

**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

<b>Region:</b> LAC	<b>Country:</b> Latin America Region	<b>Frontier Regions:</b> (i)	<b>% in Frontier Region:</b> (i)
<b>Sector:</b> A - Agriculture and Forestry	<b>IDA status:</b> (i) No	<b>% in IDA Countries:</b> (i)	
<b>Owning Dept/Division:</b> CESBD - Environment & Social Development/Bio-diversity	<b>Implementing Dept/Division:</b>	<b>Project/Transaction Leader:</b> Juan Jose Dada	
<b>Project ID:</b> 502875	<b>Project Short Name:</b> BDGEF Eco-Ent Fu	<b>Project Long Name:</b> GEF BD Eco-Enterprises Fund	
<b>Original Approval Date:</b> Mar. 6, 2007	<b>Total Funding:</b> 1,160,000	<b>Actual Project Duration:</b> 88 months	
	Original (i)	Revised (i)	Actual (i)
<b>Project Implementation Start</b>	Oct. 15, 2002	Oct. 15, 2002	Oct. 15, 2002
<b>Project Completion</b>	Oct. 12, 2009	Jan. 15, 2010	Jan. 15, 2010

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

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

<b>Relationship to IFC Project(s)</b>	<b>Relationship Type</b>	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Project Long Name</b>
IFC AS Project	None		
IFC Investment Project	None		
<b>Recipients</b>			<b>Beneficiary Type (i):</b> Other Intermediary; SME Company
<b>Stakeholder Type (i):</b> SME Company	<b>Main Client (i):</b> TNC (54431)		
	<b>Other Client(s) (i):</b>		

<b>Objective</b>	<p>Original (Mar 06, 2007) - Goal: To abate threats to biodiversity conservation in Latin America and the Caribbean by creating economic incentives to protect critical natural resources.</p> <p>The purpose of the project is to strengthen and promote success of environmentally-sustainable, socially- responsible, small- to medium- sized businesses in the Latin American region and to foster the efforts of the local nonprofit community or conservation organizations in commercial enterprise development as a means of diversifying their funding base.</p> <p>Most recent update (Oct 13, 2009) - Goal: To abate threats to biodiversity conservation in Latin America and the Caribbean by creating economic incentives to protect critical natural resources.</p> <p>By the end of the project, the specific objective is to increase by 30 the number of SMEs in Latin America that are developing sustainable business models, by supporting EEF, a financial service provider, with means to acquire, organize, and deliver their financial and technical assistance. This will in turn foster the efforts of the local nonprofit community and conservation organizations in commercial enterprises development as a means of</p>
------------------	--

