

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

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1239	
GEF Agency project ID		PIMS: 494, Atlas: 58768	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System of Ethiopia (SDPASE)	
Country/Countries		Ethiopia	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Operational Programs: 1-4 Strategic Priority: BD1 Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas	
Executing agencies involved		Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA) and GTZ-International Services	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Yes – through consultations	
Private sector involvement		Yes – through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 2016	
Actual date of project completion		September 2017 <sup>1</sup>	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	317,821	317,821
	Co-financing	250,000	0
GEF Project Grant		9,000,000	8,700,000
Co-financing	IA own	0	1,857,000
	Government	4,764,000	4,700,000
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	7,320,000	NA
	Private sector	7,750,000	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	2,595,000	NA
Total GEF funding		9,317,821	9,017,821
Total Co-financing		22,479,000	6,557,000
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		31,796,821	15,574,821
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		August 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2016	
Author of TE		Giorgio V. Brandolini, Getish Tekle	
TER completion date		November 16, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

<sup>1</sup> This completion date is in the future, but this is indeed what is stated in the TE (cover page)

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective is stated as the following in the project document: "Ethiopia's biodiversity, ecosystems and ecological processes are effectively safeguarded from human-induced pressures and adequately represented in a sustainable Protected Area System that is contributing significantly to economic development, both locally and nationally" (PD p.7).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

While the PD does not clearly state a development objective for the SDPASE, it is also clear that one of the secondary objectives of the project was to support the local economic development of populations in protected areas. This objective is largely an instrumental one as it supports the social buy-in for protected areas and enables local populations to move to alternative less resource-intensive ways of making a living.

The project was planned around two phases. During the first phase, the focus would be on capacity and institutional change. During the second phase, the project would focus on consolidating, scaling up and replicating the good management practices developed in the first phase. (PD p.11)

Over the two phases of the project, the following outcomes will be emphasized:

- **Outcome 1:** Protected areas are mainstreamed in the development framework in Ethiopia and receive greater political support
- **Outcome 2:** Appropriate policy, regulatory and governance frameworks in place, leading to redefinition of protected area categories and reduced land-use conflict
- **Outcome 3:** Institutional arrangements and capacity for protected area planning and management strengthened leading to improved PA management
- **Outcome 4:** New protected area management options and partnerships trialed, and replicated through partnerships catalyzed across protected areas
- **Outcome 5:** Sustainable financing mechanisms contributing to protected area budgets

(Summary of outcomes listed on PD pp.7-8)

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.

#### 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory as the project outcomes contribute to wildlife conservation and are consistent with international agreements, and Ethiopia’s policies. This TER agrees with this assessment and also rates project relevance as satisfactory.

The project is highly consistent with the priorities of the Ethiopian Government. Indeed, even prior to the project, the government had been active in setting up protected areas in the country. Ethiopia had already set up “a network of wildlife conservation areas and priority forest areas” covering 14% of the country, “above the global average for protected area coverage” (PD p.4). The project is also relevant in focusing on the gaps currently plaguing Ethiopia’s protected areas system, namely the lack of participation from the local population, and the disconnect between Ethiopia’s environment and development agendas (PD p.5). Indeed, the project ensures that PA ecosystems become “a source of income for the local communities” (TE p.27); with 80% of the population engaged in agriculture, the ecosystem and climatic benefits of PAs are incredibly relevant to the national poverty reduction and development agendas. The project indeed integrates conservation and income-generation components, ensuring its sustainability and relevance to the local context. (TE p.27)

The project is also fully in line with GEF-4 priorities. The SDPASE’s activities fall under Strategic Programme 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems. Indeed, “the project contributes to establishing the legal framework and capacities for wildlife conservation and managing the federal Protected areas” (TE p.25).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	--

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory as the project “improved the legal framework and management of the Protected area (...), the seizure of illegally traded wildlife increased [and the project introduced a] participatory approach in engaging the local communities in ecosystem conservation, development and use” (TE p.62). This TER assesses the project as having made significant progress towards the achievement of all its planned outcomes, but notes that it is still lacking a sustainable financing plan and therefore rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory only. In the section below, we discuss the extent to which the project successfully achieved the outcomes it was set to achieve:

**Outcome 1: Protected areas are mainstreamed in the development framework in Ethiopia and receive greater political support.**

The project only somewhat successfully supported the EWCA in mainstreaming protected areas. Indeed, “the national policies acknowledge the value of PA and ecosystems conservation but due to the scarce capacity of EWCA to rally the other environmental bodies to advocate for they are not embodied into the mechanisms framing the sector development actions”(TE p. 43). Some linkages were achieved with the tourism sector, although there was no formal adoption of PAs as a key marketing strategy by the tourism sector. Nonetheless, “during the project execution a positive trend in the inflow of tourists there was recorded: the PA income generated from tourism raised from US\$ 2.7 million to US\$ 7.6 million between 2008 and 2014” (TE p.43).

