METHODOLOGY TO MEASURE INDICATORS FOR THE PROJECT "BUILDING THE INTER-AMERICAN BIODIVERSITY INFORMATION NETWORK"

I. Introduction

The World Bank (WB), during the first Evaluation Mission of the IABIN GEF Project (Jan 2005), requested that the Executing Agency (SG/OAS) with the collaboration of the IABIN Secretariat and other key participants developed a monitoring and evaluation strategy for the IABIN GEF project, using Annex 1 of the PIP.   This strategy needed to incorporate a methodology for how monitoring and baseline data will be collected, interpreted, and analyzed.

At the Fourth IABIN Council Meeting in April, 2005 in Panama, a presentation on Monitoring and Evaluation using Annex 1 of the PIP was given by the Executing Agency with the collaboration of the Secretariat and a Working Group was created to review indicators. Some suggestions to change indicators were provided and submitted to the plenary with the recommendation that further work needed to be carried out in order to develop the methodology requested by the World Bank. There was also general agreement that some of the indicators may need to be modified in order to make them measurable, particularly those of higher order (e.g., Sector-related CAS Goal, GEF Operational Program, Global Objective) and for which no direct actions or activities were planned within the PIP at the country level, where they needed to be achieved. It was suggested that a permanent working group be established to work on the methodology but this group was not established at this time.

Subsequently, by the beginning of August of 2005, the Implementing Agency (the WB), requested that the IABIN Secretariat prepare the methodology to measure indicators. A first draft of a methodology was developed and presented to the World Bank at the Second Evaluation Mission (Aug 30, 2005). The Bank said it was a good first step in the right direction and it was agreed that the Secretariat would continue to work on the methodology.

In order to learn from the lessons learned by others in developing Monitoring & Evaluation methodologies, the Bank urged the Secretariat to look at the *System of Indicators for Follow-up of the National Biodiversity Policy - Methodological Sheets Archive*, developed by the Institute von Humboldt of Colombia. The IABIN Secretariat also reviewed the *Proposal for Regional Biodiversity Indicators for the Central American Region*, developed by the CCAD. There were many similarities between the two methodologies.

The first draft of this document was developed in October, 2005 presenting a "methodological sheet" for each one of the indicators in Annex 1 of the PIP. The draft was a combination of both of the methodologies mentioned above with some additions pertinent to IABIN. The objective of the first draft was to provide a platform for analysis and discussion among core team members responsible for the IABIN project execution and monitoring (OAS, IEC Chair, WB, and Secretariat). It was expected that each team member would review, analyze, and make in depth comments and suggestions to the draft methodology since there were still several questions that remained to be addressed, some of which referred to the purpose and soundness of some indicators, responsibilities to be defined and included in parties' agreed roles, and the need to incorporate other key participants in defining this methodology (e.g., Focal Points and TNs Coordinating Institutions representatives).

There was very little response to the first draft so, in June 2006, at the First Meeting of the IABIN Executive Committee (IEC) in Washington, DC, the methodology was presented and a task force was set up composed of Kim Winters, Ben Wheeler and Rita Besana to review each indicator and modify them according to the feedback provided by the meeting participants.

In November, 2006, after reviewing the second draft developed by the task force, the World Bank recommended to leave only 10 indicators in order to facilitate the M&E process. The Secretariat made the changes suggested by the World Bank. The next step was to share this third draft of the methodology for comments and suggestions with the IEC members. The Secretariat presented this third draft to the IEC

members and CI representatives who participated in an ad hoc meeting in Bogota, Colombia during the Iberian-American Interoperability Workshop, in order to validate the methodology, define roles and responsibilities and establish a schedule to collect baseline data and begin the M&E process. No major comments were made to the methodology at this time and it was agreed that it would be sent by the Secretariat to the Focal Points and CIs requesting comments, giving a deadline of mid January, 2007. This draft was sent to FPs and CIs on December 19, 2007. The FPs and CIs had until 10 January to provide comments.

In addition, in late December, 2006, the World Bank sent extensive comments, after the validated draft had been sent to Focal Points and CIs for their review. Only one CI sent comments by the January deadline. The Secretariat incorporated all the comments and seven indicators were the result.