	diversifying their funding base.
<b>Key Highlights (i)</b> <i>Summarize key project highlights</i>	<p>Entire Project:  This is a nine year project that started in 2002 as part of the biodiversity portfolio in IFC funded by the GEF. IFC provided (i) a one million dollar grant to finance operational costs and technical assistance activities for the Fund's investees, and (ii) advisory and supervision on the Fund management.</p> <p>EcoEnterprises Fund was a pioneer in the industry of environmentally-conscious investing funds, particularly in the area of biodiversity. It used the tools and principles of venture capital to achieve biodiversity conservation and social development goals, targeting companies with business models that would deliver benefits in a triple-bottom-line.</p> <p>The nascent nature of the Fund's objective, in combination with the incremental costs from running environmentally friendly business, required the involvement of IFC to launch and bring to conclusion the 10 year project. The project enabled EcoEnterprises to operate and provide free-of-charge assistance to the investees.</p> <p>The Fund financed 23 SMEs in 10 countries for a total value of \$6.3 million. These SMEs were able to receive co-investment from other financial services providers motivated by the Fund's involvement by (leverage) \$36 million, and later (after the Fund exited) received follow-up financing in excess of \$90 million.</p> <p>The SMEs in the portfolio sold approximately \$190 million. They partnered with 65 NGOs and created about 3,754 jobs. Due to their sustainable business and their location around High Conservation Value Areas, the companies contributed to biodiversity conservation by sustainably managing and protecting 535,454 Hectares of land. These are impacts of significant scale.</p>
	<p>Reporting period since last supervision:  EcoEnterprises closed the Fund, collected all but two investments that are following legal procedures, produced lessons learned, and a final analysis of their operations as a Fund and as Technical Assistance provider.</p> <p>In particular, EcoEnterprises conducted a survey of all portfolio companies to hear directly from entrepreneurs, owners and company principals about their investment process and technical assistance provided through this Project. It also facilitated an industry gathering to validate lessons learned and as an opportunity to share stories from and to exchange best practices.</p> <p>The Nature Conservancy (TNC), as manager of EcoEnterprises Fund closed the Fund on January 15, 2010.</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	This project was design as a non-reimbursable grant to leverage the investment of other institutions. Since IFC's funds didn't contribute to the investment capital we had no decision making role in the investment process of the Fund. IFC was always invited as observer to the Board Meetings and received the information from the Investment Committee meetings, but had no formal right to influence the investment decisions and operations of the Fund. At the time of project design, this was in alignment with our practices; if a similar project was to be designed today IFC should consider participating as an investor.

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
		<p>During the initial years of the project, it was learned also that the design of the grant agreement should be as aligned as possible with the Fund management requirements to maximize synergy between reports to IFC and to investors, reduce any potential impression that our monitoring and evaluation is an external requirement, and allow us to have more timely information.</p> <p>Other lessons related to the design of a environmentally-conscious Fund are: (a) finding the ideal balance between debt and equity in an investment portfolio isn't easy; (b) it is import to connect companies within a value chain as a way of managing risk and developing deals.</p> <p>Regardless of the lessons learned and experience of this project, the use of venture capital tools to deliver environmental and social benefits remains an area of exploration and testing. For example: (i) it is still not clear if philanthropic capital for this type of funds is competing with potential investors, or it is really the only option available; and (ii) there is an undeniable need for technical assistance that uncertain if it will disappear once the business models are proven successful.</p> <p>A financial review of the performance of the Fund commissioned by IFC delivered the following recommendations for future similar funds: (a) The use of senior debt to invest in high risk start-ups limits the potential returns from good investments, and provides only limited downside protection for bad investments. (b) The quality of the entrepreneurs is a key determinant of the investment's eventual failure or success. And (c) Larger deals make more sense from the ease and cost effectiveness of closing the transaction and utilizing the Fund's resources.</p>
	Pricing	<p>At the time of project design, there was no pricing policy in IFC. The guidelines observed were from the GEF and related to co-financing and leverage of funds.</p> <p>IFC covered the total costs of the technical assistance the Fund gave to their investees. This facilitated the Fund to raise investment capital (more than \$5million) and to operate in a difficult environment. This subsidy of the TA was justified given that environmentally-conscious investing was still a nascent industry in the region and has inherent incremental costs.</p>
	Implementation/delivery	<p>Even though the President and CEO of EcoEnterprises Fund is an experienced fund manager, the administrative support provided by the main investor and managing entity (The Nature Conservancy) showed little previous experience as a for-profit fund manager. This showed particularly in the cost of the operations and back-office support, reducing the profitability of the Fund.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the fact that the organization kept their conservation goals aligned with the Fund objective proved beneficial for the development of monitoring and evaluation tools, tracking of non-financial impact, biodiversity conservation, and other issues that a traditional fund manager would have not dedicated time to.</p>
	Development Results	<p>As it will be explained and noted below, the support to SMEs and the direct development impact expected from those were achieved, accounted for, and continued to be tracked. The biggest limitation has been the evaluation and quantification of the global biodiversity conserved or protected since the Fund uses "hectares of sustainably managed land" located in High Biodiversity Value</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
		<p>Areas as a proxy to track the biodiversity goal of the Fund and the GEF. For a project with multiple investee companies, in diverse regions, evaluating the biodiversity impact by other means would be highly expensive and complex.</p> <p>Whether supported by philanthropy, debt, or equity capital, funds in this niche need to be able to measure impact. Financial bottom-line alone does not provide the full picture of portfolio performance. EcoEnterprises developed a robust monitoring system on environmental and social impact that can be transferred to other similar funds.</p>
	Project team	There was very little rotation on the team in EcoEnterprises Fund. The team had a good balance between investment officers, social and environmental specialists, and management.
	Consultant work	n/a
	Client commitment/satisfaction	One of the things the project got right was partnering with a committed institution and principal investors. The Nature Conservancy invested in EcoEnterprises its own capital and managed to attract the Inter American Development Bank as a cornerstone investor. The fact that The Nature Conservancy is considering investing in a second EcoEnterprises Fund to be launched in a few months is a clear sign of that commitment.
	Funding leverage	The co-financing and leverage of this project was very positive. IFC's contribution of \$1million facilitated the investment of more than \$6million and leveraged additional funding in a very satisfactory way.
	Experience with replicating	Lessons from this project are feeding into our Sustainable Investing Product. And EcoEnterprises Fund II has been launched by The Nature Conservancy and the Inter-American Development Bank.
	Link with IFC Investment	The type and size of companies that the Fund invested in remain too small to be linked to an IFC investment. Only one of them (Sambazon) grew to a size that might be of interest to IFC. And the Fund itself continues to be too small and of experimental nature. What was found interesting from several IFC local offices was the possibility to refer to an IFC-supported fund initiatives and entrepreneurs that approached IFC directly but had no scale or conditions to become our clients. For future SMEs related projects and funds of similar nature, this lesson has to be considered to keep fund manager, investees, and IFC's expectations aligned.

