

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1125	
GEF Agency project ID		PIMS 836, Atlas 49202	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Moyen-Chari	
Country/Countries		Chad	
Region		North Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Operational Program: Arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems Strategic priorities: Catalyzing sustainability of protected areas	
Executing agencies involved		Chad Ministry of Environment and Water (MEW)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Local population participated as beneficiaries and through consultations.	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 2005/October 2005	
Effectiveness date / project start		2006	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 2011	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.26136	.261
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		1.4	1.4
Co-financing	IA own	.5	1.08
	Government	.045	NA ¹
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.99	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	.1	0
Total GEF funding		1.66136	1.661
Total Co-financing		1.635	1.08
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.29636	2.741
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2015	
Author of TE		Dr Ngoni Grégoire	
TER completion date		November 14, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

¹ The TE reports a figure of zero for Government co-financing. However, according to the 2013 PIR (p.60), "co-financing from government and communities, even if just in kind, should not be underestimated and should be considered fully disbursed, given the fixed assets available to the project throughout its lifetime. "

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Please note that some of the original project documents, including the TE, were produced in French. Translations provided in this document have been done to the best of the knowledge and understanding of the consultant having prepared the TER.

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	ML
M&E Design		MS	--	MU
M&E Implementation		MS	--	S
Quality of Implementation		S	--	MS
Quality of Execution		MS	--	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project’s global environmental objective is “the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity within Manda National Park (MNP), its buffer zone, and selected corridors in Moyen-Chari” (PD p.3). More specifically, the project’s immediate objectives are to “ensure the conservation and sustainable use of Manda National Park (MNP) and its immediate surroundings, while demonstrating the use of wildlife corridors as a technique for rehabilitating and maintaining the biological and genetic diversity of protected areas in southeastern Chad” (Project Executive Summary, p.2).

Without this project, the business as usual situation would be for MNP to “continue to try to exclude farmers and pastoralists from using the resources inside the park, thus leading to greater tension and conflicts, increased threat to biodiversity of global significance, and greater forgone benefits and opportunity costs” (PD p.3). To ensure this scenario doesn’t come true, the project aims to “address immediate threats and remove barriers currently preventing the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity at MNP, its buffer and priority corridor zones” (PD p.3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective as stated in the Project Document (p.125) is for the project to ensure that “the globally and nationally significant biodiversity of southeastern Chad is sustainably used by, and provides benefits to, current generations while being conserved for the benefit of future generations”.

To meet those objectives, the project was structured around the following three outcomes², against which the project will be assessed:

1. MNP operates within a well-functioning, participatory management system;
2. Residents of surrounding communities and transhumant are placing significantly less pressure on MNP's natural resources, while obtaining benefits from sustainable development;
3. One or more wildlife/livestock corridors are functioning in support of the rehabilitation of MNP wildlife, in maintaining ecological connectivity between MNP and other priority protected areas in Moyen-Chari, and in support to sustainable pastoral management.

(2013 PIR)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation. The logical framework was revised during the projet inception phase, during which time the above-listed outcomes were defined. As a result, the wording of specific outcomes differs slightly between the PD and other project documents produced during the implementation phase. However, those changes did not alter the nature of the planned project activities.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as satisfactory due to the project's good alignment with both Chad's national priorities and GEF-3 priorities under the biodiversity program.

Indeed, in Chad, Article 48 of the constitution requires that "the State and the decentralized territorial communities must ensure the protection of the environment" (PD p.1), thus supporting the project approach of enabling local communities and NGOs to carry out conservation activities and take responsibility for them. The project is also in line with Chad's *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action*

Plan (NBSAP), adopted in 2000. Indeed, the NBSAP “notes the importance and biological richness of Chad’s Sudanian zone”(PD p.1) and emphasizes the issue this project focuses on, namely “the poor relations between local populations and many protected areas in the country” (PD p.1). The project is also in line with Chad’s 1998 *Rural Development Strategy*, supporting one of the strategy’s four key objectives, namely the restoration and protection of ecosystem processes, particularly problems linked with human activities (PD p.1). Finally, the TE (p.35) also emphasizes that the project “supports the priorities of local populations as expressed in their cantonal development plan”, with the project being coherent with the needs expressed by the population of the cantons surrounding PNM as well as those of Bedaya, Dobo and Bessada, as expressed during focus group discussions organized in those cantons.

