

**Project Information:** [By clicking on (i) you will get additional information for associated section/field. Some information in this document is populated from iDESK, AS PDS Approval & AS - Supervisions.]

Data populated
Data Entry

Region: ASIA	Country: Philippines	Frontier Regions: (i)	% in Frontier Region: (i)
Sector: O-C - Finance Companies	IDA status: (i) No	% in IDA Countries: (i)	
Owning Dept/Division: CESBD - Environment & Social Development/Bio-diversity	Implementing Dept/Division:	Project/Transaction Leader: Juan Jose Dada	
Project ID: 506048	Project Short Name: BDGEF ACC	Project Long Name: GEF Asian Conservation Company (ACC)- (Tranche I)	
Original Approval Date: Mar. 7, 2007	Total Funding: 420,000	Actual Project Duration: 75 months	
	Original (i)	Revised (i)	Actual (i)
Project Implementation Start	Feb. 27, 2004	Feb. 27, 2004	Feb. 27, 2004
Project Completion	Feb. 27, 2010	Feb. 27, 2010	Apr. 30, 2010

**Project Categorization (automatically populated from the Business Lines tab in iDesk):**

Business Line(s)	Product(s)	Type
Environment and Social Sustainability	100% ESS-Other	S-I 100%

Relationship to IFC Project(s)	Relationship Type	Project ID	Project Long Name
IFC AS Project	None		
IFC Investment Project	Link to a possible IFC investment within 3 years after project approval		
<i>Recipients</i>			<i>Beneficiary Type (i):</i>
<i>Stakeholder Type (i):</i> Large Company; Government Sub-National	<i>Main Client (i):</i> EL NIDO (551323)	Large Company; Government National; Government Sub-National	
	<i>Other Client(s) (i):</i>		

<b>Objective</b>	Original (Mar 07, 2007) - The project seeks to achieve two global objectives: 1. Long-Term Conservation of Globally Significant Marine and Coastal Biodiversity: The project will seek to achieve long-term conservation of globally significant marine and coastal biodiversity at six sites in the Philippines through an innovative partnership between a private equity investment company (i.e, Asian Conservation Company, or ACC) and local NGOs. The conservation interventions will include: conservation management; marine enforcement; information-education-communication; sustainable livelihoods; biodiversity research and monitoring; and development of institutional and financial sustainability mechanisms. The six sites to be saved through the ACC project all fall within high Priority Marine Conservation Areas for the Philippines as identified by over 70 of the region's top marine scientists and conservationists in the March, 2001 Sulu-Sulawesi Sea conservation prioritization workshop facilitated by WWF. These Priority Conservation Areas have been adopted by the Philippine Government in their process to update the Philippine Biodiversity Strategic
------------------	---

Action Plan. These sites contain over 300,000 hectares of marine area encompassing a broad range of globally important biological diversity. All major marine ecosystems and species of concern in the Philippines are represented within these project sites, including coral reefs, mangrove, sea grass beds, sand flats, algal beds, submarine caves, karst sea cliffs, marine turtles, diverse assemblages of reef fish, threatened marine mammals including dugongs, large pelagic fish such as jacks and sharks, whale sharks, marine turtles, manta rays and many other species. Conservation of these sites will make a significant contribution to the protection of the Priority Conservation Areas and in turn make a major contribution to the protection of Philippine marine biodiversity overall.

2. Demonstration of a Globally Replicable Model. This project seeks to create a globally replicable model for achieving sustainable use and long-term conservation of biodiversity. This model will be highly replicable for several reasons:

(i) Many companies all over the world directly benefit from the presence of biodiversity; thus, there is considerable potential to convince companies that there is a business case for helping to preserve biodiversity. The ACC project will demonstrate that conservation makes business sense. For instance, conservation of biodiversity can both promote beneficial public image as well as secure the resource base upon which many companies depend for long-term success and profit. By establishing and demonstrating the business case for biodiversity conservation, the project will help to catalyze replication among other private sector companies in Asia and elsewhere.

(ii) The ACC project will provide a useful model for environmental organizations to achieve their objectives. At a recent workshop on Conservation Finance in Washington DC, for example, participants expressed strong interest in replicating the ACC model even though it has not been implemented yet.

(iii) The ACC model is extremely innovative because it includes its own built-in replication plan. Using GEF funds, this project will initiate conservation activities at six sites, which will be sustained by revenues from the ACC's first two investments and other private sector operators. After successfully demonstrating this model, the ACC will raise additional donor funding to launch conservation activities at additional biologically rich, threatened sites, which will be sustained in the long-term by revenues from additional investments. ACC expects to make 5-8 investments in total.

Most recent update (Feb 09, 2009) - The ACC model is innovative because for each investment: (i) it will be implemented through an innovative partnership between a private equity investment company (i.e., Asian Conservation Company, or ACC) and a local NGO, and (ii) it includes its own built-in replication plan.