To further refine the methodology, once the comments made by the World Bank and the CI were incorporated, the Secretariat held a teleconference on 28 February, 2007, with Douglas Graham and Keiko Ashida. The final document was sent once more to the World Bank and was finally approved on March 7, 2007.

This document is the final result and it represents the IABIN M&E Methodology which will be implemented starting the first quarter of 2007. It includes nine indicators.

It is worth noting that these indicators are at the Project level and that each Coordinating Institution would have to develop additional performance and impact indicators for their work plans.

2. Description of the Indicators "methodological sheet"

1. GEO Level: Indicator 1. Access to information on the biodiversity of the American Continent currently existing in individual institutions and agencies is provided through IABIN (in terms of Species, Specimens, Ecosystem, Protected Areas, Pollinators and Invasive Species).
2. Name of Indicator: Visits to the IABIN Catalog, IABIN portal and Portals of each IABIN Thematic Network increase
3. Definition of Terms: Page visits are a good measure of traffic, whereas page hits measure the number of times your server has to send out data - but that could be an image, or style sheet, or an html document, or favicon, or robots.txt file, or whatever else. Page hits are a poor measure of traffic, unless you are viewing the page hits for a specific page. **Hits**: When someone request something from a server. **Visits**: When a person views an internet page. Think "session" here. Say, a unique Internet Protocol (IP) accesses a page, and then requests three other pages in less than an hour between any of the requests, all of the "pages" are included in the visit, therefore you should expect multiple pages per visit and multiple visits per unique visitor (assuming that some of the unique IPs are logged with more than an hour between requests). **Unique Visitor**: A host that has made at least 1 hit on 1 page of your web site during the current period shown by the report. If this host makes several visits during this period, it is counted only once. The period shown by the program reports (AWStats) to be used in all IABIN Thematic Networks (TNs) and the Catalog is by default the current month.
4. Target: Visits to the Catalog and to each of the web page of IABIN and of each TN increase

by at least 25% per year from baseline, after the Catalog and the Species, Specimens, Ecosystems, Pollinators and Protected Areas Thematic Networks are operational (e.g. ready to serve data) which very likely will be at the end of 2007. For Invasive Species (I3N) visits increase at least 25% from baseline since this TN was already operational at the end of 2006 (Year 2 of the Project).

5. Pertinence of Indicator: An increase in visits to the portals indicate usefulness of IABIN to users

6. Unit of measurement: Number of visits to IABIN Catalog, IABIN portal and web portals of each TN, per year

7. Process and formula to calculate the indicator: Sum of the visits to the web sites of each TN, the Catalog and of the IABIN web site.**:**

$$\sum Visits\_IABIN + \sum Visits\_TN_1 + ... + \sum Visits\_TN_n$$

n=1,2,3,….,n, Catalogue, Other IABIN initiatives

Each CI and the Secretariat will report in their Quarterly Reports, the number of visits to their web sites.

8. Relation to other indicators: Relates to indicators 1, 3

9. Source of data:
- Web statistics reports from CIs and the IABIN portal. All TN, the Catalog and the IABIN web page server will use the same internet statistics program to measure and produce the statistics reports (AWStats logfile analyzer)

10. Baseline: 5,190 visits per month for the main IABIN web page at end of September 2005. The baseline for the Catalog and the other TNs will be taken at the end of 2006 and at that time the only webpage in operation will be that of Invasive Species (I3N). Since there was no webpage for the other TNs and the Catalog, the baseline for them will be that of the main IABIN webpage.

11. Existence of historical series: N/A

12. Periodicity of the data: Will be collected at the end of each quarter.

13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation):
Network Coordinator (Secretariat), CI Coordinators for (I3N), (SSTN), (ETN), (PTN), (PATN), and (Catalog)

14. Documents related to the indicator: IABIN, CIs Web Statistics Reports

15. Format for presenting indicator data: tables.

16. Critical Assumptions:
- Secretariat Hosting arrangement with City of Knowledge lasts 5 years as agreed in MOU
- Adequate connectivity is maintained throughout the network
- Small secretariat envisaged is adequate to operate IABIN
- CIs remain engaged and carry out the contracts for the 5 years

