

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
		Review date: 5 th October 2006			
GEF ID:	101		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)	
Project Name:	Institutional capacity building for protected areas management and sustainable use	GEF financing:	2.0000	1.94	
Country:	Uganda	IA/EA own:		-	
		Government:		-	
		Other*:	0.2890	?	
		Total Cofinancing	11.850	11.63	
Operational Program:	3	Total Project Cost:	14.1390	13.57	
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	Ministry of Wildlife and Antiquities, Uganda Wildlife Authority, Uganda Wildlife Training Institute, Dept of Antiquities & Museums, Uganda Tourist Board	Work Program date: 05/12/1997			
		CEO Endorsement: 07/09/1998		05/28/1998	
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began): 03/25/1999			03/25/1999
		Closing Date: 12/31/2002	Proposed: 01/31/2002	Actual: 12/31/2002	
Prepared by: Lee Risby	Reviewed by: DRAFT	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 3 years 10 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 4 years 9 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 11 months	
Author of TE: Karen Richardson & Jack Ruitenbeek		TE completion date: 06/13/03	TE submission date to GEF EO: ?	Difference between TE completion and submission date:	

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFEO
2.1 Project outcomes		S	MS	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	L	L	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation		N/A	N/A	S
2.4 Quality of the	N/A	N/A	S	MS

evaluation report				
-------------------	--	--	--	--

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No The ICR is satisfactory. However, the ICR could have been improved by providing information on: UWA's ability to contract for concessions in a transparent manner; the extent to which vacancies in IAs hindered achievement of project objectives; and the extent to which training activities envisioned in the SAR were realized.

In addition, a second ICR was prepared for this project, covering only the GEF portion. However, because the text of this second ICR is identical to this one--including all tables--it is inaccurate, as it attributes all project achievement to the GEF grant, which provided just 14% of the IDA/GEF contribution. The preparation of two identical ICRs for a single GEF-IBRD-IDA blend project was inefficient and contrary to the goal of mainstreaming GEF-funded activities. It would have been more appropriate to the simplification of Bank processes to issue a single ICR. Also, the sector classification should be public sector management.

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

To establish effective institutional capacity within the wildlife and tourism sectors for strategic planning, program development and implementation, and to promote long-term sustainability; (ii) to secure the vital natural resource base, particularly the PA estate and wildlife resources, during the period that institutional capacity was being strengthened.

Major components: (A) Strengthening organizational structure, management systems and operational capacity of Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), and managerial and technical capacity of UWA staff at Headquarters and Field Levels. (B) Strengthening institutional capacity of other selected conservation-related institutions, complementing the role of UWA, (C) Strengthening the National Commission for Antiquities and Museums (expected successor to existing Department of Museums and Antiquities); (D) Strengthening Ministry of Tourism, Trade, and Industry (MTTI) and Uganda Tourism Board, to promote development of a broad-based, competitive, well-regulated and sustainable tourism industry; (E) Strengthening capacity for human resources development within the tourism sector, through a "Train-the-Trainer" program benefiting both public (Hotel Tourism and Training Institute) and private sector training institutions.

Any changes during implementation? No

- **What are the Development Objectives?**

Same as above

Any changes during implementation? No

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

(1) Strengthening UWA: An organizational structure was developed and fully staffed; contract to retain an Executive Director was implemented; UWA Strategic Plan (but not a business plan) was developed; management of human resources was strengthened substantially; TORs for the UWA Board were adopted; a financial management system was developed and implemented that tightens handling of revenue; UWA's field operations were strengthened by the acquisition of equipment including computers and communications gear; considerable decision-making was devolved to local areas, and policies developed for local revenue sharing and participation in PAs; monitoring of PAs has been strengthened, and poaching and encroachment have been reduced, although they remain problematic;

(2) Strengthening institutional capacity of other selected conservation-related institutions: The Wildlife Department (WD) of MTTI implemented a Protected Area System Plan to strengthen protection of PAs, ratified 2 international wildlife conventions, and participated in international meetings on this subject. WD operations were also enhanced by the acquisition of office and communications equipment. The Uganda Wildlife Education Centre established a new business plan, built new educational facilities, established new wildlife exhibits, and expanded educational linkages with local schools. The Uganda Wildlife Training Institute completed a feasibility study, but the agency's institutional status and role remain uncertain, as does the demand for its services.