It seeks to achieve two objectives:

1) Using GEF funds, this project will seek long-term conservation of globally significant marine and coastal biodiversity through conservation activities at sites included in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, which will be sustained by revenues from the ACC's first investments and other private sector operators. The initial investment and sub-project of ACC concerns the marine portion of the El Nido-Taytay Managed Resource Protected Area (ENTMRPA), which covers 54,303 ha.

2) After successfully demonstrating the model, through the first El Nido project, the ACC intends to raise additional donor funding to launch conservation activities at additional biologically rich, threatened sites, which will be sustained in the long-term by revenues from additional investments. The ACC project aims to demonstrate that conservation makes business sense; it can both promote beneficial public image for a company as well as secure the resource base upon which many companies depend for long-term success and profit

	<p>As the project is being implemented over a 6-8 year period, the ACC portfolio companies will channel some of their revenues into endowments to be managed by El Nido foundation (ENF.) After the GEF grant funds have been fully utilized, the local NGO should be able to sustain the conservation activities through ongoing contributions from the ACC portfolio companies and proceeds from the endowments</p>
--	---

**Key Highlights ( i )***Summarize key project highlights*

Entire Project:

## 1. Background of company (ACC) and project:

This project is part of the Biodiversity portfolio funded by the GEF which started to be developed about 10 years ago. The initial concept for ACC was designed and approved by the donor in July 2005 with two distinct tranches: one relative to an investment of ACC in El Nido (tourism), and another one relative to a potential investment of ACC in Stellar Fisheries, a blue crab processing enterprise. The latter would have involved a grant of US\$2.9M to WWF Philippines to make the supplying blue crab fishing activity sustainable. The second tranche was dropped in May 2007 by ACC and IFC due to financial challenges of Stellar Fisheries and a decision by ACC to concentrate on perfecting the financing plans for Tranche I.

Tranche I (this project) involves a grant of \$1.6 million to the El Nido Foundation (ENF) in support of conservation activities at one site in Palawan. Tranche II was for conservation activities at five sites in the Visayan sea.

The overall goal of the ACC concept approved by the GEF was to conserve significant coastal and marine biodiversity in the Philippines by creating unique partnerships between a private equity investment holding company, ACC, and local NGOs.

Financial sustainability of conservation activities would be ensured by scheduled financial installments from the ACC's trustee companies to the NGOs. Post investment, these companies would also be encouraged to not only limit their impact on biodiversity but also to conserve the threatened species and the habitat in which they operate.

## 2. This project:

The objective of this project, as back-filled into IDesk in 2009, is:

Seek long-term conservation of globally significant marine and coastal biodiversity through conservation activities at the El Nido-Taytay Managed Resource Protected Area (ENTMRPA), sustained by revenues from the ACC's first investments and other private sector operators.

As the project is being implemented over a 5 year period (not counting pre-implementation), the ACC portfolio company will channel some of their revenue into an endowment to be managed by El Nido foundation (ENF.) After the GEF grant funds have been fully utilized, the local NGO should be able to sustain the conservation activities through ongoing contributions from the ACC portfolio company and proceeds from the endowment.

## 3. Key activities and results:

All outputs and most expected outcomes have been achieved. The only exception to this is in the extent of monitoring, an activity that by its nature tends to lag behind such activities as conservation management and enforcement.

Achievement includes establishment of core no-take zones in 2,111 hectares, establishment of marine patrols covering the fishing, tourism, and multiple use zones, completion of reef restoration activities, sharing of lessons locally and internationally, and conduct of community environmental education, and launch of sustainable livelihood activities. All these contributed to the cumulative expected impact of the conservation and sustainable management of 174,520 hectares, the support to 31 sustainable livelihood initiatives by the communities, and the current balance of the endowment managed by the NGO of \$524,725. All these are very satisfactory results.

ENF has adopted two forms of conservation management and enforcement: intensive and extensive. To encourage local stakeholder buy-in to the conservation process, intensive, (e.g., daily) protection of a series of marine "sanctuaries" protecting specific resources (e.g., artificial coral reefs, mangroves, dugong habitat) has been implemented. ENF also facilitates intermittent patrols over a wider portion of the ENTMRPA marine area.

Three conservation finance mechanisms foreseen in the GEF project logframe have experienced varying degrees of success. First, a Congressional Act with an annual

	<p>Reporting period since last supervision: ENF provided IFC with its last semester report and requested a last disbursement for \$263,337. Some of the progress highlights in the report are:</p> <p>An additional 386 hectares of mangroves are in the process of delineation to add to the current 2111 hectares of no-take zones within the total area under sustainable management. Four meetings and 3 workshops were held in relation to municipal level marine zoning activities. Enforcement teams conducted a total of 416 patrol operations in both terrestrial and marine areas, resulting in apprehension of 55 violations. Specimens of 11 potential new species previously collected as part of fish assessment under the Project were transported and deposited at a national museum in the University of the Philippines Los Banos. The specimens are now in the process of being named by world-renowned ichthyologists. The Project continued to support the implementation and information dissemination regarding the Ecotourism Development Fee, collection of which commenced in November 2009. As of end of Feb 2010, a total of \$2,385 had been collected from tourists.</p>
--	--