17. Costs associated with measuring indicator
Time of the 7 people mentioned above, to analyze the web statistics reports and input the results in the Project Quarterly Reports

18. Limitations and observations: It is important for IABIN to show impact. By its own nature (an information-providing place) the only way IABIN can show impact is to show USE; to show that people are entering in the network to look for information. Before IABIN existed, there were thousands of sources of biodiversity information about the Americas and the user had to spend a great deal of time looking for the appropriate site to find what he/she was looking for. IABIN will provide the user with a single point of entry to retrieve information on species, specimens, invasive species ecosystems, pollinators, and protected areas. That, in

itself, is a big change.

Does it have impact? For the user, absolutely.

How can this be measured? The only way to know the impact on the user would be to ask the user what it has meant for him/her to be able to obtain the information without having to look at thousands of places. For this, IABIN would have to administer questionnaires requesting the user to answer several questions to this regard. This is time consuming, costly and difficult to do since users usually do not like answering questionnaires, but it can be done if the funds are there for it. What can be measured easily and at minimal cost is how many people enter the network and what they look for.

19. Developed by: R. Besana, I. Valdespino and B. Ramirez

2 GEO Level. Indicator 2. Decision-support tools in operation that access information from more than one TN and that support sound decision-making concerning the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity

2. Name of Indicator: Use of the decision-support tools available through IABIN increases

3. Definition of Terms.
Decision-support tool: A desktop or web-based computer tool available through the web pages of IABIN for downloading or direct web page use that integrates information from at least two of the IABIN Thematic Networks and allows for some analysis of that data to present different scenarios, or see patterns or trends.

4. Targets:
1. At least 100 downloads after the tools have been operational for one year and 25% per year thereafter

5. Pertinence of Indicator: Measures how IABIN makes its information available for decision-making. It also measures whether there is integration among IABIN initiatives.
We presume that the frequency with which the tools are being downloaded or used ultimately is a measure of how many users are trying them out and how useful they are.

6. Unit of measurement: If the decision-making tool is one for desktop use, a good measure would be the number of downloads plus the on-line requests for data from the tool. If the decision-making tool is web-based, a good measure would be the number of visits to the tool. The sum of these two would give us the total measurement.

7. Process and formula to calculate the indicator: The sum of downloads or use per tool.
$$\sum download\_tool_1\_in\_year(X) + ... + \sum download\_tool_n\_in\_year(X)$$
n=1,2,3…,n
X>=3 since there will be three tools developed by IABIN

8. Source of data:
- IABIN Web statistics

9. Baseline: Zero

10 Existence of historical series: N/A

11. How data will be collected: Web register of number of times these tools are downloaded or used will be analyzed and the results will be reported in the Project Quarterly Reports

12. Periodicity of the data: Quarterly, commencing at end of Year 4 (when the three decision-making tools requested in the PIP would have been developed)

13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation):

IABIN Secretariat because the tools will be at the main IABIN server.
14. Documents related to the indicator: IABIN Web Statistics
15. Format for presenting indicator data: Graphs and tables
16. Critical Assumptions: • The decision-support tools are developed and operational by the end of Year 4 • The TNs are operational by the end of Year 4 • Sufficient data is available through the TNs for the information tools to access • Data is current enough for tools to provide good information
17. Costs associated with measuring indicator: Time of IABIN staff person to generate the reports and input the information in the Semester Progress Report. About 1 hour at the end of each semester.
18. Limitations and observations: 1. If a decision-support tool is developed in Year 5 of the project, the project will not be able to measure whether its downloading or use increases after it has been in operation for one year. 2. The indicator implies that the decision-making tools must be operational by the end of Year 4, since at least one year is necessary to measure increase. 3. A survey of users may be carried out if the funds for this are available. 4. There is need for SG/OAS and IEC to define whether Component 3 depends on the TNs being operational. This comes up because it would be possible to develop a tool that would address the needs of FPs and others but that do not necessarily use data from the IABIN TNs.
19. Developed by: R. Besana, I. Valdespino and B. Ramirez