**Outcome 2: Appropriate policy, regulatory and governance frameworks in place, leading to redefinition of protected area categories and reduced land-use conflict.**

The project very successfully achieved this outcome. Indeed, “the project assisted the EWCA Legal department to elaborate the legal framework for the PA management, facilitated the elaboration of implementation documents such as the Wildlife Development, Conservation and Utilization Policy and Strategy, the Second growth and transformation programmes for wildlife conservation and Wildlife sector 5 year strategic plan (2015 - 2019). Other sector strategy documents elaborated in support of the Wildlife conservation and PA management include: the Business Plan Development Tool for Protected Area Management in Ethiopia, the Development of a marketing strategy for wildlife tourism in Ethiopia, the EWCA Climate change strategy and the EWCA re-organization study” (TE p.38).

Unfortunately, according to the TE, “the impact of these documents national- and local-wide is hampered by the weak institutional positioning and leadership of EWCA, i.e. by the insufficient resources managed by EWCA and insufficient mainstreaming of wildlife conservation into national, regional and local development decision making” (TE p.39).

While the outcome has been achieved, it is not currently having the expected environmental impact.

**Outcome 3: Institutional arrangements and capacity for protected area planning and management strengthened leading to improved PA management.**

According to the TE, this outcome is the area where most project efforts were concentrated. In particular, efforts were put towards developing EWCA technical and managerial capacities. The TE describes those efforts as having been fruitful, with the EWCA having adopted “new approaches, methodologies and innovative analysis, planning and monitoring work tools in managing the PAs” (TE P.44). In addition, the TE reports “EWCA staff is now active in PA management, wildlife surveillance and assistance to tourists, scholars and other users of the PA” (TE p.44).

**Outcome 4: New protected area management options and partnerships trialed, and replicated through partnerships catalyzed across protected areas.**

The project “strengthened the EWCA and mobilized external skills to develop an approach and best practices to improve the partnership between the PA system and local population” (TE p.44). Strengthening the EWCA’s capacities went a long way in contributing to establishing partnerships between the PA system and other wildlife programs, covering a wide range of topics.

The average PA management effectiveness tracking tool (METT) score doubled from 24% to 56% between 2008 and 2016, showing impressive improvements in PA management and meeting the project targets as defined in the original project logical framework.

**Outcome 5: Sustainable financing mechanisms contributing to protected area budgets.**

At the moment, the PA system generates income “shared between the Federal and the Regional governments, the PA authorities and local communities” (TE p.46). Unfortunately, “the bulk of EWCA budget is assigned and regulated along the national budget and is not flexible to match the evolution of the commitments and opportunities created by the development and utilization of the PA” (TE p.46). At project closing, 40% of the \$US 2.24 million EWCA budget came from PA revenue, and the remaining 60% from a government allocation, still lower than the target 60% figure mentioned in the logframe. It is also likely that the current budget of \$US 2.24 million is not enough to sustainably finance the EWCA going forward. Overall, there is still no evidence of a really sustainable financing mechanism in place yet.

**Overall Assessment**

Overall, the project achieved several of its outcomes. Notably, it successfully strengthened the PA legal framework, improved the EWCA’s management practices and wildlife protection enforcement capacity, raised environmental awareness, generated support for wildlife conservation within local communities, and tested alternative livelihoods models (TE p.62). On the other hand, the policy, regulatory and governance changes do not currently appear to be achieving the expected environmental impact, and the project still lacks a sustainable financing plan.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	<b>Rating: Highly satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	------------------------------------

The TE justifies its Highly Satisfactory efficiency score due to the fact that “the project adaptive management approach and GIZ-IS collaboration in the project implementation mobilized external

expertise and financial resources through co-financed projects resulting in the smooth activities implementation” (TE p.62). This TER also rates efficiency as highly satisfactory due to the successful collaboration between the EWCA and GIZ-IS, the adaptive management approach displayed by the project, as well as its good financial management.