**Lessons Learned:**

Delete Row (i)	Lesson Area (i)	Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row
	Design/planning	<p>The two main lessons from the design of this project are related to the timeline and fixed logframe defined by the original agreements with the sponsor and the donor. In this particular case, the development of the activities, reports, and buy in from the stakeholders involved was much slower than planned; even though results at the end are greater than expected.</p> <p>1. Bottom-up protected area planning works ... slowly: As ENF's experience in El Nido has demonstrated, local buy-in takes place one stakeholder at a time. The time invested pays handsome dividends, however, both in terms of voluntary compliance with regulations that result in sustainable exploitation of marine resources of the MPA and in terms of Local Government Units (LGU) and barangay contributions to sustainable financing of conservation initiatives. The project's greatest contribution has been to provide traction where it is needed most, at the local level through buy-in by stakeholders;</p> <p>2. Evolving circumstances demand an adaptive approach: A logframe is a static snapshot about a future point in time while a project is a dynamic, evolving entity implemented by people who are required to respond to both foreseen and unforeseen circumstances. A dynamic logframe that encourages adaptive management through revision of objectives and indicators on a regular basis, would have been beneficial. And IFC should have modified the logframe when needed.</p> <p>On the overall ACC concept design, it is clear that the use of grant agreements by IFC with the partner NGOs left us without leverage and influence over ACC itself. Our engagement was therefore limited to the ground activities once ACC had decided to invest in a company and partner with an NGO. This proved to be a limiting factor for the replication and the overall management of the investment fund and financial mechanism. In the future, taking an investor role in the fund, or choosing a legal agreement directly with it, would provide a much stronger position for IFC.</p>
	Pricing	This is not applicable since the project was approved in 2005, was financed with a GEF grant and did not concern the delivery of a service strictly speaking. At that

Delete Row (i)	Lesson Area (i)	Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row
		time the only requirements were related to co-financing and leverage, which are good in this project.
	Implementation/delivery	- The project timeline significantly lagged at times due to delays in implementation and specially reporting. The main lesson learned is for the need to adapt and modify the expectations as soon as an administrative weakness is identified. ENF failed to report on time from the beginning of the project, it would have been more beneficial to adjust the reporting requirements, timeline, or disbursements to reflect their reality.
	Development Results	<p>1. A micro focus is both an advantage and a disadvantage: ENF adopted a detailed, micro-oriented approach to project implementation for most of the project period. On some components, such as Education and Sustainable Livelihoods, this has proved a considerable advantage. However, on other components, such as Conservation Management and Conservation Enforcement, the micro approach has yielded results, but on a small area.</p> <p>2. The financial mechanisms now in place may be able to provide the same level of protection that the GEF funds have provided: Over the first four years of the project, project funds were disbursed at a rate of \$232,000/year for the entire area. The financial mechanisms in place now; that is, the Conservation Trust Fund, the Ecotourism Development Fee and barangay contributions will, together provide about PhP 10.5 million annually, or \$234,000/year.</p>
	Project team	<p>1. A strong, capable sponsor is crucial for project success. While ENF was able advance a number of project activities and deliver results on the ground, its overall performance as a project manager was weak. There were regular, protracted delays in reporting and in meeting project deadlines. Main lesson from this is the need to realistically review reporting requirements in view of a sponsor capacity, without reducing the quality of information needed for IFC to supervise a project.</p> <p>2. The project had a number of different IFC task managers. Inevitably, high turnover creates challenges in communication and continuity.</p>
	Consultant work	n/a
	Client commitment/satisfaction	The sponsor was strongly committed to the project. The ENF project manager firmly believed in the project concept and was persistent in pursuing the project goals. At times the client expressed concerns about the IFC staff turnover, and the remote management from Washington. The commercial partner of ENF, ACC, has proven his commitment with the diligent contribution to the Conservation Trust Fund.
	Funding leverage	<p>During the first four years of the project, \$538,877 in co-financing was received from ENF, government, the private sector and donor agencies. The project also provided a mechanism for generating financial support from private companies benefiting from the conservation activities of ENF by means of a Conservation Trust Fund. At last report (February 2010), the Trust Fund had accumulated \$538,483.</p> <p>As explained above, the financial mechanisms in place now; that is, the Conservation Trust Fund, the Ecotourism Development Fee and barangay contributions will, together provide about PhP 10.5 million annually, or \$234,000/year. Almost the same amount per hectare at project start. The</p>