1. Indicator 3. Component 1: Interoperability and access to data
2. Name of Indicator: TNs and Catalog websites established and integrated into IABIN Portal.
3. Definition of Terms: **Integrated website:** Searches can be conducted from any TN web site to any other IABIN web site that overlay data from at least two TNs. For example, a user would be able to download information on a pollinator species, and then could find out in which protected areas this pollinator species can be found and in what ecosystem(s) these protected areas are located.
4. Target: The data of at least three TNs are integrated. The integration of the websites will take place on Year 4 through the Catalog.
5. Pertinence of Indicator: Shows the integration of the TNs and that the TNs are functioning
6. Unit of measurement: Number of TN, Catalog and other IABIN websites whose data is integrated for searches
7. Process and Formula to calculate the indicator: The sum of existing TNs` websites existing at the end of each year in which a search can be done for data from at least another IABIN TN $\sum TN\_website\_\mathrm{int}\,egrated$
8. Relation to other indicators: Related to indicators in components 1, 2, 3 and 4.
9. Source of data: TNs Web sites
10. Baseline: Zero
11. How data will be collected:

Each TN website will be accessed by IABIN staff person to make sure it is integrated into the IABIN portal.
12. Periodicity of the data: Once, at the end of Year 4
13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation):   IABIN Secretariat
14. Documents related to the indicator: None
15. Format for presenting indicator data: Narrative
16. Critical Assumptions: • CIs for all Thematic Networks are chosen and start working the first year of the project.   • Sufficient coordination can be assured between TNs to allow development of interoperability between them
17. Costs associated with measuring indicator: • Time of IABIN staff person to access and review each TN website and report findings into the Project Semi-Annual Report
18. Limitations and observations:
19. Developed by: R. Besana, B. Ramirez and I. Valdespino

1. Indicator 4: Component 2: Data Content Creation
2. Name of Indicator: Data and metadata content in the IABIN Catalog and TNs increases
3. Definition of Terms: **Catalog:** Search engine called BioBot, that will locate, evaluate, and access biological data and information from the five IABIN Thematic Networks and other IABIN initiatives   **Catalog content:** Metadata harvested by the Catalog from IABIN TNs and other IABIN initiatives   **Metadata:** Metadata: Metadata is information about a particular data set which may describe, for example, how, when, and by whom it was received, created, accessed, and/or modified and how it is formatted. Some metadata, such as file dates and sizes, can easily be seen by users; other metadata can be hidden or embedded and unavailable to computer users who are not technically adept. Metadata is generally not reproduced in full form when a document is printed. (Typically referred to by the less informative shorthand phrase "data about data," it describes the content, quality, condition, history, and other characteristics of the data.)   **New data**: data that is already in digital form within a country but that is not available through a network   **Newly digitized data**: data that has been made available to IABIN through the IABIN Data Digitizing Grants   **TNs:** The Species and Specimens (SSTN), Invasive Species (I3N), Pollinators (PTN), Protected Areas (PATN), and Ecosystems ETN) Thematic Networks of IABIN.
4. Target(s): 25% increase per year from baseline in data for the Invasive Species TN (I3N). For all the other TNs and the Catalog, the targets are: 1. To have data available through their websites by the end of Year 3.   2. A 25% increase from the number of records at the end of Year 3, per year.   3. To have disbursed all the funds available for data digitizing grants by the end of Year 4   4. At least 500,000 records by the end of the project for each TN
5. Pertinence of Indicator:

1. Measures the effectiveness of the Secretariat and of each Coordinating Institution (CI) to convince potential data providers in the Americas to share their data through IABIN.
2. Measures how effective the data digitizing grants were in obtaining newly digitized data

6. Unit of measurement: 1.Number of data and metadata made available through each of the TNs and the Catalog by means of the data digitizing grants. 2. Number of data and metadata made available through each of the TNs and the Catalog without a grant incentive.

7. Process and Formula to calculate the indicator: 1. Starting at the end of Year 3 of the Project, each CI (except I3N) will measure at the end of each quarter, the number of data obtained through the data digitizing grants. 2. Starting at the end of Year 3, each CI (except I3N) will measure at the end of each quarter, the number of data made available through their TN. The number of data available the previous period will then be subtracted from his number to give us the number of new data made available through each TN in the period being measured. From this, the number of data made available through data digitizing grants will be subtracted, to give the number of data made available without grant incentive.
For I3N, this process will start the first quarter of 2007.