The project was implemented using a mixed approach, whereby the EWCA was the main execution agency, but assisted by the GIZ-IS to provide final and administrative services, as well as strategic technical assistance (TE p.31). According to the TE, this was a wise approach that made sense in the context of this project, and that allowed for more effective project execution.

According to the TE, project execution was achieved very flexibly, using an initially fixed project timeframe, but relying on work plans that were annually approved. The project “adopted a pro-active approach to face the challenges identified case by case in the field, and formulated Annual work plans to answer to these emerging issues instead of adopting a stiffer global planning approach. Thus, different implementation paces and packages were delivered along the individual PA situation and progress” (TE p.32).

Finally, financial management for the project appeared to be very good; at the time when the TE was written, “the project had allocated the available resources with expenditures amounting to 100% of those [of] the first phase and 90% of those of the second phase” (TE p.33).

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE rates overall sustainability as moderately likely due to the fact that sustainable financial management of the PA system has not yet been achieved, with resources currently generated not sufficient to fund the necessary activities for a healthy, sustainable PA network in Ethiopia (TE p.9). This TER agrees with this assessment and also rates overall sustainability as moderately likely.

**Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Unlikely**

While the project has made progress in developing new financial partnerships further, thereby ensuring project sustainability, current and planned revenues are not sufficient to ensure the financial sustainability of PAs.

At project closing, 40% (lower than the 60% target figure mentioned in the logframe) of the \$US 2.24 million EWCA budget came from PA revenue, and the remaining 60% from a government allocation. It is also likely that the current budget of \$US 2.24 million will not be enough to sustainably finance the EWCA going forward. Overall, there is still no evidence of a really sustainable financing mechanism in place yet. However, the government of Ethiopia will most likely continue to fund PAs, which improves the chances of success for project sustainability going forward.

**Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely**

The TE rates socio-political sustainability as likely since “the local communities’ engagement creates the conditions for the sustainable PA ecosystem management” (TE p.9). Indeed, the TE provides great evidence that the project successfully raised the awareness of local populations about the importance and value of protected areas. Information was disseminated locally through “TV, radio, websites, brochures, leaflets, magazines, reports, exhibitions, as well as educational programmes for schools” (TE p.58). The fact the PAs are contributing to the livelihood of local communities also helps supports their social acceptability and perceived desirability.

At the national level, “the interest in and national commitment to the sustainable utilization of the PAs is increasing steadily” (TE p.57), with researchers and tourists increasingly visiting PAs. This interest in and awareness of PAs are also key in ensuring that social and political commitment to PAs remains.

### **Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely**

First, the project put substantial efforts towards building the capacity of the EWCA, which is now much better able to manage the PAs as evidenced by its increased METT scores. Indeed, as described in the TE, “the EWCA and PA authorities have enlarged their scope from Wildlife to Ecosystems management by strengthening their capacities and methodologies to plan, operate and monitor wildlife and their ecosystems, by using tools such as the METT scoring, wildlife tracking collars and routine field monitoring surveys, by establishing the PA development advisory committees and rangers’ collaboration with the local communities in the PA ecosystems protection” (TE p.6).

In addition, the policy and regulatory level work done by the project has resulted in the enhancement of PA’s legal status, although this has not yet translated into real environmental gains.

### **Environmental Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely**

The TE reports the presence of “climate change and community related hazards” as potential threats to the project, but does not describe their likelihood. Given this uncertainty and lack of detail, environmental sustainability is rated as moderately 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?

