shown that there is an unsaturated demand from local grassroots groups for small grants in support of biodiversity conservation despite the existence of other financing mechanisms, such as the GEF Small Grants Program (SGP).</p>	<p>Rating: HS 6</p>
<p>B Effectiveness</p> <p>The 2006 independent evaluation and later assessments in hotspots confirm that substantial progress has been made towards better conservation. CEPF has completed grant-making in nine regions while grant-making remains active in six regions approved for investment since July 2002. In total (by March 2007), CEPF has committed \$89.8 million in direct grants to more than 600 civil society groups in 33 countries in South and Central America (4 hotspots, \$28.9 million), Africa and Madagascar (5 hotspots, \$28.8 million), the Caucasus (\$7 million), and East Asia (4 hotspots, \$25.1 million). Special re-granting programs in some regions bring the number of groups supported by CEPF to more than 1,000.</p> <p>A major focus of CEPF interventions was the creation or expansion, consolidation, and improved planning and management of protected area networks. In the aggregate, as of March 2007, CEPF had contributed to the creation or expansion of 9.4 million hectares of protected areas in 15 countries. According to the IEG report, there is no evidence provided in the external evaluation that CEPF systematically improved protected areas management. The GPR mission to the Southern Mesoamerican region found, for example, that while there are initiatives under way to support forest guards in all three Southern Mesoamerican countries, these rely on volunteerism; there has been no discussion of the livelihood activities forfeited enabling the guards (or "keepers") to occupy these posts. Aside from the lack of analysis of such livelihood issues, the initiatives fail to indicate how resources currently being spent to supply forest guards with necessary equipment, gasoline, food, and medicine will be sustained beyond the life of the project. Moreover, there are too few forest guards to properly enforce protected area boundaries and volunteer forest guards seem to have little support from national militaries to enforce environmental laws on site—the use of formal "denouncements" is a good start, but it is more of a bureaucratic response than one that tackles the root policy causes of agricultural encroachment, road construction, illegal logging, and poaching.</p>	<p>Rating: MS 4</p>
<p>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</p> <p>The IEG's report states that more assessments are necessary to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the CEPF approach.</p> <p>The CEPF modality was chosen by the donors because it is a nimble and cost-effective way to get small grants to civil society. According to the TE, the project was also very efficient in terms of leveraging additional funding: CEPF grant recipients have reported some \$128 million in leveraged funds to date.</p> <p>According to the Global Program Review, cost-effectiveness has been a major point of debate in GEF Council discussions concerning support for a second phase of the CEPF (Fall 2006–Spring 2007). The Council has conditioned CEO endorsement of CEPF's second phase on capping operational costs at 24 percent, program management costs for subgrantees at 13 percent, while retaining total CEPF Secretariat costs at 12.5 percent of donor contributions</p> <p>With respect to the cost effectiveness of the program: <i>Management Costs of the Ongoing Joint Small Grants Program Evaluation</i>, a technical paper prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office, compared the management costs of the GEF corporate Small Grants Program with several similar small grants programs, including the CEPF. The review found that SGP management costs are in the order of 28–31 percent of total program expenditures, and CEPF costs are slightly higher, between 30–34 percent. The review paid particular attention to one type of grant, the coordination grants, which the review</p>	<p>Rating: MS</p>

says totaled about \$14 million. The coordination unit (CU), now referred to as a regional implementation team (RIT) is an implementation modality that is unique to the CEPF; the external evaluation found that CUs provided high-quality local program implementation services. A full assessment of cost-effectiveness would require an analysis of the benefits uniquely derived from the support of the implementation teams in addition to an accounting of costs, compared to other small grant programs that rely on more centrally managed project implementation units. As such, there is a need to determine the ratio of supervision and management services being provided by the implementation teams versus specialized technical assistance.

With respect to cost effectiveness of the grant schemes: IEG was unable to undertake a more thorough analysis because the Close-Out reports provide very little information on the costs and results of the individual grants awarded through these schemes.

