

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 846		Review date:		10/19/2006
IA/EA Project ID:	PO63318 PMIS823	GEF financing:	at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Albarradas in Coastal Ecuador: Rescuing Traditional Knowledge on Sustainable Use of Biodiversity	IA/EA own:	0.725	0.743
Country:	Ecuador	Government:	-	-
		Other*:	0.758	0.888
		Total Cofinancing	2.358	3.181
Operational Program:	1, 3	Total Project Cost:	3.083	3.924
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Escuela Superior Politecnica del Litoral ESPOL – Centro de Estudios Arqueologicos y Antropologicos CEAA	Work Program date		-
		CEO Endorsement		07/14/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		08/24/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 3 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 3 years	Difference between original and actual closing: No difference
Author of TE:	-	TE completion date: 04/30/2004	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 (TFSR)	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	HS	-	-	HS
2.2 Project	N/A	-	-	L

sustainability				
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	HS	-	-	HS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	S

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

Yes. It provides a complete assessment of the project's achievement of objectives and presents the main research findings in a concise way.

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 TE, the project's Environmental Objective is "to increase knowledge about traditional and modern systems of technologies for sustainable use of the globally-outstanding biodiversity of Southwestern Ecuador, and increased local participation in the benefits of conservation".

A review of the project brief shows that there was no change during implementation.

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

The TE lists the following 3 objectives:

1. to enhance understanding of the Albarradas (Pre-Columbian Detention Ponds) systems as a response to a changing environment by determining ways in which newly constructed Albarradas differ from traditional ones (placement in the landscape, fluvial and surface runoff, design, and core construction)
2. to understand the ways through which traditional common property resource management systems (Albarradas) have changed in response to changing social, economical, and political contexts
3. to enhance understanding of wild relatives of crop varieties in the area's ecosystems and to promote their conservation

The project brief lists the same objectives.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The TE describes the following main results:

- A GIS system was established, based on a remote sensor survey of the area and validated by field work. This system created also include information of botanical, archaeological and socio cultural character, and is a baseline product for future research and for the implementation of a program directed towards the sustainable management of Albarradas and their associated biodiversity.
- The study on the chronology of Albarradas construction served to confirm the initial hypothesis about the strength of this technology.
- 595 species are preserved in the project herbaria, including seeds of endangered species and endemic species.
- Ancient plant cover of Albarradas and their environs was determined, 8 wild relatives of domestic plants were identified, 31 endemic species, and 181 species that were considered endemic to the Galapagos Islands. The wild relatives recovered in Albarradas conserve the species germoplasm preserving them from extinction.

4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance	Rating: HS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain 	
<p>The vast amount of information produced in this study about Albarradas traditional knowledge and technology is a critical input to enhance our understanding of factors affecting biodiversity sustainability. Project was consistent with OP1 strategy because it promoted the preservation and maintenance of traditional and local knowledge that sustainably manages biodiversity important to agriculture (such as wild relatives of domesticated plants).</p>	
B Effectiveness	Rating: HS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	
<p>As mentioned in the TE, the project objectives were not only met, but all research teams were able to surpass initial expectations, which translated not only in obtaining all the expected outputs but to discover new products. Different research teams (Archaeology, Geology, Botany, Paleo-ethnobotany, and Sociocultural Anthropology) discussed the implications of their findings and were able to test and validate all specific research hypotheses.</p>	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	
<p>According to the TE, the project successfully implemented several activities such as a remote sensor survey, a geological and geographical study, an interdisciplinary study of traditional common property resource management system, and a botanical / ethnobotanical analysis. In addition, it mentions that some unexpected problems (like the late initial disbursement of funds) were lessened thanks to the ability to adapt activities within planned research guidelines within the logical framework and to the advancement of funds by the ESPOL.</p>	

Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? - The main impact of this project has been a substantial increase in the knowledge and understanding of the Albarradas system. The TE mentions that the data produced has permitted ESPOL to design a viable program of sustainable management of Albarradas and their environs, which will have a great impact on the conservation of Albarradas when it is implemented.