(3) Strengthening the Department of Antiquities and Museums (DAM): recruitment of an Executive Director and establishment of an advisory Board were authorized, a number of students were trained, and operational equipment purchased; also within this sub-component, the government approved establishment

of a Ministry of Monuments and Museums.

(4) **Strengthening MTTI and Uganda Tourism Board:** Complementing EU assistance to the tourism sector, several activities were undertaken by this agency, including: development of a comprehensive tourism strategy; tourism statistical database; and sector manpower needs assessment.

(5) **Strengthening capacity for human resources development (training) within the tourism sector:** a train-the-trainer program involving 103 individuals in the hospitality industry was carried out; physical improvements were made and additional equipment provided to the hotel and tourism training institute; curriculum development for further training was initiated.

Most significant outcome: Institutional capacity of UWA was strengthened considerably

- Management of human resources in UWA has improved significantly, with improved effects on morale
- The project contributed substantially to improvements in agency governance, integrity, and honesty in contracting

Significant shortcomings:

- UWA's ability to contract for concessions in a transparent manner was hindered by political interference
- Recommendations to reduce UWA's headquarters operating costs from 50% of the total budget to 30% were not implemented
- Less progress was made than was envisioned in transforming IAs into more autonomous, self-supporting agencies
- Recommendations to terminate or modify some concessions were not implemented, which undermined UWA's revenue generation potential
- WD ability to carry out international statutory obligations was hampered by lack of adequate staffing
- Vacancies in key MTTI positions resulted in less participation than expected in capacity building and training

Provision of counterpart funding was delayed, which hindered achievement of some components; by project close, however, 86% of the appraisal amount had been provided

4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

Overall 13 / 3 = 4.3

A Relevance

Rating: S

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The project was consistent with GEF capacity building priorities in the biodiversity focal area to strengthen PA systems management, improve policy environment and private sector involvement (e.g., through concessions)

B Effectiveness

Rating: MS

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

The project was relatively innovative in that it was originally intended to be one project, but the Bank recognized that Uganda government partners had critically low capacity to implement PAMSU through one project. Therefore, a separate institutional capacity project was designed and the project effectively split into two parts. The project was relatively effective particularly in relation to the component 1 - devoted to strengthening Uganda Wildlife Authority (see 3 above). There were some shortcomings relating to long term financial sustainability of Uganda Wildlife Authority and parts of the PA estate which the project was not able to fully resolve, and also reduce operating costs for that reason the project is rated marginally satisfactory. Although the follow on project – PAMSU is continuing to address these issues.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar**

projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?

The ICR did not calculate ERR / Financial RR. Hence, it is not possible to accurately assess the projects cost-effectiveness. However, the qualitative assessment presented in the ICR indicates that the project was marginally satisfactory in terms cost-effectiveness. The following reasons support this assertion – the project successfully developed financial / budgetary controls and skills within the main government partner – Uganda Wildlife Authority. For example, staff received training in management accounting, now all PAs have annual operating plans and budgeting procedures in place. This was a considerable achievement given that the Authority had no accounting or auditing system in place at the beginning of the project.