The TE describes the state of co-financing at project end succinctly:

*“The GEF grant of over US\$ 9 million was matched by UNDP’s own grant of about US\$1.9 million and the Government of Ethiopia in kind contribution of about US\$ 4.7 million, for a total investment of US \$15.9 million of which US\$ 14.6 million had been spent at the time of the Terminal evaluation field mission (April-May 2016). The project catalyzed another US\$ 37.4*

*million worth of Wildlife conservation funds through co-finance projects, i.e., about 2.5 times the project itself (see table here below), for a total of US\$ 52.0 million.” (TE p.5)*

The MTR explains why the final co-financing available to the project differs so much from the co-financing announced at CEO endorsement:

*“Since the project documents were first drafted in 2006, there have been substantial changes to the financing of the project and, more specifically, to the co-financing of the activities. One major co-financer of the project, African Parks, ceased their operations in Ethiopia in the period between the completion of the project documents and the commencement of the project. This represented a significant decline in co-finance (of USD 7.75 million). However, other sources of co-finance have emerged (for example, EU funding for FZS, see Annex 8) and further funding is in the pipeline. In addition, funding from UNDP has been made available to the project (total value USD 1,199,374.00 over the three years, 2010 – 2012), partly as a result of the excellent financial management and disbursement displayed by the project. (MTR p.19)*

It must be noted that much of the co-financing reported in the MTR and TE refers to financing for others programs in wildlife and protected areas management in Ethiopia that came through as a result of the SDPASE project, and not for core funding to be used as part of this project. Nonetheless, it testifies to the ability of the project to catalyze partners and promote more spending on conservation issues in Ethiopia.

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?

Project implementation started in October 2008 and was performed in two 4-year phases, the second one with a planned ending date in September 2016. A one-year extension was granted to the project until September 2016 to put in place a trust fund retaining the income generated by the PA management system and catalyzing external contributions. (TE p.5)

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 does not discuss country ownership specifically. However, the government of Ethiopia, through the executing agency – the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority – has actively participated in the execution of this project.

At project end, the TE reports that “the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority has allocated Birr 87 million (about US\$ 4 million) to ease the relocation of settlers from the core area of Simien Mountains National Park along a participatory approach to ecosystem conservation and local development” (TE p.6), showing evidence of the agency’s commitment to PAs.



Finally, the Government of Ethiopia did provide substantial in-kind co-financing to the project, amounting to \$4.7 million, also evidencing its commitment to the issues tackled as part of this 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E design at entry as moderately satisfactory due to several baseline values not being established at entry, but does not provide any detailed justification for this rating. This TER, instead, rates M&E design as satisfactory as all components of a strong M&E framework were planned and the logical framework was comprehensive, logically sound, and most of the indicators met the SMART criteria.

The Project Document (pp.17-23, 34-35) presents a very detailed and well-structured strategic results framework presenting project outcomes, key performance indicators, baseline data when available, targets, means of verification and critical assumptions. Unlike the TE, this TER finds that baseline data is specified for all key performance indicators, and notices a real effort to ensure those indicators meeting the SMART criteria.

The PD presents the project’s plans for external evaluations, internal evaluations and monitoring activities. An adequate budget appears to have been set for the project, and the PD even mentions the projects’ plan to use M&E data for adaptive management: “The project will be implemented through an adaptive framework that feeds the findings of M&E into operational planning, thus enabling management strategies and activities to be adjusted as necessary” (PD p.14).

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory as “data collection, analyses and reporting were performed along the planned stages” and the M&E plan “was designed and performed along the flexible annual planning approach resulting in timely and customized feed-back informing the project decision making process” (TE p.8). For the same reason, this TER assigns the same rating.

The main M&E tools that were put in place by the PMU are the following:

1. Joint monitoring system, an annual exercise by EWCA/SDPASE to assess yearly progress;
2. *Management effectiveness tracking tool* (METT) scoring exercise, performed every 4 years to measure the evolution of the PA management;
3. Joint monitoring field visits of PSC members;
4. Ad hoc monitoring visits performed by the UNDP, EWCA/SDPASE staff and selected experts to identify and analyze specific topics of interest for the Wildlife conservation and PA management.

(TE p.35)

The mid-term and final evaluations took place as planned. The project team and steering group heavily used the results of the mid-term evaluation to plan the project’s second phase. According to the TE, the mid-term evaluation “recommendations concerning the management of the PA have contributed to the elaboration of the EWCA organization restructuring plan” and the evaluation “was especially useful in orientating the project in addressing the challenges of mainstreaming the PA management in the livelihood of the surrounding population”(TE p.35). Overall, the M&E system appears to have been effectively used for adaptive project management.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
--	------------------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP’s quality of implementation for this project is rated as highly satisfactory as “UNDP provided effective guidance in framing the project execution arrangements, in backstopping the National executing agency and funding the enhancement of the PA” (TE p.8). This TER also rates it as highly satisfactory, especially due to the creation of a GEF Program Specialist position in the country office.