Delete Row (i)	Lesson Area (i)	Comments and Suggestions (e.g. What worked well? What would you have done differently?) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Additional Lessons Learned Row
		surprisingly similar numbers should be viewed with caution though for several reasons: a) a significant portion of the project funds expended to date have been spent on one-time investments that need not be repeated; b) it is unclear that the investments to date are assuring at least some basic protection level over the entire area; c) costs in the future will differ both in their nature and in the area covered from costs to date.
	Experience with replicating	<p>The fact that ACC, IFC and the donor (GEF) all agreed on dropping the second tranche limited the opportunity to demonstrate successful replication of conservation activities at five sites in the Visayan region. While the overall goal to develop a model of sustainable financing is highly relevant, ACC &amp; ENF concentrated on conservation at the El Nido site. And as explained above, the fact that IFC chose to engage with a grant agreement directly with the Foundation instead of ACC, limited the influence and involvement in the investment and growth strategy of ACC.</p> <p>The project had some success in duplicating the successes at small marine sanctuaries over a larger portion of the protected area. The key question: whether the ACC model can be replicated at another site, remains unanswered but the conservation finance mechanisms adopted, and their results will be shared publicly by the systems put in place by the donor: GEF, which gets copies of all project results.</p> <p>Recently, the sponsor has reported that there is significant private sector interest in replicating the ACC model at other sites both in the Philippines and in other south-east Asian countries. This interest from investors suggests an agreement with the approach. The fact that the model has yet to be replicated should not be interpreted to mean that replication is not possible, just that it has not yet been proven to occur. Recently, ACC announced the potential acquisition of another resort in Northern Palawan, which confirms ACC's interest in concentrating in tourism.</p>
	Link with IFC Investment	The project was not linked to an IFC investment.

Lessons learned would be easy and valuable to translate into a [SmartLesson](#). Please consider writing a short [SmartLesson](#) based on your experience.

**Follow up opportunities:**

Are there new business development or replication opportunities?	AS	Investment
	No	No
<i>If yes,</i>		
<i>1. Describe opportunity</i>		
<i>2. Recommended follow up action</i>		

**Summary of Supervision Performance Ratings:**

Performance Category (i)				
Supervision Reporting Period	Development Results	Financial	Timeline	Overall
#1[As of Jun. 30, 2007]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	B - Slightly Delayed	B - Some Areas of Underperformance





Performance Category (i)				
Supervision Reporting Period	Development Results	Financial	Timeline	Overall
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned This project rating will be assessed at mid term in October 2007. The current rating is based on partial information derived from previous progress reports.			
#2[As of Dec. 31, 2007]	C - Significantly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	C - Significantly Delayed	C - Significant Underperformance
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned This report is based upon the last progress report received in June 2007. Cofinancing remains significantly behind expectations and development of a replicable model that can be scaled-up and extended to other areas in the Philippines or elsewhere remains elusive.			
#3[As of Jun. 30, 2008]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	A - On or Ahead of Plan	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Regular delays in reporting and disbursement have not necessarily led to delays in achieving most development results, because of strong co-financing capacity by ENF. Overall performance is assessed as Satisfactory. Replicability of the ACC model (conservation-based holding company) is still undetermined.			
#4[As of Dec. 31, 2008]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	B - Slightly Delayed	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned The Mid term review of the project completed in mid September 2008 rated the project as having some areas of underperformance; in terms of the relevance of original objectives, and outcome achievement. The components rated most satisfactory or highly satisfactory were: conservation enforcement and Information, education and communication, and sustainable livelihoods.			
#5[As of Jun. 30, 2009]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	C - Significantly Delayed	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned From the information in the MTR and discussions with partner and sponsor, IFC considers that the project in reality has achieved most of its objectives although not needing all of the funds nor all of the time. The area of underperformance concern the grantee's management weaknesses and reporting delays. The financial rating has been assigned based on the following: Technically the project IS 'under budget' as only 60% of the budget has been disbursed; however 84% of time has elapsed since the start of the project. This does not truly constitute an 'A' performance. The client is actually delinquent in its request for disbursements as a result of a delayed expenditure plan. This information factors into the overall rating assigned for this supervision cycle.			
#6[As of Dec. 31, 2009]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	B - Slightly Delayed	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Based on the MTR, most of the project objectives have been accomplished. However, as reported in previous PSRs, there has been underperformance in project management, reporting, and request for disbursements. The Performance Rating of the project improved this PSR from C to B because the sponsor normalized its administrative outstanding issues and requested the three disbursements delayed by those. The effort to accomplish this was atypical and we don't know if ENF will be able to repeat it on time to close the project properly in a few months. Rating may change then again.			
#7 [As of Apr. 30, 2010]	B - Slightly Below Current Targets	B - Up to 15% Above Budget	A - On or Ahead of Plan	A - On Track with all Performance Categories
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Rationale for overall performance rating assigned: All project outputs and most expected outcomes have been achieved, and reported on by the sponsor. The sponsor complied with all requirements for the last disbursements, receiving and reporting for 99.7% of the project funds and original budget The project has successfully accomplished the conservation and sustainable management of 174,520 hectares, supported 31 sustainable livelihood initiatives by the communities, and established a Trust Fund holding a current value of \$524,725. The current period saw an additional 386 hectares of mangroves in the process of delineation for protected area status and continuation of important zoning, enforcement and dissemination activities. In addition, a new sustainable finance instrument, the Ecotourism Development Fee, was initiated in the project area.			