The project is also fully in line with the GEF-3 biodiversity focal area’s first strategic objective, namely *catalyzing sustainability for protected areas*. The project aims to establish this capacity within the MNP by focusing on improving the enabling environment, developing capacity and driving national-level policy reform (PES, p.4). By demonstrating the viability of this conservation model, this project might also contribute to enhancing the sustainability of other protected areas in Chad and beyond.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	--

The TE rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory due to the successful development of a park management system and of wildlife/livestock corridors, but noticing shortcomings in the implementation of adequate monitoring systems for the project and only weak change in the agricultural practices of the local population. According to the TE, the project achieved 80% of its objectives. This TER supports this assessment and, for the same reasons, also rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory.

In the paragraphs below, we discuss the extent to which the project successfully achieved its planned outcomes:

Outcome 1: Manda National Park (MNP) operates within a well-functioning, participatory management system

The TE evaluated achievements under this component as having been 100% achieved (TE p.31). Indeed, most planned activities under this result have been accomplished, including the operationalization of the environmental database, as well as the development of institutional support for conservation activities in MNP. The management system developed as part of the project was truly participatory, with all relevant stakeholders having actively participated in the process.

Outcome 2: Residents of surrounding communities and transhumant are placing significantly less pressure on MNP’s natural resources, while obtaining benefits from sustainable development;

The TE evaluated achievements under this component as having been 80% achieved (TE p.31). Planned micro-credit schemes have been implemented, but the TE notes that while some of the most important threats outlined in the PD have been reduced, many have not been significantly so (TE p.31). Poaching has been reduced by 35%, bush fires by 5%, and forest clearing for agricultural purposes has largely been

eliminated. The awareness of local populations regarding conservation issues has been increased through the dissemination of information regarding national forest conservation regulations. However, there was reportedly no significant change regarding the agricultural and herding practices of farmers in the project area. Indeed, the TE notes that “ the factors and forces that led the local population to abuse the vegetation and wildlife in MNP, namely poverty and population growth, remain” (TE p.38). Overall, the project did have important positive outcomes, but achievements were less significant than expected, and not significant enough to categorically define the project’s conservation activities as successful.

Outcome 3: One or more wildlife/livestock corridors are functioning in support of the rehabilitation of MNP wildlife, in maintaining ecological connectivity between MNP and other priority protected areas in Moyen-Chari, and in support to sustainable pastoral management.

The TE evaluated achievements under this component as having been 60% achieved (TE p.31). In all 7 cantons, Cantonal Natural Resource Management Committees were set up and supported the project through monitoring and the distribution of awareness raising material. Protected corridors and associated management plans have been established for MNP and the Djoli-Kira Forest, but no regular wildlife monitoring has been set up as planned. Despite those shortcomings, an aerial monitoring survey conducted in 2014 in the protected corridors noticed that the vegetation cover had improved and ecosystems showed signs of improvement (TE p.31). This is positive, in particular due to the challenge caused by the large distances existing between the areas that the corridors meant to connect.

Overall Assessment

The project successfully reinforced the capacity of the MNP through recruiting, training and the revision of regulations to better protect biodiversity. The planned wildlife/livestock corridors have been established, and while the project did contribute to the development of a biodiversity monitoring system, it has not yet been fully implemented. Finally, the project was very successful in engaging local relevant stakeholders, including location populations, which has enhanced and will continue to enhance project impact and conservation outcomes.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory due to lower than expected project disbursements, and the delays that were incurred at various stages of project implementation. However, the TE finds a relatively strong financial management and staff engagement. For those reasons, this TER also rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory.

According to the TE, “financial means, necessary material and human resources have not always been available to implement project activities within delays and meet the agreed objectives within budget and without waste” (TE p.v). In addition, the project faced a few financial issues.

First, much of the expected co-financing did not materialize. Indeed, the planned contributions from the EU (\$350,000), France (\$640,000) and Care International (\$100,000) did not come through. This forced the project management unit to revise the budget allocated to various program components.

The project faced initial delays due to staffing issues and revisions to the project implementation plan. During implementation, difficulties conciliating the UNDP’s procurement procedures with the reality of the field in Tchad have slowed down the project. Seen in this context, the project’s disbursement rate of 83% can be considered as satisfactory (TE p.83).