According to the TE, the UNDP devoted “substantial own resources to the project execution” (TE p.34). The UNDP ended up committing and providing \$1,857,000 in co-financing. In addition, the country office created a new position – ‘GEF Specialist’ – to follow up on GEF projects. This, according to the TE, “allowed a more active and regular participation of the UNDP Country office in the monitoring of the project activities, including the establishment of strong links with the PMU and frequent visits to the PAs” (TE p.34). During project implementation, the UNDP showed “flexibility and practicality in the

harnessing of the implementation arrangements of this project which are slightly unusual. At the beginning it has devised the institutional arrangements governing the project and later provided a proactive backstopping to the project, monitoring its execution without interfering in the technical and administrative sphere of decisions competing to the National executing agency in collaboration with the PMU and execution partners.” (TE p.34)

The Project Document was also of very high quality, which allowed for smooth implementation and increased the likelihood the project would be delivered as planned.

Overall, the UNDP appears to have fulfilled its responsibilities as implementing agency very well, and to have played an important role in the achievement of project outcomes.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---	-----------------------------

The executing agencies for this project were the Ethiopia Water and Conservation Agency (EWCA) and the GIZ-IS. In the TE, the EWCA’s quality of execution for this project is rated as highly satisfactory as EWCA and GIZ-IS worked in complementary ways and displayed good adaptive management. This TER instead rates it as satisfactory given the EWCA’s weak ability to influence decisions beyond those under its direct influence.

This project’s executing modalities were somewhat complicated, with the GEF having signed an agreement with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), but responsibility for project execution being given to the EWCA, which was tasked to execute the project along the National Execution (NEX) modality. In addition to this, the GIZ-International Services (GIZ-IS) was contracted by the *Ministry of agriculture and rural development* (MoARD) to “provide administrative and technical support for project execution, including fiduciary management, procurement, staff recruitment, management of the PMU, and financial and operational reporting, under EWCA’s direction” (TE p.14).

The GIZ-IS’s role was mainly to take care of financial administration for the project, while the EWCA was leading in program-related activities. The EWCA and GIZ-IS worked together “in a complementary way” (TE p.8) and the project “performed in an efficient, flexible way the activities planned” (TE p.36). Project activities also took place on time and along the forecasted timeline.

The executing agencies appear to have used a proactive, adaptive management approach which facilitated the execution of activities case-by-case in response to the emerging needs of the assisted PA” (TE p.8). As mentioned in the M&E implementation section above, the PMU did use M&E evidence when making project-related decisions, and project management was flexible enough to easily adapt to new circumstances and evidence.

Despite this good execution performance, the TE criticized the EWCA for its “limited its capacity to influence decisions in sectors outside its immediate mandate” (TE p.37) which might have limited the project’s ability to mainstream its wildlife conservation activities.

**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 in the effectiveness section above, the project successfully strengthened the PA legal framework, improved the EWCA's management practices and wildlife protection enforcement capacity, raised environmental awareness, generated support for wildlife conservation within local communities, and tested alternative livelihoods models (TE p.62).

Unfortunately, there is currently only limited evidence showing the impact those institutional and social changes are making. According to the TE, there has been an "increased seizure of illegally extracted elephant ivory and destruction of MT 6.1 in 2015" (TE p.6), and the population of "some key species like the *Mountain Nyala*, *Walia*, *Swayne's Hartebeest*" have stabilized (TE p.52). Those positive changes are most likely due to the strengthened PA framework.

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.

This project has led to several important socio-economic changes in the area. First, in the protected areas, "the project contributed to raise the National revenues from eco-tourism and sustainable hunting from about US\$ 600,000 in 2007-2008 to US\$ 900,000 in 2013-2014 (+50%), the direct tourism related income (i.e., the PAs admission fee) representing about one third of this amount and the hunting related activities two thirds" (TE p.7). This is a substantial income that will contribute to the financial sustainability of the project going forward. However, it is important to note that this revenue is still smaller than that generated by hunting (TE p.51).

The TE describes the project as having created opportunities for women to play a more active role in the economy as "some of the promoted jobs concern women such as the honey production and cooking in communities near the Bale Mountains NP and Nechisar NP" (TE p.58).