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:**

	AS	Investment
Are there new business development or replication opportunities?	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	A - On or Ahead of Plan	B - Some Areas of Underperformance
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Environmental and social benefits from the project could be enhanced by a more strategic use of the technical assistance funds. The rest of the objectives and activities initially planned are being met as expected.			
#2[As of Dec. 31, 2007]	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 As stated in previous PSRs, the environmental and social benefits from the project could be enhanced by a more strategic use of the technical assistance funds, because of the nature of the technical assistance and the timeframe of the investments this can not be corrected in the short term and the new strategic approach to technical assistance will prove results later in the project. The rest of the objectives and activities initially planned are being met as expected.			
#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 Similar to previous PSRs, FEE is implementing its activities as planned. It continues to improve its financial situation (to an acceptable level), and to deliver on technical assistance to the companies and communities in its portfolio. Nevertheless, the biodiversity impact of all these can only be tracked using hectares of land and people benefited by the companies as proxies, since the initial design and monitoring framework doesn't provide a baseline and the resources to do biodiversity monitoring on the ground.			
#4[As of Dec. 31, 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 Similar to previous supervision reports, FEE is implementing its activities as planned. It continues to wind down operations. The overall rating is reflecting FEE's lower than expected financial performance and slower than anticipated distribution of TA funds. However, it is delivering on projected social and environmental indicators through the provision of finance and TA funds the companies in its portfolio and affected communities. As mentioned in previous PSRs, the biodiversity impact of all these can only be tracked using hectares of land and people benefited by the companies as proxies, since the initial design and monitoring framework does not provide a baseline or the resources to monitor biodiversity on the ground in a more sophisticated manner.			
#5[As of Jun. 30, 2009]	B - Slightly Below Targets	A - On or Under Budget	A - On or Ahead of Plan	A - On Track with all Performance Categories
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned Similar to previous supervision reports, FEE is implementing its activities as planned. It continues to wind down operations. The overall rating for this semester reflects an improvement in expending of technical assistance funds. The projected social and environmental impact remains high and positive, even though the indicators will not increase since the Fund is closing and there is no growth in the portfolio. As mentioned in previous PSRs, the biodiversity impact of all these can only be tracked using hectares of land and people benefited by the companies as proxies, since the initial design and monitoring framework does not provide a baseline or the resources to monitor biodiversity on the ground in a more sophisticated manner.			
#6 [As of Jan. 15, 2010]	A - On or Above Current Targets	A - On or Under Budget	A - On or Ahead of Plan	A - On Track with all Performance Categories
	Rationale for overall performance rating assigned This semester was for EcoEnterprises to close operations, complete all lessons learned documents and reports, disburse capital collected to investors, and close the Fund. All activities have been completed and the documentation of lessons learned and experiences has been very satisfactory. EcoEnterprises prepared several summary documents about their experience in different sectors and with different size of companies.			