Finally, from the start, the project suffered from difficulties hiring and retaining competent employees, including key technical staff, secretaries and drivers (TE p.42). However, the staff that was recruited was very engaged in the project and appropriately conducted the financial management of the project; they were an important factor in the project’s success.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE rates sustainability as moderately likely. On the upside, the institutional capacities of relevant actors have been substantially strengthened and “the committees set up are now better structured and functional, and local administrations appear to be committed to maintaining the gains made as part of the project” (TE p.45). On the downside, some of the stakeholders have only weakly engaged in the project, the project has failed to put in place strong coordination mechanisms between project actors, and there is no clear financing mechanisms for the initiative going forward. As a result, this TER also rates project sustainability as moderately likely.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

According to the TE, the project has already identified financial partnerships that could ensure the financial sustainability of the project (TE p.44). However, the nature of those partnerships is not clearly defined, nor is their scope. The TE also reports that local authorities have voiced their interest in continuing to finance local related conservation projects. Overall, it appears moderately likely that funds will be available to continue at least some of the project activities.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

Local populations are now much more aware of the importance of biodiversity conservation in the area. The micro-credit activities put in place as part of the project helped support local economic development, reduce the pressure on natural resources, and reduce poaching (TE p.45).

On the other hand, “the project did not propose clear alternatives to the groups that are most negatively impacting the MNP’s environment (herders, farmers, hunters, etc.). They get substantial financial benefits from their activities and, even though they might now be more aware of the negative impact of their activities on the environment, are not yet ready to give up those activities since alternative income-generating activities are not available” (TE p.45).

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

The institutional capacities of relevant actors have been substantially strengthened. Local partners now have much better awareness and understanding of conservation issues, and natural resource management committees have been created (TE p.44). Those committees are now “functional, and local administrations appear to be committed to maintaining the gains made as part of the project” (TE p.45). However, the TE provides very little detail on the activities of those committees and the extent to which they are really well positioned to continue project activities following completion.

The TE also praises the project strategy which, acting on three fronts (national/central government, NGOs, local communities), built in a convergence in interests and made it more likely that over time, various actors at various levels would be able to compensate for each other’s weaknesses and ensure project sustainability (TE p.45).

However, the TE also notes low commitment of the national government for the project, which could challenge the continuation of the project and its benefits going forward.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

There are no reported or known environmental risks to this project. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as likely.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Most of the expected co-financing that was expected for this project did not materialize. Indeed, the planned contributions from the EU (\$350,000), France (\$640,000) and Care International (\$100,000) did not come through. UNDP financing did come through, albeit at a higher level than expected (\$1,080,000 instead of \$500,000), thereby filling some of the gaps left by the other funders who had dropped out. Overall, co-financing issues do not appear to have affected project outcomes or sustainability.

Note that according to the TE, the in-kind co-financing promised by the government did not come through. However, according to the 2013 PIR, “co-financing from government and communities, even if just in kind, should not be underestimated and should be considered fully disbursed, given the fixed assets availed to the project throughout its lifetime” (2013 PIR, p.60). It remains unclear to this TER whether or not government co-financing was provided.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project suffered from initial delays due to negotiations regarding (i) the Project Document, which postponed project start from 2003 to 2006; (ii) the implementation of the Project Initial Phase, and (iii) the setting up of the Project Management Unit (TE p.12). Once the project started, there were difficulties reconciling the UNDP's procurement procedures with the reality of the field in Chad that slowed down the project. As a result of those delays, the project was extended until December 2015 (TE p.7).

On the upside, according to the TE, initial project delays might have enabled the project team to engage in more, deeper consultations with stakeholders. This in turn may have contributed to better project outcomes (TE p.11).

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE describes country ownership and general involvement from the government of Chad to have been very low:

"The government of Chad was not able to provide the project the co-financing it had originally promised. In addition, some of the most important contributions expected from the government – legislative documents regarding conservation and biodiversity in MNP – have not yet been approved. " (TE p.43)

However, as noted above, it remains unclear whether the government co-financing materialized or not.

According to the TE, it was sometimes difficult to schedule technical meetings involving government officials, and there were communication issues between the Project Management Unit and the government focal points. However, towards the end of the project, the Ministry was strongly engaged in the project monitoring activities. (TE p.43)

Overall, country ownership was rather low, and this lack of involvement might negatively impact the sustainability of the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E design at entry as moderately satisfactory. Instead, this TER rates M&E design as moderately unsatisfactory due to the weakness of the original logical framework developed for the project.