8. Relation to other indicators: Related to global indicators and to Component 1 and 4 indicators

9. Source of data:
• Catalog and TNs Quarterly Reports

10. Baseline: Zero for the Catalog, SSTN, PTN, ETN, and PATN. I3N will provide number of data available at the end of 2006 as the baseline.

11. How data will be collected: IT staff person of Catalog CI and of each TN will measure at the end of each quarter, the number of data available through their TN. The number of data available the previous period will then be subtracted from his number to give us the number of new data made available through each TN in the period being measured. The CI then reports this in the Quarterly Progress Report

12. Periodicity of the data: Quarterly

13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation):
Coordinating Institutions for the Catalog and TNs and Secretariat (for the part on grant-giving)

14. Documents related to the indicator: Quarterly Progress Reports from Catalog and TNs

15. Format for presenting indicator data: Table

16. Critical Assumptions:
• Potential data providers are willing to make their data available through IABIN
• CIs remain engaged and carry out the contracts for the 5 years

17. Costs associated with measuring indicator:
• Time of Catalog and TNs CI staff person to analyze the data and input the information in the Progress Report.

18. Limitations and observations:
What is a reasonable increase in data? Well, it depends on where we start from. For instance, for the Catalog and ETN, PTN, PATN and Species TN, since there is zero data to start with, we hope that at the end of 2007 there will be some data being served through each of these TNs, because they will not have the infrastructure ready for capturing data until late in 2007. On the following years, however, this will not be a problem, and an increase of 20% from the data available at the end of 2007 is a reasonable target.

For specimens, it is another story. IABIN will have to decide whether the baseline for Specimens will start from zero as with the other TNs or if the specimens that are presently being served through GBIF will be counted towards the baseline. Many of the data providers for IABIN for specimens are also data providers for GBIF and, once the SSTN is ready for capturing data, all the data served through IABIN will automatically be available through GBIF and vice versa. So, if we decide to count the specimens already available through GBIF, which is nearly 100 million records (of which we do not know how many are from the Americas), it could be in the millions of records (let's say it is 10 million records for the sake of this

discussion), and achieving a 10% increase (1 million records) in one year may be very difficult, particularly since most of the specimen data in the Americas is not in digital form yet.

19. Developed by: R. Besana, I. Valdespino and B. Ramirez

---

1. Indicator 5. Component 2.2: Technical Training

2. Name of Indicator: Number of people trained per year on data creation tools, data quality and use of tools developed by IABIN TNs

3. Definition of Terms:

Data creation tools: Tools that will allow potential data providers to digitize their data to be made available through each of IABIN Thematic Networks, according to the standards established by IABIN. These tools will be developed by each one of the TNs.

Technical training: Sessions conducted by a facilitator to show potential data providers how to utilize the data creation tools. The training module and manuals will be available through each IABIN TN web page

4. Targets:
1. To have a data-digitizing tool for each of the TNs by the end of Year 3
2. To have a training module and training materials developed for the data digitizing tool of each TN by the end of Year 3
3. At least 180 people trained (in total) per year in Year 4 and Year 5 of the project.
4. Training module and training materials for each TN downloaded by at least 100 people by the end of Year 4 and a 50% increase in Year 5.

5. Pertinence of Indicator: This is a performance indicator. It measures whether the data creation tools, the training modules and the training manuals were developed, as well as the number of people who participated in the training sessions.

6. Unit of measurement: Number of people trained per year on data creation tools, data quality and use of tools developed by IABIN TNs

7. Process and Formula to calculate the indicator: The number of people participating in each data creation tools training workshop in each TN will be added. Then these numbers will be added to arrive at the total number of people trained in data creation

tool $PT\_TN_1\_in\_year(X) + PT\_TN_2\_in\_year(X) + ... + PT\_TN_n\_in\_year(X)$

PT_TN=People Trained in TN
N=1,2,…n
X>=1

8. Relation to other indicators: Relates to indicator 4.

9. Source of data:
• Trainers Reports under each TN, including List of people trained

10. Baseline: Zero

11. How data will be collected: Staff person in each CI will review Trainers Reports to obtain number of participants. This will then be reported in the CI Project Semi-annual Report

12. Periodicity of the data: Annually – for I3N commencing on Year 1, for all the other TNs, commencing at the end of Year 3.