4.1.2 Impacts

The external evaluation identified several direct impacts that are attributable to CEPF. In addition to contributing to extending protected area networks, the program has helped to build the capacity of local and national NGOs and to broaden environmental awareness. IEG's site visit and interviews with CEPF Grant Directors confirmed that building the capacity of local NGOs is a main focus of the program. But capacity strengthening is a *process rather than an impact* which, if sustained, can then lead to the generation of environmental benefits. Indicators to measure NGO capacity developed thus far are limited to the level of additional cofinancing that groups funded by CEPF are able to obtain due to the acquisition of grant proposal writing skills. Having worked with more than 600 civil society groups, CEPF has the potential to contribute to the development of a methodology for monitoring and evaluating how such capacity development can achieve sustainable biodiversity conservation results, but has yet to do so.

The external evaluation also points to the achievement of effective advocacy by grantee organizations in connection with infrastructure and other development projects. There is ample anecdotal evidence of CEPF-financed project influence in this regard, including successful efforts in Armenia and Southern Meso-America to redirect infrastructure away from classified or protected areas, cancellation of logging concessions in a biosphere reserve in the Tropical Andes, and in a proposed protected area in Sundaland. Indeed, common threats identified by the Ecosystem Profiling processes have included logging, mining, ranching, tourism, urbanization, infrastructure, livestock grazing, road and dam construction, intensification and expansion of agriculture, and the collection of plants for medicinal use. However, the Bank does not appear to be engaging in effective dialogue with CEPF on the interactions between poverty and conservation to ensure both that its projects in the hotspot sites are not doing harm and that CEPF's risk mitigation strategies are not detracting from countries' development aims.

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: 4 L
Financial sustainability would not be a problem because there was sufficient input for the beneficiaries to continue raising funds on their own. In addition, the independent evaluation recommended that the Donors continue and expand the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund. Accordingly, at the invitation of the GEF CEO, a project (CEPF-2) for a second GEF grant was submitted to the GEF Council in June 2006 and is expected to become effective in FY08. Another two of the original donors, CI and MacArthur Foundation, have also made commitments to this second phase and a sixth donor, l'Agence Française de Développement, has joined the partnership.	
B Socio political	Rating: 3 M L
CEPF support has also played an influential role in shaping national and municipal policies in favor of biodiversity conservation. For example, in the Tumbes-Chocó-Magdalena region, Colombia integrated the corridor concept into policies of the Department of National Parks, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Transportation, Mining, and Energy. In the Philippines, the National Economic Development Authority incorporated biodiversity conservation priorities into the newly updated thirty-year Regional Physical Framework Plan for a key region of the country. However, according to the IEG's report, there are some issues that attest against the relevance of the project. First, the design of the program, namely the pursuit of the hotspot approach to biodiversity conservation is a subject of debate in the biological science community. Some scientists contend that investing in areas containing the most species at risk of extinction often translates into investing in areas in which there is a small chance of success because of overwhelming development pressure or official corruption	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 4 L
<u>Several of the partnerships formed under the project will continue beyond CEPF.</u> Around Tesso Nilo National Park in Sumatra, for example, WWF will continue working with Jikalahari, a newly established local NGO. Partnerships and	

alliances were forged among civil society groups and others, including governments, within each hotspot. In some cases, groups which had previously worked in an isolated fashion had the opportunity to work with others, increasing their impact and also the breadth of their perspective. Thus, the institutional and governance related risks are low.

D Environmental

Rating: 4 L

No environmental risks are foreseen.

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good

- Development of a web site as a resource for CEPF grantees and others. According to the PSR (2005) the CEPF Web site continues to grow as a valuable resource for CEPF grantees and others, with an average of 427 visitors a day from more than 100 countries. In July 2004, CEPF launched a significantly expanded online Resource Center to consolidate and enable visitors to more easily locate the many documents and other resources available on the site.
- Publications: A library bringing together all CEPF publications available online, including annual reports, ecosystem profiles and final project completion reports. In FY 2004 (July 2003-June 2004), visitors to the site downloaded 264,722 copies of these documents, including 20,490 final project completion reports detailing results and lessons learned by project leaders.
- E-News Subscribe: An easy-to-complete, online subscription form for our newsletter. Subscribers to the newsletter now number more than 1,200.
- Ecosystem Profiling: The external evaluation found that CEPF had made strong progress over its first five years, although there was some variation in hotspot performance. While it found that a coherent planning process—Ecosystem Profiling—had been developed, the profiles were expressed in general terms, making it difficult to assess gains in biodiversity conservation. This review has found that the Ecosystem Profile, as it evolved scientifically, offers a global environmental public good that has utility beyond a mere investment planning function.