**Development Effectiveness:** [Click on respective (i) for guidance on rating.]



	Highly Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Mostly Unsuccessful	Mostly Successful	Successful	Highly Successful	Not Applicable
<b>Development Effectiveness- Synthesis Rating (Based on criterion 1-5) (i)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rationale	<p>The project is rated as “mostly successful” since the main project objective was achieved. The model proposed by ACC was tested and is now providing financial sustainability to the conservation organization and the protected area. The longer term expectation that ACC would replicate the model at multiple sites has not yet happened, however there is evidence that ACC is working on acquiring a new company in a new site. It is also known to the IFC Biodiversity Team that knowledge on the conservation finance instruments used by ENF and ACC are sought after in the world of conservation finance. Financing protected areas is a very difficult activity which works best when tourism is associated, which is the case in El Nido.</p> <p>At the site level, the 174,520 hectares of area managed sustainably, and the 31 households that implemented sustainable livelihood options are also significant impacts. The area managed is more than three times the expected at project start, this because time and funding allowed for El Nido Foundation to expand their area of work.</p> <p>The project is not rated higher because there was some underperformance in project management, reporting, and the request for disbursements throughout its life.</p>						

	Unsatisfactory	Partly Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Yet Achieved	Meets Exclusion Criteria (i)
<b>1. Strategic Relevance (i)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>This project was strategically relevant and fully aligned with the Biodiversity Practice Area objective and the GEF mandate when it was designed and approved. It was part of IFC's effort to develop and incubate new "biobusinesses". The development of these new business models is highly relevant to our work in high biodiversity areas, like the Philippines, the Amazon, the Andes, and Central America.</p> <p>The Philippines stand out globally as a center of marine biodiversity. More than thirty million people directly depend on this marine wealth for income and protein. However, the marine biodiversity and resources of the Philippines are severely threatened by human activity. However, with proper technical assistance and incentives, the private sector has vast potential to not only mitigate its own impacts, but to also contribute directly to biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Under the new IFC Sustainable Business Advisory Department priorities, the learning from this project might contribute to Sustainable Investment's objective; and it supports the strategic pillars of the ESS Business Line, in particular the reduction of biodiversity loss.</p> <p>The development and showcasing that a combination of financial mechanisms can substitute funding from international donors for the management of protected areas is significant. As well as the potential case that an investment fund can operate with the mandate to own and run only environmentally responsible businesses. The fact that the investment fund and the company are contributing financially to the objective of the project is a proof of strategic relevance too.</p> <p>Considerations of the Pricing Policy for this project are not applicable since the project was approved in 2005 and financed with a GEF grant. At that time the only requirements were related to co-financing and leverage, which are very good in this project.</p>					

2. Output Achievement (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>The primary outputs in the logframe were reef restoration, conservation management training, support ENF's capacity for marine enforcement, and training to the communities on sustainable livelihoods.</p> <p>Most of the related indicators did not have baselines established; this was standard at the time of project design and approval. Also, at the time of project design it was not requested to ENF to evaluate/survey the training satisfaction and opinion of recipients. The Outputs have to be rated, therefore, by their effect on the outcomes and impacts.</p> <p>Conservation Plans are in place for 15 barangays, exceeding the expected 7 barangays at project design. Particular attention has to be given to the 2078 reef structures installed; the 724 community leaders trained and 511 reports done for conservation management (including biodiversity surveys, manuals, and assessments carried out yearly in each barangay); and the 179 community members trained on sustainable livelihood options.</p>					
3. Outcome Achievement (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rationale	<p>The primary outcome was a new business model implemented: ACC as an investment vehicle that owns a company and partners with a local NGO to deliver conservation and social benefits. The only limitation of this outcome is in the expected replication in other sites, which has not happened yet.</p> <p>At the ground level, other important outcomes were the 83 prosecuted marine violations and the 5 regulations governing park management (these contribute to the sustainable management of hectares impact). Additionally, 2 new business models were introduced to the communities allowing for the 31 sustainable livelihood options reported as impact; those are local ecotourism and sustainable fisheries.</p>					
4. Impact Achievement (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rationale	<p>The most important project impact is securing the financial future of the marine protected area and the work of El Nido Foundation. Even though the objective of ACC to replicate the model in multiple sites and with several companies was not achieved, the combination of financial mechanisms for this site is securing the long term financing of El Nido Foundation and proving the model proposed successfully.</p> <p>At the site level, and quantitatively, the number of hectares of area managed sustainably (174,520), and the 31 households that implemented sustainable livelihood options are also significant impacts.</p> <p>Regarding the financial contribution target, the project expected ACC to invest \$11.4 million in multiple companies. This was exceeded, by 2009 ACC had invested \$12.5 million in three companies operating in the area. The indicator tracked and reported by the project in the Impact section refers to the financial contribution that these companies did to the Conservation Trust Fund (\$524,000).</p>					
5. Efficiency (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>At the end of the project, with a \$1.6 million budget, the conservation system and management of the marine protected area is in place and with a financial mechanism that promises to cover the expenses during the long term.</p> <p>The most significant factor in judging the project's efficiency is that IFC's investment developed a combination of financial mechanisms (development fee, conservation trust fund, and annual local government contributions) that can substitute entirely the funding from donors. Achieving long term financial sustainability for a protected area is a significant accomplishment with an investment of less than \$1.6 million.</p>					