General assessment: The Project Document (pp.95-96) features a comprehensive M&E plan, including monitoring arrangements, mid-term and final evaluation activities, timeline, responsibility for M&E activities, budget and a plan for learning and knowledge sharing. The logical framework for the project (PD pp.125-131) appears adequate, covering a wide range of project components – engagement with stakeholders, expected conservation activities, etc. - and capturing all intended project outcomes.

However, when taking a closer look, we notice that outputs are not listed, that many of the indicators do not meet the SMART criteria, and that the chosen indicators focus on project activities, and not on project outcomes.

Weakness of Indicators: While indicators were specified for all project components as part of the logical framework (PD pp.125-131), those indicators were often not easily measurable, and the means for verification were often ill defined. For instance, one of the indicators is “*Residents of 30% of surrounding communities have benefited from micro-enterprise / micro-credit schemes by end of year 3*”. This indicator fails to specify what benefits should be captured, and what levels of benefiting residents must have reached to be qualified as having benefited. In addition, the logframe does not state what data or means of verification will be used to make this assessment. Several other indicators suffer from similar problems. (TE p.16)

Focus on activities instead of outcomes: The indicators selected as part of the project’s logical framework focus on making sure activities have taken place as planned, and not on ensuring that beneficiaries have benefited from positive changes as a result of those activities. As stated in the TE, “the accomplishment of an activity such as signing an agreement or hosting a workshop isn’t an end in itself, but simply the means towards it” (TE p.14). The project focused its monitoring efforts towards ensuring that project activities took place as planned, and not towards ensuring that those activities translated into benefits on the ground. An example of this is the indicator “*Pilot program for fuelwood alternative energy supply to Sarh is operational by end of year 4.*”, which supports the outcome ‘Residents of surrounding communities and transhumants are placing significantly less pressure on MNP’s natural resources, while obtaining benefits from sustainable development’ (PD p.129). This indicator – as well as all other indicators for this outcome – focuses on activities implemented by the project, and not on more complex measures of biodiversity, conservation or socio-economic improvement.

Other shortcomings: In addition to the other two weaknesses above, the logical framework and evaluability potential of the project were weakened as no baseline data was collected.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E implementation for the project as moderately satisfactory due to the completion of all planned M&E outputs, but noting several delays in the delivery of M&E outputs. This TER also rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory.

In 2007, during the initial project phase, the logical framework was revised and restructured around 3 results and 11 intermediary products (TE p.7). Efforts were made to refocus indicators around intended project benefits instead of focusing on project activities. While this is a positive development, severe shortcomings remained with regards to the verifiability and measurability of most indicators.

All planned M&E reports were eventually delivered, but “sometimes with severe delays” (TE p.26). According to the TE, project staff were not particularly cognizant of the importance of M&E activities, and, throughout the life of the project, a dedicated M&E expert was not always available, meaning that the project coordinator often had to take care of M&E reporting (TE p.28).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP, which implemented the project jointly with UNOPS. In the TE, the UNDP’s quality of implementation for this project is rated as satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as moderately satisfactory due to the overall adequate management and support it provided to the project, but noticing important weaknesses in project design that ended up affecting its implementation.

Project management and support:

According to the TE, for this project, UNOPS acted as the implementing agency on behalf of UNDP in Chad (TE p.29). The performance of both organizations should therefore be examined.

According to the TE, “the UNDP, through its Chad office, was fully involved in the daily management and monitoring of the project. However, the UNDP-Chad office was not able to establish good lines of communication and information exchange with the government agencies involved in the project (TE p.23).

However, UNDP adequately fulfilled its role as technical advisory, ensuring the project was being implemented as planned and ensuring procurement rules were being respected (TE p.29).

As for UNOPS, “it reliably managed the project in a way that respected all regulations. However, project management showed weaknesses, with disbursement requests often facing long delays, and payments to suppliers being approved late (TE p.23). UNOPS’ office location, far away from the project, substantially contributed to the delays involved in implementing activities (TE p.29).