13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation):
CIs of TNs

14. Documents related to the indicator: Data creation tools Trainers Reports

15. Format for presenting indicator data: Narrative

16. Critical Assumptions:
• Funds available are sufficient to train the required number of people

• Funds available are sufficient to cover the Hemisphere
• CIs remain engaged and carry out the contracts for the 5 years
17. Costs associated with measuring indicator:
• Time of OAS staff person to read the trainers reports and input the information in the Project Semi-annual Report
18. Limitations and observations:
Being trained does not mean that the person learns or becomes effective or that he/she will use the tool to digitize data and make it available through IABIN. In order to measure impact of training for making data available through IABIN it may be necessary to conduct a survey of trainees at the end of the project to see how many of them used the data digitizing tool and training and how it helped them. Another survey of data providers could help us learn how many of them used the data digitizing tool in order to make their data available through IABIN. There are no funds available for these surveys
19. Developed by: R. Besana, B. Ramirez and I. Valdespino

1. Indicator 6. Component 3: Value-added Tools for Decision Making Decision-support tools in operation that access information from more than one TN and that support sound decision-making concerning the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
2. Name of Indicator: At least three decision-support tools available through IABIN
3. Definition of Terms. **Decision-support tool:** A desktop or web-based computer tool available through the web pages of IABIN for downloading or direct web page use that integrates information from at least two of the IABIN Thematic Networks and allows for some analysis of that data to present different scenarios, or see patterns or trends.
4. Targets: 1. At least 3 new decision-support tools in operation by end Year 4.
5. Pertinence of Indicator: This is a performance indicator
6. Unit of measurement: Three tools
7. Process and formula to calculate the indicator: The sum tools.
8. Source of data: • IABIN Web page
9. Baseline: Zero
10 Existence of historical series: N/A
11. How data will be collected: The OAS will access the IABIN Web Page at the end of the Year 4 to test each tool and make sure they are operational
12. Periodicity of the data: Once, at the end of Year 4
13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation): SG/OAS
14. Documents related to the indicator: N/A
15. Format for presenting indicator data: Narrative
16. Critical Assumptions: • The decision-support tools are developed and operational by the end of Year 5 • The TNs are operational by the end of Year 3
17. Costs associated with measuring indicator: Time of OAS staff person to test the tools and report their operation in the final report.

18. Limitations and observations:
19. Developed by: R. Besana, I. Valdespino and B. Ramirez

1. Indicator 7. Component 4: Sustainability of IABIN
2. Name of Indicator: Funding and other resources secured for continued and effective functioning of IABIN
3. Definition of Terms: **Financial sustainability:** Money and other resources provided for the coordination of the network, infrastructure maintenance, etc., that will ensure that IABIN continues to function after the GEF funds end. **Sources of funding:** The sources of funding may be: a) Cash, b) in kind donations (e.g. goods and services such as plane tickets, lodging, etc.), c) Staff time. The funding must respond to needs identified in the work plan of the Network.
4. Output for indicator: At least two additional sources of funding per year, which will cover the Network expenses.
5. Pertinence of Indicator: Indicates some degree of financial sustainability of the network
6. Unit of measurement: Number of successful fundraising initiatives
7. Process and formula to calculate the indicator: Proposals accepted and financed will be added at the end of each year $$\sum \Pr oposal\_in\_year(X)$$ X=>2
8. Relation to other indicators: Related to Component 4 indicators
9. Source of data: • Grant/donation contracts signed
10. Baseline: End of 2004
11. How data will be collected: The Semi-annual Project Reports will be analyzed to find information on grants obtained.
12. Periodicity of the data: Annually commencing on Year 2
13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation): IABIN Secretariat
14. Documents related to the indicator: Semi-annual Project Reports
15. Format for presenting indicator data: Narrative
16. Critical Assumptions: • IABIN Secretariat, SG/OAS and IEC have the time to carry out fundraising • A fundraising strategy is developed and followed
17. Costs associated with measuring indicator: Time of IABIN Staff person
18. Limitations and observations: 1. Commencing on Year 3 of the Project, there is a critical need to provide funding for the position of Director for which declining funding through the GEF project is available. 2. There is need to decide what will be done after the GEF Project ends in terms of maintaining the Network. What the Council envisions? Do they want to continue the network? Do they see the need for a Secretariat? 3. The CIs for the TNs are purchasing servers and other equipment for the Network, and the