**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 objective of this project was to increase by 30 the number of SMEs in Latin America that are developing sustainable business models, by supporting a financial services provider with means to acquire, organize and deliver financial and technical assistance. This was challenging given EcoEnterprises Fund was pioneering this type of environmentally-conscious funds.</p> <p>Though outcomes were somewhat lower than targeted, the impact of the project is significant enough to justify a “Mostly Successful” rating.</p> <p>The environmental and social impact of these investments was strong:  - 535,424 hectares of land are under sustainable management or direct protection  - 3,754 jobs were created  - \$90 million of follow-on funds were mobilized.</p> <p>Also, in terms of co-financing and leverage, the IFC funds (\$1 million) leveraged \$6.3 million invested (ratio of 6), with co-investments to the SMEs from other financial service providers motivated by the Fund’s involvement totaling \$36 million.</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 "biobusiness". The development of these new business models is highly relevant to our work in high biodiversity areas, like the Amazon, the Andes, and Central America.</p> <p>Under the new Department priorities, the learning from this project 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 Fund used the tools and principles of venture capital to achieve conservation and social development goals, targeting companies with business models that would deliver benefits in a triple-bottom-line. The type of companies and sustainable business models supported are under-served by local and international financial service providers. And any financing to these types of SMEs had to be complemented with technical assistance and considerable hand-holding from the Fund. The fact that the market is not serving these SMEs is the failure that EcoEnterprises addressed.</p>					
<b>2. Output Achievement (i)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Rationale	<p>The output targets were (i) advisory services to EcoEnterprises fund, and (ii) \$1 million grant to cover part of the operational costs of the fund and the technical assistance provided by it to the investee SMEs. Therefore, this Project achieved all outputs.</p> <p>The budget was disbursed and implemented as planned; and IFC contributed to the guidance of the Funds operations by an active supervision and participation in the Board Meetings.</p>					
<b>3. Outcome Achievement (i)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rationale	<p>This project has two outcomes: the implementation of changes done by EcoEnterprises fund</p>					



	<p>as advised by IFC, and the number of SMEs reached by EcoEnterprises fund. As explained before, the first outcome was fully met and the second one partially met.</p> <p>The target was to support 30 SMEs in Latin America, the Fund supported only 23. This shortfall is justified due to the lack of experience and understanding of the risks and limitations at the time the target was set. The 23 SMEs received a total investment of more than \$6 million and guidance from the Fund staff. And the ones eligible based on the IFC's donor (GEF) guidelines received direct technical assistance non-reimbursable funds (\$400,000).</p> <p>As part of the final evaluation of this project, the Fund conducted a survey of all SMEs. Some relevant conclusions related to this output are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The most used and requested additional service was technical assistance to improve the business and the environmental/social impact. SMEs took full advantage of the technical assistance and the available funds were unable to satisfy the demand. Nevertheless, the majority of responses in the survey indicated that financial survival remains the main focus of the SME managers; over and above environmental and social impact.</li> <li>- The SMEs were appreciative of the role EcoEnterprises Fund played in bringing in other financiers. The importance of an investment network cannot be underestimated in sharing deals, providing the right investment at the right time, and graduating investments to the next level.</li> <li>- It is reported that SMEs continue to monitor social and/or environmental impacts and examine similar criteria as requested in EcoEnterprises Fund's Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Tool.</li> </ul>						
4. Impact Achievement (i)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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 overall impact of the portfolio of EcoEnterprises has been monitored and tracked by the Fund since its inception. Detailed contributions by investee were regularly provided to IFC, as well as reports on the specific activities financed by the technical assistance funds. 535,000 hectares of sustainably managed land, 3,750 jobs created, \$90 million finance facilitated by advisory services, and sales revenue in excess of \$190 million are significant impacts achieved by the Project.</p> <p>Impact was very strong demonstrating the importance of a triple bottom-line. Nonetheless, a rating of "Satisfactory" is assigned instead of "Excellent" given that back in 2002 when the project was initiated IFC did not have target-setting guidelines so we have no targets to compare against.</p>						
5. Efficiency (i)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Rationale	<p>In regards to this Project, the efficiency of supporting 23 SMEs, creating more than 3,700 jobs, influencing the sustainable management of more than 535,000 hectares, and facilitating financing in the scale of \$90 million with a budget of \$1 million is highly efficient.</p> <p>If the efficiency analysis is done for EcoEnterprises Fund itself, the same results with an investment capital of \$5.3 million and the \$1 million grant from IFC, the balance remains positive.</p>						
6. IFC Role and Contribution (i)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Rationale	<p>Sustainable investors concluded that this niche needs "smart subsidies" in addition to risk capital to help SMEs. While most early funds lacked the ability to cover such costs, thanks to IFC, EcoEnterprises Fund was one of the first to have an established technical assistance facility to provide this type of "hand-holding" support ( to build a supply chain, train suppliers, and underwrite certification costs, for example).</p>						

	<p>One of the biggest challenges for EcoEnterprises fund was finding projects that meet the environmental, social, and financial bottom line. Each company has a unique combination, some stronger in particular areas than others and building a balanced portfolio requires a degree of trade-off among the three objectives. IFC's technical assistance funds allowed EcoEnterprises to support the investees in the area they needed the most and make sure the biodiversity and development results were being monitored and enhanced. None of the investors in the Fund had the capacity to contribute to the technical assistance funding therefore IFC filled a gap in the financial structure and technical design of the Fund.</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 post project completion monitoring needed. This project has enough lessons learned and analysis done by its implementation team and external parties.



## 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)								
Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Targets (i)		Results (i)		
				Cumulative		Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative
				Original	Revised			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide risk capital financing for env. and socially responsible ventures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of entities receiving financing from ESS project	30.00		23.00	0.00	23.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Build capacity and promote sustained success of earlier-stage enterprises and local community and conservation partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of entities receiving advisory services	30.00		32.00	0.00	32.00
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide funding for EEF's operational costs	<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 funding for EEF's advisory services to enterprises, local communities, and conservation partners	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of entities receiving advisory services	1.00		1.00	0.00	1.00

<input type="checkbox"/> Add Outcome Row								
Outcome (i)								
				Targets (i)		Results (i)		

Delete Row (i)	Component /Activities (i)	Discontinued (i)	Indicators (i)	Baseline (i)		Cumulative			Changes during prior periods	Change during this Period	Cumulative	Is post project completion monitoring by unit outstanding?	If yes, annually for how many years?
				Original A	Revised B	Original	Revised	Expect to achieve by					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide risk capital financing for env. and socially responsible ventures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	(US\$) Income generated by new biodiversity-based business models or financial products	0.00		0.00		Project completion	150,827,451.00	0.00	150,827,451.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Build capacity and promote sustained success of earlier-stage enterprises and local community and conservation partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Number of firms/FIs adopting sustainable practices based on advisory services	0.00		0.00		Project completion	11,621.00	0.00	11,621.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Build capacity and promote sustained success of earlier-stage enterprises and local community and conservation partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Suppliers with increased economic benefit and livelihood security	0.00		0.00		Project completion	3,620.00	0.00	3,620.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide risk capital financing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Total incremental sales revenue (US\$)	0.00		0.00		Project completion	178,034,633.00	0.00	178,034,633.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of new business models or new financial products implemented	0.00		30.00		Project completion	23.00	0.00	23.00	No	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	Cumulative		
	risk capital financing												
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing advisory services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of entities that implemented recommended changes	0.00		30.00		Project comp	32.00	0.00	32.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing advisory services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of entities obtaining certification due to Advisory Services	0.00		0.00		Project comp	23.00	0.00	23.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing support to SMEs	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of SMEs reached	0.00		30.00		Project comp	0.00	23.00	23.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and IFC provided its advisory services	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of entities that implemented recommended changes	0.00		1.00		Project comp	0.00	1.00	1.00	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?
				Original A	Revised B	Original	Revised	Expect to achieve by	C	D	E=(A,B)+C+D		

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		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide risk capital financing for env. and socially responsible ventures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	Hectares of sustainably managed land	0.00		0.00		Project completion	65,096.00	0.00	65,096.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide risk capital financing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Hectares of land managed sustainably	0.00		0.00		Project completion	65,096.00	0.00	65,096.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide risk capital financing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dropped	Number of people positively affected (direct)	0.00		0.00		Project completion	129,520.00	0.00	129,520.00	Select one	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing risk capital financing and advisory services	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Hectares of sustainably managed land	0.00		0.00		Project completion	535,456.00	0.00	535,456.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing risk capital financing and advisory services	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Number of jobs	0.00		0.00		Project completion	3,754.00	0.00	3,754.00	No	Select one
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing risk capital financing and advisory services	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Value of financing facilitated by advisory services (US\$)	0.00		0.00		Project completion	90,125,533.00	0.00	90,125,533.00	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		
<input type="checkbox"/>	EEF is operational and providing risk capital financing and advisory services	<input type="checkbox"/> Select reason	Sales revenue (US\$)		0.00		0.00		Project completion	190,991,620.00	0.00	190,991,620.00	No	Select one

**Comments on development results achieved**

Entire Project (including additional relevant results (positive and negative) other than those planned)	<p>Indicators were modified to reflect the nature of the project. IFC advised the fund which proceeded to follow recommendations and disburse into environmentally-responsible SME-projects. "Number of entities receiving advisory services" &amp; "Number of entities that implemented recommended changes" refers to the fund. "Number of SMEs reached" was added to replace "Number of new business models implemented" as this is more descriptive of the environmentally-conscious projects, this refers to the 23 SME investments of a targeted 30.</p> <p>Value of financing facilitated refers to the follow-up financing the SMEs were able to secure after EcoEnterprises invested in them.</p> <p>This project was designed and approved in 2002 following donor guidance and documentation. Baseline and targets were not set for all indicators at the time (not required then).</p>
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>		1,160,000	1,160,000	1,160,000	100	1,148,574	5,808	1,154,382	100
IFC									
Partners/Donors:									
Pooled Funds:									
GEF Implementation : Pooled Trust Fund	TF051958		1,000,000	1,000,000	100	1,000,000	0	1,000,000	100
GEF Supervision : Pooled Trust Fund	BF000107		123,779	123,779	100	119,645	0	119,645	97
SBI/GEF Supervision : Pooled Trust Fund	TF093297		36,221	36,221	100	28,929	5,808	34,737	96
<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>		1,160,000	1,160,000	1,160,000	100				
<b>Additional Contributions</b>									
<b>Preimplementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
<b>Implementation</b>		14,000,000	14,000,000	0	0	34,053,759	0	34,053,759	
Client/Beneficiary Parallel Support			14,000,000	0	0	34,053,759	0	34,053,759	
<b>Post Implementation</b>		0	0	0		0	0	0	
<b>Total Project Size (Total Funds Managed by IFC + Total Additional Contributions)</b>		15,160,000	15,160,000	1,160,000	8				

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	For this period				Total Uses				Total	%
	Budget	Actual	Amt	%	Budget	Actual	Amt	%		

managed by IFC	A	Expenses B	Variance C = A-B	Variance D = C/A	E	Expenses F	Variance G = E-F	Variance H = G/E	Budget I	Spent J = F/I
<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>Implementation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,808</b>	<b>-5,808</b>		<b>1,160,000</b>	<b>1,154,382</b>	<b>5,618</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,160,000</b>	<b>100</b>
Staff Costs	0	5,808	-5,808		86,938	101,716	-14,778	-17	86,938	117
Consultants	0	0	0		27,482	19,982	7,500	27	27,482	73
Travel Costs	0	0	0		34,821	21,925	12,896	37	34,821	63
Contractual Services	0	0	0		8,960	8,960	0	0	8,960	100
Communications & IT Chargeback	0	0	0		46	47	-1	-2	46	102
Other Expenses	0	0	0		1,753	1,753	0	0	1,753	100
Development Grant (Grants, Donations & Ext Participant Cost)	0	0	0		1,000,000	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000	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>Total Uses</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,808</b>	<b>-5,808</b>		<b>1,160,000</b>	<b>1,154,382</b>	<b>5,618</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,160,000</b>	<b>100</b>

\*\* 0 of staff costs comes from RMS

<b>Pricing Goals (i)</b>	
Charging for Products/Services (Yes/No)	Yes
Charging details	<p>EcoEnterprises Fund is a demonstration project, and so if IFC's contribution to it. By playing a catalytic role to spur a change in how business development and investment is undertaken by conventional capital markets in Latin America and the Caribbean and encouraging NGO business venturing, EcoEnterprises Fund is a pioneer, charting new territory for the private sector and environmental conservation communities.</p> <p>By developing and implementing this innovative approach and encouraging the replication of successful models around the world, this project will highlight the importance of integrating biodiversity preservation into sustainable commercial activities. These examples will then invite traditional business and financial players to consider collaborative ventures with local communities and NGOs in Latin America and other regions as a means of generating support for critical natural resources worldwide.</p> <p>EcoEnterprises Fund will continuously document and publicize the impact of these activities on areas of important global biodiversity, therefore generating a wealth of public knowledge.</p> <p>The high replicability value of this project will be realized by implementing a well-developed information collection and dissemination strategy, and by working through The Nature Conservancy's partner networks in Latin America.</p>
Comments <i>Describe the key factors in setting the charging structure. If No selected above, specify reason.</i>	<p>GEF funding of \$1 million will be dedicated to the incremental cost of maximizing the long-term biodiversity benefits of EcoEnterprises Fund's investments.</p> <p>The Fund provides an exceptional opportunity to leverage the conservation impact of GEF dollars. First of all, the GEF funding will trigger a one-to-one matching commitment from the Inter-American Development Bank. Second, GEF's contribution will be matched by \$9 million in other co-financing, to form a combined project total of \$10 million. This amounts to a leverage ratio of 1:9. In the third instance, EcoEnterprises Fund will finance only up to 50 percent of any given sub-project (investment), and this will lead to approximately \$5 million in additional co-financing.</p> <p>Last, each sub-project will have active participation by a conservation NGO, which</p>



	<p>ensures that an ongoing part of the revenues derived by the investment will be returned to conservation, whether through equity returns or through fees or some other mechanism. This cannot be quantified at this stage but serves to demonstrate the multiple leverage effect of this project.</p> <p>Because of the early stage of development of this business model (both the investees' and the fund's), it is considered necessary to subsidize it with a grant. This is justified by the global public goods protected and created: biodiversity, livelihoods for the poor, small enterprises, etc.</p>
--	--

WBS Status <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Add WBS Row</span>								
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-00502875-TF093297-M7	GEF BD Eco-Enterprises Fund	No	Jun. 30, 2010	7,500.00	0.00	Last payment to external review consultant pending.

**Timeline:**

Delete Row (i)	Key Activities for Reporting Period	Activity Status	Timeline <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Add Timeline Row</span>

*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 <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Add Consultant Row</span>
		[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, Bruce Wise, Diana Mirzakarimova, Nazira Abdukhaililova, 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	Nazira Abdukhaililova	CES Finance and Budget Team
Team Assistant	Samia Benbouzid	Vinitha R. Jayalal
Other Team Members	Cecilia Lim, David Martz, OEG Monitoring	
Management Team	Primary	Proxies
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, Samia Benbouzid, Oleh P. Khalayim

**Additional Comment(s):**

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

TL Initiate Completion - Initiate Completion by Juan Jose Dada at 04/15/2010 11:15:57 AM  
Comment :

Finance Officer Review - Cleared to Unit Manager by Nazira Abdukhalilova at 04/15/2010 11:34:57 AM  
Comment : cleared

Unit Line Manager Clear - Cleared to Unit Manager by Catherine Cassagne at 04/15/2010 11:38:07 AM  
Comment : Cleared conditionnally

The PCR is good overall but still needs some improvements here and there in the formulation of the highlights, lessons learned and development effectiveness to capture and account for the main points in a crisp way. I would also like to see more information in the PCR on the biodiversity impacts of this project which are the most important ones. Half a million hectares of sustainably managed land (obtained by 23 SMEs) is quite remarkable and deserves some detail.

Business Line Specialist 1 Clear - Cleared to Unit Manager by Catherine Cassagne at 04/15/2010 11:39:42 AM  
Comment : Cleared conditionnally.

Comments = idem to Unit Line Manager's

M&E Officer Review - Cleared to Unit Manager by Jacqueline Bueso-Merriam at 04/15/2010 11:40:44 AM  
Comment : Cleared for M&E - this was a challenging project that aimed to make the case for biodiversity-conscious investment in a nascent industry. As such, the original target of catalyzing 32 SME projects was ambitious, what matters most is the 23 projects that were successfully launched by SMEs demonstrate the importance of a triple-bottom line. Hence, team agreed to rate Outcome as satisfactory. TL did downgrade some of the other ratings based on discussions with ESS M&E team. It should also be noted that the project had very strong impact, perhaps meriting an excellent rating, but the decision was to rate satisfactory given that back when this project was approved impact-targets were not required and hence we have none to benchmark against.

Unit Manager Approve - Approved by Trang Nguyen at 04/16/2010 12:18:26 PM  
Comment : Agree with comments of ULM, and will expect final submission by April 30.

TL Initiate Completion - Initiate Completion by Juan Jose Dada at 05/02/2010 03:51:25 PM  
Comment : Text revised to reflect comments from Unit Line Manager and Unit Manager

M&E Officer Review - Cleared to Unit Manager by Jacqueline Bueso-Merriam at 05/04/2010 01:02:04 PM  
Comment : Cleared for M&E, only updated to reflect UM comments.

Business Line Specialist 1 Clear - Cleared to Unit Manager by Maria Soledad Requejo at 05/05/2010 03:20:36 PM  
Comment : Clearing on behalf of Catherine Cassagne who has cleared by email.

Finance Officer Review - Automatically Released after 7 days by Nazira Abdukhalilova at 05/10/2010 06:07:00 AM  
Comment :

Unit Manager Approve - Approved by Trang Nguyen at 06/01/2010 12:53:33 AM  
Comment : My comments on previous version have been incorporated.