Weaknesses in the project document/project design phase: The project document, while comprising all required sections, suffered from important gaps. First, while the project objectives were well defined, the specific way in which the project activities would contribute to their accomplishment was less clear. For example, the logical link between ensuring the active participation of farmers to the MNP management plan and the reduction in pressure on the environment is never clearly stated; at project completion, results show that this reduced pressure might in fact never have materialized. The PD describes how better environmental management will benefit all stakeholders, but does not clearly specify how it would do so, or how those stakeholders would be convinced to change their practices accordingly (TE p.12). Indeed, the PD focuses more on the positive impact of the MNP conservation project on the environment rather than on the local population, without explaining how both can go hand in hand. (TE p.13)

In addition, the TE criticizes the UNDP for, in the project design phase, not having adequately considered the project risks related to the immensity of the territory covered by the project, its difficulty of access, and particular cultural specificities (TE p.13). While it is unclear how this oversight has negatively impacted the project, it is obvious that a thorough risk analysis has not been done for the project at the design stage. While the PD mentions a few risks (PD p.2), the fact that “a considerable number of risks, that are featured in the GEF/UNDP’s checklist on risk management, have not been mentioned for this project is deplorable. Amongst those risks, those related to beneficiary receptivity, accuracy of initial hypotheses, local financial support, implementation schedule and expert availability were not considered and did end up negatively impacting the project.” (TE p.17)

However, it should also be mentioned that the PD had important strengths. For instance, the PD carefully considered and incorporated the experience of other relevant projects into this project’s design (TE p.19).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---	--

The executing agency for this project was the Chad Ministry of Environment and Water (MEW). The TE rates the quality of their execution as moderately satisfactory due to project implementation delays and staffing issues that plagued the project. This TER agrees with this rating.

Overall, the MEW adequately fulfilled its project execution mandate, ensuring that project activities be implemented on time (TE p.23). Together with the Project Management Unit and the Steering Committee, the MEW “worked hard to ensure that all project activities would be executed” (TE p.24).

According to the TE, “several activities were executed with delays”, and the financial management of the project was found to be lacking (TE p.43). The MEW suffered from staffing issues, struggling to recruit and retain qualified staff during the first years of project implementation (TE p.42).

However, the outputs delivered by the MEW were found to be of good quality, including the MEW’s engagement with various project stakeholders, which was instrumental in ensuring positive project outcomes.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

As mentioned above, the project’s M&E framework unfortunately did not focus on measuring concrete measures of environmental or biodiversity change as a result of the project. The 2014 aerial monitoring survey conducted in the protected corridors shows that the vegetation cover has improved and ecosystems show signs of improvement (TE p.31). The evaluator also reports seeing “ a band of baboons and a multitude of birds in the park”, but this anecdotal evidence cannot be relied on to speak to environmental change caused by the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

As was the case for environmental change, the project’s M&E system did not adequately measure socio-economic change. A microcredit scheme was put in place, but its impact has not been measured. The TE reports that “the microcredit and microsavings scheme that was set up has allowed local communities to develop income-generating activities that are reducing pressure on the MNP’s natural resources” (TE pp.45-46), but no evidence is provided to support this claim.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems,

including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Capacity-building was an important project component, with several awareness raising activities being held to encourage local herders and farmers to reduce their impact on the environment.

b) Governance

The project supported the creation of the Development and Management Committee of the National Park of Manda, including several partners representing civil society, development NGOs including COOPI (Italian Cooperation), APDI (Association for the Promotion of Sustainable Integrated Development) and ADTS-Chad (Friends of the Earth South Chad), womens associations, farmers organizations, unions and the decentralized public services. (PIR 2013, p.62)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were reported as part of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

While a lot of the project elements (natural resource management committees, cantonal development committess, participatory approaches adopted, etc.) could be replicated to other areas of Chad and beyond, they have not yet been replicated.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The report presents the following lessons learned:

1. Biodiversity conservation is by nature a transdisciplinary and multisectoral issue. It requires joining the efforts of several relevant actors and harmonizing their positions within the project framework.
2. Closeness and continuous dialogue between the project team, MNP staff and local populations were necessary to achieve results.
3. Developing revenue-generating activities for local populations is a useful way of reducing poaching.
4. Activities in the field are essential to project success, and should be given the necessary financial support.
5. When alternative revenue-generating activities aren't proposed as an alternative to local communities, the chance that their behavior will change is low, even if they become aware of the importance of environmental conservation.
6. Dependency on external funding reduces a project's financial sustainability.
7. The project suffered from delays, often when transferring funds. This has affected project implementation and reduced the confidence of stakeholders in the project. This issue could easily be avoided by adequately training project staff to ensure all requests, financial and otherwise, are submitted following the procedures established by UNDP and UNOPS. Similarly, UNDP and UNOPS must be clearer in communicating those procedures to project staff.
8. Project documents are not perfect, but are usually well prepared by multidisciplinary and competent teams. The Project Document should not be changed without solid reasons and the certainty that changes won't lead to project failure