b. Demonstration

c. Replication

d. Scaling up

- CEPF support has also played an influential role in shaping national and municipal policies in favor of biodiversity conservation. For example, in the Tumbes-Chocó-Magdalena region, Colombia integrated the corridor concept into policies of the Department of National Parks, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Transportation, Mining, and Energy.
- In addition, according to the TE, at least five Ecosystem Profiles have included strategic directions that specifically target the private sector (Atlantic Forest, Cape Floristic Region, Madagascar, Succulent Karoo, and Sundaland), with several achieving significant conservation contributions from national and international companies in the mining, agribusiness, wine production, logging, and ecotourism sectors.
- Sub-projects have also targeted conservation on indigenous lands, supporting community-based management of protected areas or indigenous territories.

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

One of the components of the project was M&E and Knowledge Management. Timeframes and indicators were thought out during the design. The objectives of this component were to develop a system for monitoring and evaluation of the project, and a system for information and knowledge management. The Biodiversity Conservation Information System (BCIS) would take the lead on building and managing of the system. For reasons unrelated to CEPF, BCIS was dissolved during the program's second year. Information and knowledge management subsequently became a primary function of the CEPF Secretariat management team.

However, it should be noted that the early log frame was written in general terms and lacked specific, verifiable targets for some indicators.

B. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): S

Reports were produced at different time intervals and results/ recommendations were immediately adopted—as it happened also with the mid term review (according to the TE). Quarterly and annual progress reports focused on specific achievements by sub-projects at the hotspot level. The five-year assessments, finalized in 2006/2007 for nine hotspots, report against the ecosystem profile log frames. In later years, CEPF also reported annually at the hotspot level against the standard GEF biodiversity indicators.

The TE notes that "CEPF did an admirable job of practicing adaptive management based on informal analysis of implementation experience. This was particularly true at the regional level, with several regions benefiting from regular stakeholder meetings to share lessons learned and develop and share guidelines on key issues, such as conservation stewardship".

C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?

Yes. It was a component of the project and included outputs and outcomes and funds from the beginning.

C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?

Yes

C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?

Yes

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?

According to the TE, lessons learned during implementation were continuously being integrated into ongoing operations. Some lessons are quite specific to this project, but other aspects of the approach have wider applications. Among these lessons are the following:

- Global Programs require discrete funds for adequate oversight
- The CEPF governance model may need revisiting to consider the current lack of developing country participation on the program's governing body
- The Global Environment Facility, in its role as a governing body member and financing partner of a global program, should consider how to balance evolving standards for global program evaluation against its own project reporting requirements.
- Transaction costs for large donors to reach multiple smaller organizations can be reduced by use of a multi-purpose intermediary that provides not only grant-making services but also technical and other support to grantees.
- Civil society varies greatly in its level of organization and sophistication from country to country.
- A coherent planning process such as that used in the preparation of ecosystem profiles together with a strategic alignment of grants, can contribute greatly to the coordination and effectiveness of conservation interventions.
- A governance structure that includes donors in higher-level decision making can be very useful for producing buy-in and can enable greater flexibility to make adjustments in the course of implementation.
- Concerns about conflict of interest and self-dealing are bound to arise in cases where the granting organization can also be a grantee, even where such grants are subject to independent review.
- Monitoring outcomes at the portfolio or the global level is more complex than simply aggregating outcomes of individual sub-projects.

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

- Projects that work with civil society must have sufficient knowledge of the level of development of the sector and be flexible to design appropriate interventions with local organizations, including capacity building.
- In a project that takes a deliberately experimental approach, phasing start-up of regions is a good way to take advantage of the fact that many lessons are learned early on in project implementation.
- Careful thought must be given to useful indicators or benchmarks for monitoring at these levels at the very beginning of project implementation, or else data will not be available on which to base well-supported conclusions about impacts.

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.

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?	6
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.

<p>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?</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>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?</p>
<p>No</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes:</p>	<p>No: x</p>
<p>Explain:</p>		

<p>4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)</p> <p>PIR (2005) Project Document GEF ICR Data Sheet IEG Global Program Review</p>