6. IFC Role and Contribution (i)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>IFC managed technical assistance grant allowed ENF to build an endowment for the area and, jointly with ACC investment fund model, prove that this Protected Area was able to achieve financial sustainability with a combination of mechanisms. Financial sustainability of a protected area is not a common accomplishment. IFC, with a number of biodiversity related projects like this one, wanted to prove that when the private sector has a role it is possible to reach sustainable conservation financing and here, the objective was attained. IFC's support to the marine protected area model with ACC and ENF as partners was key since no one else has supported these initiatives.</p>					

<b>Post completion monitoring recommendation</b> [Based on outcome and impact indicator level recommendation within Development Results section that follows]	
Recommended	No
Recommended duration for annual post completion monitoring	
Approach for post project completion monitoring (including estimated level of effort, resources and funding source)	No monitoring is recommended here.

## Development Results

[Double-click here](#) to get the list of mandatory indicators for each Business Line and Product.

<input type="checkbox"/> Add Outputs Row								
Outputs (i)				Targets (i)		Results (i)		
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Cumulative		Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative
				Original	Revised			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of community leaders receiving targeted training	0.00		65.00	0.00	65.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	community consultations for establishment of no-take zones / MPAs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of Fisher/community groups with who negotiation sessions have been held	0.00		14.00	0.00	14.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Operating Manual for Protected Area Management Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of reports completed	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reef Restoration	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of reef structures installed	0.00		1,448.00	630.00	2,078.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marine Enforcement. Ordinances, regulations and other laws promoting marine biodiversity conservation and protection are developed and effectively enforced	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	Percentage of local government and community groups trained on new regulations	0.00		50.00	0.00	50.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conduct of actual patrols and enhancement of patrol operations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	Number of effective patrols conducted	0.00		157.00	0.00	157.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable Livelihood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Types of training offered to enhance household income	0.00		8.00	0.00	8.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	El Nido	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of entities receiving advisory services	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00

Outputs (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outputs Row								
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Targets (i)		Results (i)		
				Cumulative		Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative
	foundation							
<input type="checkbox"/>	El Nido foundation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of entities receiving financing from ESS project	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conseravtion management: training of community leaders	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of participants in workshops, training events, seminars, conferences, etc.	0.00		159.00	565.00	724.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide grant to ENF to conserve marine biodiversity thorough unique partnership w holding company	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of entities receiving financing from ESS project	1.00		1.00	0.00	1.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide grant to ENF to conserve marine biodiversity thorough unique partnership w holding company	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of entities receiving advisory services	1.00		1.00	0.00	1.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation management-training of community leaders	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of reports (assessments, surveys, manuals, Phase I/strategic option reports) completed	0.00		509.00	2.00	511.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marine enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of procedures/policies/practices/standards proposed for improvement or elimination	1.00		1.00	0.00	1.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable livelihoods	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of participants in workshops, training events, seminars, conferences, etc.	0.00		121.00	58.00	179.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and financial sustainability	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of procedures/policies/practices/standards proposed for improvement or elimination	1.00		1.00	0.00	1.00

Outcome (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row													
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Baseline (i)		Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?
				Original A	Revised B	Cumulative			Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative		
				Original A	Revised B	Original	Revised	Expect to achieve by	C	D	E=(A,B)+C+D		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	Management of Fisheries, shoreline, habitat restoration and protection of endangered species undertaken	0.00		0.00		Project completion	0.00	0.00	0.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	community consultations for establishment of no-take zones / MPAs0	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	3 no take zone areas agreed with communities	0.00		0.00		Project completion	0.00	0.00	0.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Operating Manual for Protected Area Management Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	All 12 members of the Board trained and draft manual developed	0.00		0.00		Project completion	0.00	0.00	0.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marine Enforcement. Ordinances, regulations and other laws promoting marine biodiversity conservation and protection are developed and effectively enforced	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	9 marine violation cases were recorded	0.00		0.00	9.00	Project completion	5.00	0.00	5.00	Select one	Select one



Outcome (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row													
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Baseline (i)		Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?
						Cumulative			Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulat-ive		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable Livelihood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	% of trained community members who end up in meaningful employment	0.00		0.00		Project comp	41.00	0.00	41.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Enforcement: increasing enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Marine violations successfully prosecuted	0.00		0.00		Project comp	28.00	55.00	83.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Enforcement: changing laws, codes and policies	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of recommended laws/regulations/amendments/codes enacted	0.00		10.00		<1 yr post co	5.00	0.00	5.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide grant to ENF to conserve marine biodiversity through unique partnership w holding company	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of new business models or new financial products implemented	0.00		1.00		Project comp	1.00	0.00	1.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marine enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of recommended procedures/policies/practices/standards that were improved/eliminated	0.00		1.00		Project comp	1.00	0.00	1.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marine enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of violation cases reported	0.00		0.00		Project comp	19.00	55.00	74.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable livelihoods	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of new business models or new financial products implemented	0.00		1.00		Project comp	2.00	0.00	2.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and financial sustainability	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of recommended procedures/policies/practices/standards that were	0.00		6.00	1.00	Project comp	1.00	0.00	1.00	No	Select one