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: L
<p>The Project Brief states that the financial sustainability is high because, under the agreement whereby ESPOL participates in the operation of the Santa Elena oilfields, it must use 30% of the net income received to finance educational, cultural, scientific, and social development programs having a direct impact for the Santa Elena Peninsula. ESPOL, in order to comply with its mandate, is implementing the Program for the Development of the Santa Elena Peninsula and, in addition, the TE mentions that a Pilot Project, sustaining the Model for Integrated Management of Albarradas, will be financed by PRODEPINE.</p>	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
<p>In order to reduce risk, the project brief identified that it was crucial that project activities become part of the program that ESPOL is developing for the area. The PIR 2002 assesses that ESPOL has demonstrated its commitment to the project by incorporating project activities (especially</p>	

those related to laboratory analysis) into the overall academic program of the University. On the other hand, the TE mentions that the pilot project that is now in process of implementation has experienced some delays because the local officer from the Development project for indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian peoples (PRODEPINE) insists on relying on “modern” technologies that have been proven inappropriate in previous research.

C Institutional framework and governance

Rating: L

The TE assesses that governmental policies and regulations had no negative impact on the project, and makes no mention of any possible future risks regarding this issue

D Environmental

Rating: L

The PIR2002 concludes that the risk related to illegal land transactions of territories close to the (planned) main water-distribution aqueducts for CEDEGE irrigation projects was not as paramount as assumed during project preparation.

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

A Financial resources	Rating: L
B Socio political	Rating: L
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
D Environmental	Rating: N/A
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: L	

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good

The TE mentions that the project produced several reports, a system of Geo-referenced Information on Albarradas (SGIA), and resulted in the creation of a very complete data base. The project also conducted workshops to exchange information with important stakeholders and institutions, like the Indigenous Communes of the coast, local NGOs, ministries, among others.

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

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)

Rating: HS

Yes. A thorough and detailed M&E system was planned, and a list of hypothesis to be tested was identified. The project brief explains that ESPOL and partner agencies have invested substantially in the past 25 years in research related to Albarradas, water management, socio-cultural traditions, and environmental issues, and that this project was based on this relevant research.

B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

Rating: HS

According to the TE, the review of a multiple combination of sources of information, beginning by primary sources through direct field work, as well as secondary sources from the technical

literature, official legislation, and communication media archives permitted the interdisciplinary research team to assure the validity and credibility of their results. It also explains that achievement of project objectives was constantly assessed in discussion workshops with the participation of all members of the research team and enriched in workshops with various stakeholders and institutions that operate in the area.
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? Rating: HS
Information included in the TE shows that a good proportion of the project's budget was allocated and spent in the various surveys, analysis and researches planned.
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? Yes. Not only was M&E of the Albarradas the project's main objective, but it was also successfully implemented by a multi-disciplinarian and multinational-team of researchers that included archaeologists, socio-cultural anthropologists, botanists, paleo-ethnobotanists, and geologists.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons 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?
No useful lessons are mentioned in the TE,

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
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Achievement of project objectives is assessed in relation to the indicators included in the project brief. It also includes an assessment of the various hypotheses about the function of Albarradas that were tested.	HS (6)
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? The TE is in general convincing and presents complete evidence. However it does not include ratings.	S (5)
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE mainly describes some of the project's main outcomes in more detail. It does not assess any of the potential risks that are mentioned in the Project Brief (like illegal land transactions)	MU (3)
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	U (2)

Lessons included in the TE are actually a list of the findings from the research activities that were taken by the project.	
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes. It also includes a complete description of the project's Financial Management status.	HS (6)
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? The section on M&E presented in the TE is not very complete and provides limited analysis.	MU (3)

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 project's goal was to improve knowledge of the Albarradas system, so a technical assessment of the project's impacts is not relevant. However, the TE does recommend that funding should be made available for implementing the Integral model for sustainable management and upkeep of Albarradas developed by the project.

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

Project brief, Trust Fund Status Report 2003, PIR 2002