The new PA management capacity has, according to the TE, positively affected "the availability of resources for the local communities – water sources, wood, forages, soil fertility" (TE p.52). Unfortunately, the project's focus on developing alternative sustainable sources of income for local populations, such as honey production and handicraft production, was only moderately successful as the EWCA "lacked the mandate and resources to tackle the external factors

influencing the behavior of the local communities and to undertake a large scale effort in such direction” (TE p.52).

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

One of the most important components of this project was to build the capacity of PAs so as to increase their enforcement ability. Indeed, the project “contributed to putting in place the institutional framework and capacities for Wildlife conservation and Protected areas system management in Ethiopia. Its achievements have been substantial in ensuring that EWCA, the lead sector agency, elaborated the legal framework of the PA and deploy management, technical and administrative capacities to run the protected areas. The action was effective in raising awareness and political support of the Ethiopian government that increased the funding of the EWCA operations in order to complement the income generated by the sustainable utilization of the PA through tourism, hunting and research fees. The project specifically raised the professional level of the PA staff and planning and monitoring capacities of the HQ. It contributed to create the physical assets allowing the field deployment of the scouts and assistance to the PA users. The establishment of EWCA resulted in the capacitating and deployment of 700 field staff and employment of 120 more at the HQs. The present budget is covering the EWCA park management and half of it comes from the contribution of the income generated by the parks to the National treasury.” (TE pp.48-49)

b) Governance

The project successfully reformed important aspects of PA management in Ethiopia, and learned important lessons regarding the best way to tackle conservation challenges.

First, as a result of the project, “the EWCA and PA authorities have enlarged their scope from Wildlife to Ecosystems” (TE p.6). Second, the project established PA development advisory committees, to which local stakeholders and authorities participated. This participatory and decentralized approach to PA governance will most likely continue beyond project completion.

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.

This initiative was not replicated or scaled up. Currently, EWCA capacity and lack of funding prevent a broader adoption of this initiative. However, as mentioned above, *the project* catalyzed another US\$ 37.4 million worth of Wildlife conservation funds through co-finance projects, showing that some project components are getting mainstreamed.

## 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 joint lessons learned and recommendations:**

1. The Ethiopian socio-economic context provides little opportunities for an enclave approach to the PAs management: the PAs ecosystems conservation contributes to the welfare of the local communities. Conservation and development exigencies coexist in the PA regions and the PA boundaries don't establish a clearly cut spatial separation between the wildlife population and the human communities. The PAs provide environmental services contributing to the local socio-economic development. The PA management (Wildlife conservation) should be associated with local (alternative livelihoods) and national development initiatives (recreational activities, education and all other main sectors). In short, the PAs system management has to be harmonized with the local development policies and strategies. And the community leaders, local authorities and other entities in charge of local development have to contribute to the planning of the PAs ecosystems conservation and use. The project established pilot collaborations in this field. The restructuring of the EWCA and establishment of the trust fund should strengthen such collaborations, e.g. by expanding the community-managed protected areas and PA community councils' competencies.
2. Wildlife is not a stand-alone component of the national development. The contribution of PA management to development is not confined to the welfare of the surrounding communities. The impact of Climate change locally and nationally requires the framing of a broader approach to harmonize the sustainable PA system management with the national development policies. The integration of the exigencies of Wildlife / ecosystems protection into the land use planning

has to be performed through a cascade approach from the national to the local level. The EWCA institutional positioning has to strengthen its advocacy and leadership in mainstreaming the Wildlife conservation and PA management into the national development policies and strategies. The restructuring of EWCA by framing it inside the MoEFCC mandate and by enhancing its operational autonomy will create the conditions to greater advocacy at the political level and for the mobilization of resources and collaborations at a larger scale and in a more structured way. Critical PA management areas exceeding EWCA resources are:

2.1 The PA participatory management (for example, the establishment of the PA development advisory committees) has to be both participatory and adaptive, to address the particular geographic, socio-economic, and cultural issues facing the communities; systematization, experience sharing and collaboration with the academy have to be part of such approach.

2.2 The capacities of the communities have to be strengthened in identifying business opportunities, fund raising and development of micro-enterprises; this approach has to be properly assisted and monitored, e.g. by development NGOs.

2.3 Moving from conservation to sustainable development requires co-financing projects establishing the environment enabling the PA participatory management as the needed resources and time overcome the EWCA capacities. This sector should be a priority area of the Trust fund.