CIs may be able to keep this equipment and maintain the infrastructure and services to users if funding is secured for this purpose.

4. A small Secretariat could operate in a location where all those servers be kept. This small Secretariat would be responsible for maintaining the infrastructure, provide services to the users and fundraise.

For any of the options, funds must be secured. A minimum of US$250,000 per year would be needed for either option.

19. Developed by: R. Besana, I. Valdespino and B. Ramirez

1. Indicator 8. Component 4: Outreach and Communications
2. Name of Indicator: New partnerships facilitated by IABIN involving access to biodiversity information within the Americas
3. Definition of Terms: **Partnerships**: Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) or Memorandums of Collaboration (MoCs) are signed with organizations whose scope is international. These organizations may be NGOs, government organizations, multilateral or bilateral organizations(e.g. World Bank, BID, UNEP). These partnerships are different than the agreements made with Data Providers and entail carrying out joint programs or activities, maintaining coordination and communications in order to avoid duplication of efforts. **Involving access to information:** Any activity that would allow IABIN to carry out its mission. These can be providing access to information, providing logistical or other kind of support to the Secretariat or a CI
4. Output of indicator: About four new partnerships per year starting in Year 2 (at least 16 in total by end of project).
5. Pertinence of Indicator: IABIN is a network of networks and therefore if we achieve a great deal of participation from other networks, in theory IABIN becomes more useful.
6. Unit of measurement: Number of partnerships facilitated by IABIN that involve access to biodiversity information within the Americas
7. Process and formula to calculate the indicator: Annually, the Secretariat will include in its reports the number of MoUs signed during the year with multinational partnerships and will indicate what joint activities have been agreed. $$\sum MoU\_in\_year(X)$$ X>=2
8. Relation to other indicators: It relates to all the output indicators.
9. Source of data: • MoUs signed each year with multinational organizations
10. Baseline: Two (CHM and GBIF)
11. How data will be collected: • A IABIN staff person will review the new multinational partnership agreements and will report them in the IABIN Semi-annual Report
12. Periodicity of the data: • At the end of each year, commencing with Year 2
13. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation):

IABIN Secretariat
14. Documents related to the indicator: MoUs
15. Format for presenting indicator data: Narrative in Semi-annual Report
16. Critical Assumptions: - Decisions concerning conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are significantly influenced by availability of good information
17. Costs associated with measuring indicator: • Time of IABIN person to review the MoUs and report in the Project Semi-annual Report
18. Limitations and observations: Need to consider that it is not just a MOU that guarantees an effective partnership. There is also a need, when interpreting this indicator, to better understand how well each partnership is working and how it is pertinent and effective for the goals of IABIN.
19. Developed by: R. Besana, B. Ramirez and I. Valdespino

