

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1257	
GEF Agency project ID		1056	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Protection and Management of Pakistan Wetlands Project	
Country/Countries		Pakistan	
Region		South Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP2: Coastal, Fresh Water and Marine Systems; SP 2 for the Biodiversity Focal Area: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Systems and Landscapes	
Executing agencies involved		WWF Pakistan; Ministry of Climate Change, Pakistan	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency: IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature)	
Private sector involvement		Some level of involvement, no mention of company names by the TE. (TE,p.28)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		8/25/2003 (Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Projects in GEF-3, GEF-4, and GEF-5, p.1)	
Effectiveness date / project start		08/01/2005 (TE,p.1)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		03/31/2011	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/2012 (TE,p.1)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.342	.342
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.99	2.99
Co-financing	IA own	1.50	2.30
	Government	0	0
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	7.30	6.43
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		3.33	3.33
Total Co-financing		8.80	8.73
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		12.13	12.06
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/17/2012 (TE,p.1)	
Author of TE		Frans Werter, Shahid Rashid Awan	
TER completion date		01/2013	
TER prepared by		Chenhao Liu	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environment Objective (GEO) was "to promote the sustainable conservation of freshwater and marine wetlands and their associated globally important biodiversity in Pakistan." (PD, p.1)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is "to conserve wetlands and their associated globally important biodiversity in Pakistan without exacerbating poverty." (TE, p.25)

The project aimed to achieve its PDO through achieving the following two immediate Objectives:

"Immediate Objective 1: to create and maintain an enabling environment for effective and sustainable conservation of natural wetlands, at federal, provincial/territorial and local levels.

Immediate Objective 2: to implement sustainable wetland conservation at four representative sites that will serve as replicable models for subsequent nationwide conservations initiatives." (TE, p.25)

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

There were no changes in GEO, PDO and project immediate objectives.

The original logical framework developed during the project preparation was revised in 2007 to make it more practical (see annex 5). As compared to the original version presented by the project documents, there have been no significant changes in format but with only a few revisions in expected outputs. For example, the expected sub-output 3.5 (under output 3 and project immediate object 1) was dropped; sub-output 5.3 (under output 5 and project immediate objective 1) was changed from "By Project Year 7.0, effective multi-media based public awareness campaign on wetlands, and their associated biodiversity is delivered to the public at large and to key decision-makers in particular." To "A biennial

public opinion poll indicates a statistically significant positive trend in public and private sector awareness levels from Project Year 1.0 till Project Year 7.0” (TE, part II,p.4)

#### **4. GEF EO 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.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

In a binary scale (Relevant/Irrelevant), the TE rated the project’s relevance as “Relevant”. This TER rates the project’s outcome relevance as “Satisfactory”. The project is consistent with relevant strategic priorities for development at the national and international level.

The project belongs to GEF’s biodiversity focal area, and it fits primarily into OP 2 Coastal, Freshwater and Marine Ecosystems but is also relevant to OP 1-Arid and Semi-arid Zone Ecosystems, OP 3 - Forest Ecosystems; and OP 4 - Mountain Ecosystems. The Project is in line with GEF Strategic Priority 2 for the Biodiversity Focal Area-"Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Systems and Landscapes". (TE, p.31)

The project is also part of Pakistan’s concrete actions toward fulfilling its obligation as the signatory of UN Conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, UNCCD, and Convention on Climate Change. The project also fits well into Pakistan’s development priorities of poverty reduction in the rural area and improving rural governance with the increasing role of community-based organizations. (TE, p.32)

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

The TE rated the project’s outcome effectiveness as “Satisfactory”. The TE has presented the project’s actual achievements by the end of the project and compared them with expected outputs in detail. This TER rates the project’s outcome as “Moderately Satisfactory” based on the evidence presented in the TE report which indicates that the majority of the expected outputs have been achieved partially or are on track to being fully achieved. A comparison of the project’s achievements against its expected outcomes is presented below: (TE, p.47-64)

## **Immediate Objective 1: Create and maintain an enabling environment for effective and sustainable conservation of natural wetlands at federal, provincial territorial and local levels**

Under the immediate objective 1 there are 6 expected outputs. Output 1 is the establishment of sustainable institutions to provide national level coordination for the conservation of wetlands biodiversity in Pakistan to promote the dissemination of lessons learned, especially from Project Demonstration sites. This output was partly achieved. Specifically, it was expected that the Project Management Unit (PMU) would be transformed into a permanent “National Wetlands Management Council (NWMC)” under the Ministry of Climate Change staffed by relevant government personnel, and the agency would include a specialized Technical and Equipment Resource Centre (TREC) for surveys and fieldwork. However, at the end of the project the PMU was staffed by government staff as intended, but the NWMC had not been created. The TREC was established and functioning well as expected.