Outcome (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row												
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?	
				Baseline (i)			Cumulative					Changes during prior periods
			improved/eliminated									

Impacts (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Add Impacts Row													
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?		
				Baseline (i)		Cumulative			Changes during prior periods			Change during this Period	Cumulat-ive
				Original A	Revised B	Original	Revised	Expect to achieve by	C	D	E=(A,B)+C+D		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Coral Reef Restoration in Tres Marias successful	0.00		0.00		Project comp	0.00	0.00	0.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marine Enforcement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	Decreasing number of marine violations	0.00		0.00		Project comp	0.00	0.00	0.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation values imparted to local communities, government, private sector	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	Number of entities adopting sustainable practices	0.00		6.00		Project comp	6.00	0.00	6.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	.Sustainable Livelihood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	At least 40 % of trainees get engaged in employment	0.00		0.00		Project comp	13.00	0.00	13.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional/Financial Sustainability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data N/A	% collection of committed funds from the private and public sector (i.e., from user fees and leveraged from/allocated by local District Council	0.00		0.00		Project comp	0.00	0.00	0.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation management & Reef	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Hectares of land managed sustainably	0.00		54,000.00		Project comp	104,111.00	70,409.00	174,520.00	No	Select one

Impacts (i)												<input type="checkbox"/> Add Impacts Row	
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Baseline (i)		Targets (i)			Results (i)			Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?
						Cumulative			Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative		
	restoration												
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable livelihoods: benefiting from agriculture alternatives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of people positively affected (direct)	0.00		0.00		Project comp	836.00	0.00	836.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable livelihoods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of jobs	0.00		0.00		Project comp	31.00	0.00	31.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable livelihoods	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of jobs (women)	0.00		0.00		Project comp	0.00	0.00	0.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and financial sustainability	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Value of financing facilitated by advisory services (US\$)	0.00		11,400,000.00		<1 yr post co	442,249.00	82,476.00	524,725.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable livelihoods	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of households with sustainable livelihood	0.00		0.00		Project comp	0.00	31.00	31.00	No	Select one

### Comments on development results achieved

Entire Project (including additional relevant results (positive and negative) other than those planned)	Regarding the financial contribution target, the project expected ACC to invest \$11.4 million in multiple companies. This was exceeded, by 2009 ACC had invested \$12.5 million in three companies operating in the area. The indicator tracked and reported by the project in the Impact section refers to the financial contribution these companies did to the Conservation Trust Fund (\$524,000). This contribution had no target, but the fact that the combination of financial mechanisms will provide enough funding for the protected area makes it satisfactory.
Reporting period since last supervision	

<b>Budget Sources (USD):</b>		[Budget information is pre-populated from IBIS. <a href="#">Double-click here</a> to view/create/edit budget data.] Note: The line items for pre-implementation DO NOT expand.							
Stage	Source of Funds	Budget		Secured		Actuals			
		Original	Current	Amt	%	Cumulative till previous period	For this period	Total	% of secured
		A	B	C = B/A	D	E	F = D + E	G = F/B	
<b>Funding</b>									
<b>Preimplementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
<b>Implementation</b>		2,020,000	420,000	420,000	100	178,480	8,443	186,923	45
IFC									
Partners/Donors									
Pooled Funds									
GEF Supervision : Pooled Trust Fund	BF000107		218,751	218,751	100	155,695	0	155,695	71
SBI/GEF Supervision : Pooled Trust Fund	TF093297		201,249	201,249	100	22,785	8,443	31,228	16
<b>Post Implementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
IFC									
Partners/Donors									
Pooled Funds									
<b>Revenue</b>									
<b>Preimplementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
<b>Implementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
Cash Fees									
Investment Income									
Fees not for Project									
<b>Post Implementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
Cash Fees									
Investment Income									
Fees not for Project									
<b>Total Funds Managed by IFC (does not include Fees not for Project)</b>		<b>2,020,000</b>	<b>420,000</b>	<b>420,000</b>	<b>100</b>				
<b>Additional Contributions</b>									
<b>Preimplementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
<b>Implementation</b>		15,300,00	15,300,00	15,300,00	100	15,272,466	0	15,272,466	100
Client/Beneficiary Parallel Support		0	0	0		0	0	0	
Post Implementation		0	0	0		0	0	0	
<b>Total Project Size (Total Funds Managed by IFC + Total Additional Contributions)</b>		<b>17,320,00</b>	<b>15,720,00</b>	<b>15,720,00</b>	<b>100</b>				

Comments/Explanation for significant variances:

<b>Budget Uses (USD):</b>		[Budget information is pre-populated from IBIS. <a href="#">Double-click here</a> to view/create/edit budget data.] Note: The line items for pre-implementation DO NOT expand.								
Uses if Total Funds managed by IFC	For this period				Total Uses				Total Budget	% Spent
	Budget	Actual Expenses	Amt Variance	% Variance	Budget	Actual Expenses	Amt Variance	% Variance		
	A	B	C = A-B	D = C/A	E	F	G = E-F	H = G/E		