3. The SDPASE project contributed to the build-up of the EWCA capacities in Wildlife conservation, PA system management and design and implementation of Wildlife conservation and sustainable development and use strategies. The EWCA mandate advocates for the concentration of its activities along its core skills in Wildlife conservation and PA management. Acquisition of further capacities, knowledge and innovation technology, methodologies should be preferred to the EWCA direct access to a broad range of skills / expertise and dispersion of resources across a wide range of fields overlapping with the mandate and capacities of other institutions and the private sector. For instance the monitoring of the PA has to be strengthened – also by acquiring remote surveillance capacities - in order to facilitate and strengthen EWCA in planning the PA protection and in leading its partners in other sectors in performing their activities of repression of illegal PA exploitation and of promotion of economic development. In fact, the project strengthened the PA staff's capacities and deployment but it didn't integrate them into a comprehensive approach to eco-system monitoring through the adoption of remote sensing and geographical information systems technologies and capacities. The PA authorities, scouts, etc. perform their tasks in the absence of the information needed (a) for the surveillance and analysis the PAs situation the large scale and (b) for orientating their field deployment on the basis of a multifactor and comparative assessment of the situation and priorities in the field.
4. Consequently, the following targeted actions **fixing the socio-economic context** have to be prioritized for the continuation of the project achievements:

4.1 the integration of EWCA planning capacities with those of the MoARD and MoLF in rural and agricultural development, to reduce the degradation of savannah, bushland and forests exploited for farming purposes (subsistence food and commercial products) adjacent to the PAs and propose alternative areas for the intensification of subsistence food production,

4.2 the formulation of plans for the development of alternative livelihoods associated with the recreational use of the PA development in collaboration with the MoFEC and Regional development authorities, MoCT, State owned enterprises and entrepreneurs' associations, and development NGOs (e.g. by adopting the *Area development programme* approach)

4.3 the association with the Ministry of water, irrigation and energy and the Road authorities in the sustainable land use planning in the PA (e.g., wood harvesting is a national challenge),

4.4 the association with the MoLF, in charge of rangelands and pastoralism, in establishing forage reforestation areas endowed with water points along the pastoralists migration treks or in selected areas of the PA to reduce their seasonal exploitation of the PA ecosystems,

4.5 the capacity building of the judiciary and law enforcement agents on the regulation and surveillance of the wildlife protection and trade,

4.6 the upgrading of the PA monitoring by the adoption of remote sensing and geographical information system technologies in order to frame these initiatives along objective and sound criteria and under the leadership and guidance of the EWCA.

5. The EWCA concentration on its core tasks (PA system management) while forging **sector alliances** to fix the PAs socio-economic context is the key to (a) establishing a leadership in Wildlife conservation, and thus (b) ensuring the sustainable management of the PA system. The unity of vision and mandate are essential to balance the exigencies of conservation and development. The EWCA reorganization plan has to be implemented by adopting a Business model encompassing the Wildlife and ecosystem conservation and local and national development at once. The elaboration of the mentioned Business model should identify the potential sources of income to match the exigencies of Wildlife conservation and PA management. It has to include the revenue-raising mechanisms and the financing of the trust fund in order to ensure that (a) an adequate flow of resources supports the EWCA institutional activities and (b) the environmental services provided by the PAs to the local and national development are properly remunerated.

(TE pp.63-65)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE's recommendations were jointly made as part of the lessons learned presented, as described above. For this project, recommendations cannot be separated from the lessons learned.





## 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 report presents a very detailed discussion of outcomes and impact, presenting relevant evidence when available and relevant. Unfortunately, the report fails to systematically assess outcome indicators for the project, making it difficult to evaluate achievements against pre-established targets.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is very consistent and clearly structured. Evaluation questions are clearly answered, and all required components are thoroughly discussed. Ratings are very clearly provided and substantiated, although the link between the rating and the justification could be more clearly made.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project's planned and realized expenditures in total and per activity, as well as actual co-financing used, are reported.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned and recommendations are very detailed, comprehensive, and in line with the evidence provided in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Total project budget figures are available, as well as project budget by phase, outcome and year. Actual co-financing is reported. However project costs per activity is not reported.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides a satisfactory summary of M&E implementation, but only limited assessment of the project's M&E design at entry.	MU
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

## 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.