Output 2 was that the planning and land-use decision-making of wetlands conservation agencies at all levels is enhanced through the provision of comprehensive, current wetlands information decision support systems and tools using spatial and other data from Wetlands GIS Database. This output was partly achieved. Specifically, the project implementation was expected to set up a comprehensive exploratory survey of uncharted wetlands to collect baseline data (100% of internationally significant and 75% of nationally significant wetlands). The project was also expected to establish a GIS-labs at national level to analyze data on wetlands and associated socio-economic information, and hardware/software of the GIS and relevant trainings were to be provided to the 6 provincial and territorial agencies. Also, other natural resource management agencies were to use the GIS facilities. At the project’s end the survey program was successful in terms of coverage and results. The national GIS-lab was established and operating well as expected, where the national wetland survey data was analyzed which provided significant insights for understanding the country’s wetland conservation. But regional GIS facilities were still in the preparation stage, and the TE was unoptimistic of the sustainability of GIS labs due to lack of continued institutional support.

Output 3 is the development of National Wetlands Conservation Strategy (NWCS) and following-up adoption and implementation at federal, provincial/territorial and community level. This output was on track to be fully achieved. The National Wetland Policy was drafted, endorsed, and pending for approval by the cabinet. Thus, there is significant threshold that it has to cross before the expected result is fully achieved. Output 4 is the enhancement of technical competence of government agencies and CBO (community-based organization) conservation staff through comprehensive training and capacity building programs. This result was fully achieved. Over the project period of 7 years a total of 117 trainings were organized with the attendance of 9124 trainees from government agencies and CBOs (both professionals and non-professionals in wetland conservation). Trainings were conducted at both national and provincial level with extensive and balanced geographical coverage. Output 5 is the design and implementation of a national wetland awareness program. This result was fully achieved. The project adapted the Communication, Education and Public Awareness strategy of the Ramsar bureau to increase awareness. The awareness strategy was effective. The project was able to reach out to high level politicians, specific groups at provincial and community levels and schools all over the country. Activities at national level were replicated at provincial and community levels. In total 149 awareness raising events were organized,

43% were campaigns mostly based on international themes. The awareness campaign was also augmented by wide media coverage, large production of advocacy materials, and set-up of information centers at the project’s demonstration sites. Output 6 is the development and adoption of elements of long-term sustainability of wetlands conservation. This output was not achieved. Specifically, the project was intended to develop a sustainable mechanism for financial support, a target which is unlikely to be achieved.

**Immediate Objective 2: To implement sustainable wetlands conservation at four representative sites that will serve as replicable models for subsequent nationwide wetlands conservation initiatives**

The expected 4 outputs under the immediate objective 2 are the development and implementation of a comprehensive management plan for sustainable conservation of biodiversity in 4 demonstration sites. These outputs were partly achieved. A total of 7 management plans for the 4 project demonstration sites were developed (four demonstration sites: Makran Coast Wetlands Complex (MCWC); Central Indus Wetlands Complex (CIWC); Salt Range Wetlands Complex (SRWC); North-West Alpine Wetlands Complex (NAWC)). However, none of them have been approved by relevant authorities. But at each demonstration site a number of alternative livelihood activities were implemented. For example: In MCWC women were trained in embroidery with seashells, cloth making like school uniforms, net making and seafood cooking; the project also introduced drip irrigation, orchards (49 families) and off-season vegetable growing in SRWC. Also, the project introduced in each demonstration site alternative energy sources. By the EOP, about 120 biogas plants, 200 fuel efficient stoves, and 10 wind turbines were installed. In addition, 620 solar lanterns have been introduced.

Overall, one can conclude from the above comparison that the project’s outcome achievement is largely in line with expectations, but there is a marked gap between its actual achievements and targets. