

PROJECT EVALUATION SERIES

**Final evaluation of the project
“Integrated Management of the Ilha
Grande Bay Ecosystem”
(BIG Project)**

**GCP/BRA/078/GFF
GEF ID: 3848**

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2019

Management response to the Final evaluation of the project “Integrated Management of the Ilha Grande Bay Ecosystem” (BIG Project)

Overall response to the evaluation

- In general terms, FAO is satisfied with the result of the evaluation. The evaluators have appreciated the efforts of the project management to apply principles and practises of adaptive management to achieve the ultimate core outcomes. A small divergence of opinions with the management team remained regarding the relative importance of some of the shortcomings of the project. It is the opinion of the management team that, although the initial project design did not enable the achievement of the outcomes under Component 2, the changes made to project design after the mid-term review produced satisfactory results.
- It is the management opinion that the most relevant drawback of the evaluation process has been the failure of the professional hired to support the ET to perform the field mission in the project region. This meant that information had to be given in second hand and more clarifications were needed throughout the process, causing an unnecessary burden on the management team and delaying in the delivery of the draft report. The draft report should have been redacted in Portuguese instead of English as stated in the ToRs of the ET to ease communication with and review by national stakeholders).
- FAO considers most recommendations pertinent.

Response by recommendation

Management response to the (Evaluation Title)					Date
Evaluation Recommendation (a)	Management response (b) Accepted , Partially Accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N) (f)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection (c)	Responsible unit (d)	Time frame (e)	
Insert title of section, if any					
<p>Recommendation 1 To FAO: Difficulties encountered by the evaluation team in evaluating co-financing and project expenditure suggest that future projects would benefit from a real time financial monitoring system, as far as possible.</p>	Partially Accepted	<p>As far as GEF funding administered by FAO is concerned, real time recording of expenditures is already in place (GRMS), in spite of some technical drawbacks faced during implementation.</p> <p>A real time monitoring system of co-financing would be desirable, but it is only feasible provided that non-FAO stakeholders (particularly the national executing partner) adhere to the monitoring system.</p> <p>Additionally, some of the co-financing partners did not have any common management/command lines with the project management unit and therefore were not accountable to the project. Future projects need take this into consideration when designing the institutional/implementation arrangements.</p>			N
<p>Recommendation 2 To FAO: When significant changes are made to project outputs over the course of implementation, these should be documented in a structured way (e.g. through inclusion in the logical framework) and adequate new indicators and outputs should be developed and obsolete ones abandoned, in order to maintain project logic. This will facilitate</p>	Accepted	<p>At the time of consolidating the alternative strategy to achieve the project outcomes named "Initiative BIG 2050", the interpretation prevailed that, since there would be no change in the definitions and indicators of outcomes, a revision of the logical framework should not be needed. We accept that, in order to better reflect project activities and their contribution to the achievement of the project's outcomes, the outputs and respective indicators in the</p>			

posterior monitoring and evaluation activities.		logical framework of the project should have been formally revised.			
Recommendation 3 To FAO: All project documents for evaluation should be made available in an organised manner at the beginning of evaluation process, before field mission and in accordance to the project logical framework.	Accepted	A preliminary set of documents had been handed out by OED and the BH, but additional needs have been detected by the evaluation team leader at a later stage, during the field mission. Requested documents were sent with some delay.			
Recommendation 4 To FAO/GEF: Ensure as much as possible in future projects that co-financing is directly linked to specific project outcomes and that its activities and expected outcomes are under the control of the project.	Accepted	Experience with GEF projects has taught FAO that full compliance of co-financing commitments (including the timeline for delivery) cannot be taken as granted. Hence the outcomes and milestones set for the project must be fully under the control of FAO and the national GEF project implementation agency.			
Recommendation 5 To State Government: to apply the successful model of the BIG2050 Initiative for other areas in Rio de Janeiro State, preferably as a whole, or parts of it (RADAR, "Challenge", the use of PPPs)	Partially Accepted	INEA initiated a dialogue with the Ministry of the Environment and invested human resources towards elaborating a new proposal for financing in which the BIG2050 concept would be applied to similar ecosystems both within and outside the state. The success of this does not depend only from INEA, though. Current efforts from INEA are focused ensuring the financial sustainability and continuity of the initiative BIG2050. A necessary condition for it's upscaling.	INEA	Continuous	Y
Recommendation 6 To FAO and GEF: Future projects aimed at biodiversity conservation and/or supporting protected areas would benefit from a thorough analysis of what can be effectively accomplished with	Accepted	The failure to deliver the expected results related to Component 2 adopting the strategy proposed at design stage may well be the consequence of insufficient analysis during the project preparation phase.			

<p>available funds and the onsite reality of the threats and issues being addressed. They should have a deep understanding not only of the relevant policies and laws but also of the many stakeholders involved.</p>					
<p>Recommendation 7 To FAO and GEF: Analysis of METT scores should not be limited to the overall as a proxy to project success and impact. Analysis should consider the different elements of the Tool and be associated, when possible, to further evidence as a means to be verified. Casual correlations should not be made as a way to increase project impacts.</p>	<p>Rejected</p>	<p>METT as only been adopted as the standard management effectiveness tracking tool since GEF-5. The project was formulated during GEF-4 and therefore its logical framework did not include any MEET targets.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 8 To FAO and GEF: Gender and other cross-cutting issues should always be considered in new projects. Not considering should be specifically justified.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Gender analysis and other relevant safeguards have become mandatory during the FAO project cycle (including design). FAO project proposals under the current and future GEF cycles must include a gender analysis.</p>			