But an overall business plan was not developed, although a strategic plan was completed and is being used to guide decision-making. Some issues such as reducing Uganda Wildlife Authority overhead costs at HQ and Board of Trustees excessive sitting fees were not adequately addressed during the project lifetime and there was some political interference.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?** It is too early to adequately assess impacts in terms of GEBs. However, the project did achieve its outcomes of building capacity of the wildlife conservation sector in Uganda and this is likely to be further augmented by the follow on project.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: ML
As already indicated above the main project partner Uganda Wildlife Authority now has procedures and controls in place to manage its financial affairs in much more sustainable manner. For example, revenue collection from tourism is much more efficient (although still low in absolute terms). Critically, the Wildlife Authority has been able to build up a budget cushion from revenues of Ugsh 1 billion – equal to about 3 – 6 months of operations as a buffer against any unexpected events.	
But there is still a significant mis-match between costs of maintaining the PA estates and revenues from concessions and tourism (with the Uganda Tourist Board), which the follow on project – PAMSU will have to address. In the longer term if Uganda is able to attract more tourists, coupled with further improvements in cost-effectiveness then financial sustainability will improve. But this remains to be seen.	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
The project improved community involvement in PA management and decision-making through planning processes, annual operations plans and management plans. Decentralization of management from Uganda Wildlife Authority HQ to field level has also improved management flexibility to respond to community and local political issues. However, problems such as crop-raiding animals remain in many areas.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
Significant progress was made in developing the institutional and governance framework of Uganda Wildlife Authority, National Museums, Uganda Tourist Board and the Ministry from a very low baseline situation. Included significantly improving Wildlife Authority HQ and field level management, monitoring and planning skills base, developing capacity of Uganda Tourist Board including planning strategies to augment tourist visitation.	
D Environmental	Rating: ML
The capacity building activities have improved management of the PA estate and reduced poaching (particularly by staff). An overall PA systems plan was developed and passed. The project (in coordination with GTZ) developed a monitoring system for the PAs which has been implemented with some success to measure the ecological and managerial aspects of conservation management. But poaching, political interference and encroachment remain threats around some PAs.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE: **12 / 4 = 3**

A Financial resources	Rating: ML
B Socio political	Rating: ML
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
D Environmental	Rating: ML

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good - Not applicable
2. Demonstration - Not applicable
3. Replication – Not applicable
4. Scaling up – the project has attempted to link into the GOU policy on progressive decentralization of government services (type of scaling-up of service provision) also supported by the donor community. However, the project has contributed to these efforts in the wildlife conservation sector, but it alone is not responsible for the approach.

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE 15 / 3 = 5

<p>A. In retrospection, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rating: S (5)</p>
<p>The ICR makes no specific mention of the project M&E systems. However, Annex 1 “key performance indicators” – does seem to show that the project had a well developed set of outcome and output indicators against which progress was measured. The project did provide some support to improve the Uganda Wildlife Authority monitoring systems – such as MIST (developed by GTZ) – this has provided enough information to show that wildlife numbers have improved in some PAs.</p>
<p>B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rating: S (5)</p>
<p>The M&E system seems to have operated throughout the project. Progress was tracked in a satisfactory manner (based on information in Annex 1)</p>
<p>C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rating: S (5)</p>
<p>Project coordination and implementation had a budget of US\$1.24M but actual was US\$1.74M. This included M&E. The monitoring detail in Annex 1 indicates that capacity was sufficient.</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? The information in Annex 1 does indicate that the M&E system functioned fairly well, however it is difficult to term this good practice when there is nothing to compare it against.</p>

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</p>
<p>Phased approach to institutional capacity building: An explicit separation between institutional capacity building and substantial field investments provides opportunities to reduce risks in the follow-on investments. First, it permits the policy framework to be placed on a sound footing; and second it permits the identification and correction of existing institutional weaknesses.</p>
<p>Decentralized decision-making: Decentralized institutional support is critical when protecting a vulnerable resource base. The decentralization of decision-making from UWA HQ to the field, empowered the previously disenfranchised field-based staff and allowed some autonomy.</p>
<p>Adaptive management as a risk mitigation strategy: Uganda Wildlife Authority demonstrated through ‘trial by fire when faced with dysfunctional boards, insolvency, kidnapping and murder of international tourists, that a professional approach to problem-solving and risk mitigation will overcome many of these challenges.</p>
<p>Donor coordination: The focus of other donors, primarily the EU on tourist development and marketing</p>

permitted ICB-PAMSU to focus more specifically on institutional management issues and critical habitat protection.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report Overall = 4.2	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	4
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	4
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	3
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	3

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes:	No: X
-------------	--------------

Explain: Not necessary the ICR covers the main outcomes in a satisfactory manner.

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

None

Reviewer's Comment: I agree with this TER.