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report makes the following recommendations:

1. The project's institutional and organizational structure should be revised in view of a phase 2 project: some of the project's planned results will only materialize if a broader ecosystem protection network is put in place. To do so, it would be necessary to:
 - a. Develop fieldwork activities, and work with the private sector and local communities;
 - b. Exploit the extent to which UNDP procedures allow for the decentralization of GEF funds, thereby facilitating the implementation of activities by the PMU;
 - c. Develop a procedures manual including a clear M&E plan and replication plan;
 - d. Ensure to better conform with national priorities and ensure that workplans remain flexible enough to meet national priorities, despite sometimes departing from the original logframe;
 - e. Reevaluate the necessity of using UNOPS as the auxiliary implementing agency
 - f. Contact the IUCN to consider established a technical collaboration on activities related to the local management;
 - g. Plan for a longer project duration.
2. Support the creation of complementary revenue-generation activities:

- a. Promote tourism and eco-tourism activities, thereby ensuring additional economic opportunities for the MNP.
 - b. Promote the identification of conservation village leaders, including women and first nations, and teach them group participation tools.
3. Create a strong synergy between different actors
 - a. Emphasize co-financing by involving donors who can add value to the project;
 - b. Collaborate with university or research institutions by developing partnerships to generate new knowledge;
 - c. Insofar as possible, involve government organizations and existing NGOs in project implementation to ensure sustainability.
4. Improve security in the region and around the MNP
 - a. The project should work towards the opening of the park to the Chadian public and to external visitors. The visibility of the park will strengthen its mission and will provide additional revenues;
 - b. Security in the region will to a large extent determine the feasibility of a tourism component to the project. This does not only depend on local authorities or on the government, but also on regional stability and the stability of other bordering countries;
 - c. The project's management units will have to monitor security and make decisions about programme scope based on this reality.
5. Define a better plan to leverage results and a good communication strategy.
 - a. Define a leverage plan that would allow to identify good practices and lessons learned, the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, and ways to promote those practices and lessons.
6. Strengthen the capacity of beneficiaries
 - a. Insofar as possible, ensure a good representation of women in the various committees and consultation platforms (insofar as possible, considering the low representation of women in partner organizations), and consider their specific role, notably within village communities;
 - b. Strengthen the involvement of communities in the management of parks is a priority; The new law on protected areas is a notable success, and should be supported by local governance and the sharing of economic gains.
7. Increase awareness
 - a. Campaigns to raise the population's awareness regarding the importance of biodiversity and protected areas should be held, in particular using radio;
 - b. Improve the awareness raising, education and information of authorities about the legal and regulatory aspects related to park management;

- c. Strengthen the management capacities (human, material, financial) of MNP at all levels, but in particular on the field. This starts with the recruitment of personal for monitoring, but also includes training agents and communities.
8. Sustainable natural resource management
- a. Develop sustainable natural resource management around the park and the corridors;
 - b. Better define and organize the corridors for cattle movement;
 - c. Local management conventions need to be established with herders. This will start with communication and awareness campaigns with herders, farmers and other relevant actors.
9. Management of the Project Management Unit
- a. Strengthen the PMU staff: secretary, technical M&E staff, etc.
10. Develop alternative activities
- a. Develop alternative income-generating activities for herders, and involve them in conservation activities.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The project clearly assesses each of the planned results, providing a % rating and describing achievements accomplished under each component.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Ratings are always well substantiated, but it is not always clear where the evidence comes from. It is sometimes unclear whether assessments are based on facts and evidence, or on the perceptions/opinion of the evaluator. The report is consistent.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability is adequately assessed. Project exit is not specifically discussed, but only addressed as part of the broader sustainability discussion.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are detailed and clear, but not in all cases supported by the rest of the TE. They are also sometimes very self-evident.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	A summary of project costs is included per activity is included, but actual co-financing figures are not available.	MS

Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides a very thorough discussion of the M&E system put in place in the design stage of the project, and provides sufficient analysis of the M&E activities that were conducted during the project's implementation phase.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.