<b>Preimplementation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Implementation</b>	<b>28,749</b>	<b>8,443</b>	<b>20,306</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>420,000</b>	<b>186,923</b>	<b>233,077</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>420,000</b>	<b>45</b>
Staff Costs	16,666	6,659	10,007	60	216,558	110,657	105,901	49	216,558	51
Consultants	7,083	1,784	5,299	75	141,674	53,856	87,818	62	141,674	38
Travel Costs	5,000	0	5,000	100	48,829	9,449	39,380	81	48,829	19
Contractual Services	0	0	0		1,500	1,500	0	0	1,500	100
Communications & IT Chargeback	0	0	0		24	46	-22	-92	24	192
Other Expenses	0	0	0		11,415	11,415	0	0	11,415	100
<b>Post Implementation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>28,749</b>	<b>8,443</b>	<b>20,306</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>420,000</b>	<b>186,923</b>	<b>233,077</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>420,000</b>	<b>45</b>

\*\* 0 of staff costs comes from RMS

<b>Pricing Goals (i)</b>	
Charging for Products/Services (Yes/No)	Yes
Charging details	US\$ 15 million is planned as investment by the holding company ACC in various investee companies. Co-financing from other NGOs and donors, including ENF itself, has been committed for an amount of US\$ 300,000.
Comments <i>Describe the key factors in setting the charging structure. If No selected above, specify reason.</i>	- Marine and coastal biodiversity of global significance is protected sustainably by this project. - the ACC model will be rich of lessons for similar or other environmental funds. - all knowledge created by GEF funded projects is public information.

<b>WBS Status</b>								<input type="checkbox"/> Add WBS Row
Delete Row (i)	Discontinued (i)	WBS element	Name	Closed	Expected/Actual close date	Outstanding commitments	Outstanding Fees	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IFC-00506048-BF000107-F7	ACC GEF Supervision	Yes	May. 15, 2010	0.00	0.00	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IFC-00506048-TF093297-F7	ACC SBI Supervision	Yes	May. 15, 2010	0.00	0.00	

**Timeline:**

Delete Row (i)	Key Activities for Reporting Period	Activity Status	Timeline	<input type="checkbox"/> Add Timeline Row
----------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	----------	---

*Explanation for delays in start and/or completion of key activities and resulting impact on overall project timeframe.*

**Consultants:** [This information should be entered manually]

Delete Row (i)	Consultant Name/Firm	Expertise/Comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Add Consultant Row
		[In line with IFC Legal requirements, consultant performance information should NOT be provided]	

**Project Team:** [This information should be automatically populated from iDESK]

Core Team Members	Primary	Proxies
Transaction Leader	Juan Jose Dada	Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Evelyn M.



		Dimaandal, Maria Soledad Requejo, Maria del Rosario Rojas
Monitoring and Evaluations Officer	Baljit Wadhwa	Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Shir Ashar Naveh, Jacqueline Bueso-Merriam
Finance Officer	Diana Mirzakarimova	CES Finance and Budget Team
Team Assistant	Evelyn M. Dimaandal	Vinitha R. Jayalal
Other Team Members	Cecilia Lim, OEG Monitoring	
<b>Management Team</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Proxies</b>
Unit Line Manager	Catherine Cruveillier Cassagne	Juan Jose Dada
Business Line Specialist 1	Catherine Cruveillier Cassagne	Juan Jose Dada
Business Line Specialist 2		
Business Line Specialist 3		
Business Line Specialist 4		
Business Line Specialist 5		
Unit Manager	Quynh Trang Phuong Nguyen	Thanh Thuy T. Nguyen, Fayana A. Willie

**Additional Comment(s):**

--

**Review and Approval Status:** [This information should be automatically populated from iDESK]

<p>TL Initiate Completion - Initiate Completion by Evelyn M. Dimaandal at 06/28/2010 11:54:29 AM  Comment : Text revised to include background on ACC, the overall concept approved by the GEF, and the second tranche dropped. Juan Jose Dada has requested that i start the workflow through an email dated 6/28/2010.</p> <p>M&amp;E Officer Review - Cleared to Unit Manager by Baljit Wadhwa at 06/28/2010 11:58:26 AM  Comment : Cleared. All off-line comments considered. Thank you.</p> <p>Business Line Specialist 1 Clear - Cleared to Unit Manager by Catherine Cassagne at 06/28/2010 12:02:49 PM  Comment : Cleared - Good results of this project.</p> <p>Unit Line Manager Clear - Cleared to Unit Manager by Catherine Cassagne at 06/28/2010 12:03:26 PM  Comment : Cleared - I am glad to see good results of this project.</p> <p>Finance Officer Review - Cleared to Unit Manager by Diana Mirzakarimova at 06/30/2010 03:50:37 PM  Comment : cleared</p> <p>Unit Manager Approve - Approved by Trang Nguyen at 07/30/2010 07:33:08 PM  Comment : Offline review comments have been incorporated accordingly. Good lessons to be learned, and agree with project ratings.</p>
--