1. Indicator 9. Component 5: Project Management
2. Name of Indicator: Project is rated satisfactory or better by the World Bank and by the IABIN Council
3. Definition of Indicator: The PIP and AOP were implemented according to the activities and within the budget and timing specified
4. Output for indicator: Good ratings by WB and IEC
5. Pertinence of Indicator: Determines that the project is being implemented according to plan and successfully. In addition, this allows seeing if there is need to make any adjustments to the plan.
6. Unit of measurement: Rating of Satisfactory or better
7. Formula to calculate the indicator: not needed
8. Relation to other indicators: It relates to the whole project
10. Source of data: • Mid term and Final Evaluation Reports
11. Baseline: Zero
12. How data will be collected: The PIP and AOP will be analyzed in order to calculate where each planned activity should be (in %) according to them. The Annual Reports will be analyzed to calculate the actual percentage of completion of each activity. The resulting numbers will then be used to calculate the indicator.
13. Periodicity of the data: Annually for the data provided by the WB, at Mid-term and at End of Project for information provided by the WB and IEC
14. Responsible parties (for data collection, analysis and presentation): IEC
15. Documents related to the indicator: Mid term and Final Evaluation Reports
18. Format for presenting indicator data: Narrative
19. Critical Assumptions: • The IEC is able to provide effective oversight of the Executing Agency. • The OAS provides the administrative and financial support needed by the Focal Points, the Secretariat and the CIs. • The OAS takes into consideration the technical recommendations of the Secretariat and applies them to the management of the project.
20. Cost associated with measuring indicator: Time of OAS staff person to analyze the evaluation reports
21. Limitations and observations: • The main limitation here is that the success of project coordination cannot be measured just by implementation of activities or execution of budgets. In the end there is always going to be a need for a qualitative and objective assessment of how well the project is being implemented

- There should be some flexibility allowed for the extra time that it has taken to the TNs and Catalog to become operational due to the changes in the kind of contract that the World Bank allowed for the CIs.

- Also, flexibility has to be allowed for the activities that under this new contract now have to be open to a bidding process instead of being assigned to members of each consortium.

- There is also need for flexibility to allow for the analysis of needs in regards to the tools that IABIN will develop for decision-making.

- There is need, too, to capture the lessons learned in the implementation of this project. For example, the lengthy negotiations between the WB and OAS to come up with an acceptable way of implementing the PIP's request that the CIs provided a 2:1 co-financing. Or that in the PIP, there is an organizational chart of the management and coordination of the GEF project in which the Secretariat is shown at the same level as the Executing Agency (OAS), thus in effect giving the Secretariat the same authority and responsibility as the Executing Agency. However, the fact that the Secretariat was hired by the Executing Agency, in effect put the Secretariat in a subordinate position where its technical advice may not always have been taken into consideration.

22. Developed by: R. Besana, B. Ramirez and I. Valdespino

3. Establishing the Baseline

All the indicators will need a baseline, both defined with a value and with a time period, even if that baseline is zero. The Project Implementation Plan (PIP) establishes that the baseline for the indicators is to be measured as of the end of the second year of the project, which is December of 2006.

3.1. Responsibilities for measuring and reporting indicators

The IEC:
Indicator 9

The Coordinating Institutions for the TNs and the Catalog:
 Indicators 1, 4 and 5

The IABIN Secretariat:
 Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8

The OAS:
Indicator 6

The following table will be used to report the baseline and for measuring the indicators at the end of each quarter:

IABIN Indicator Measuring Matrix

Indicator	Responsible	Baseline as of Dec 2006	Measurement on 1st Quarter 2007	Measurement on 2nd Quarter 2007
1. Visits to the IABIN Catalog and Portals of each IABIN Thematic Network increase	NBII – M. Frame I3N – A. Grosse SSTN – E. Mata ETN – V. Abreu PATN – E. Dalcin PTN – L. Adams IABIN Secretariat	5,190 visits/mo as of 9/05		
2. Use of the decision-support tools available through IABIN increases	IABIN Secretariat			
3. TNs and Catalog websites established and integrated into IABIN Portal.	IABIN Secretariat			
4. Data and metadata content in the IABIN Catalog and TNs increases	NBII – M. Frame I3N – A. Grosse SSTN – E. Mata ETN – V. Abreu PATN – E. Dalcin PTN – L. Adams IABIN Secretariat			
5. Number of people trained per year on data creation tools, data quality and use of tools developed by IABIN TNs	NBII – M. Frame I3N – A. Grosse SSTN – E. Mata ETN – V. Abreu PATN – E. Dalcin PTN – L. Adams			
6. At least three decision-support tools available through IABIN	OAS – R. Huber			
7. Funding and other resources secured for continued and effective functioning of IABIN	IABIN Secretariat			
8. New partnerships facilitated by IABIN involving access to biodiversity information within the Americas	IABIN Secretariat			
9. Project is rated satisfactory or better by the World Bank and by the IABIN Council	IEC			

Panama, March 7, 2007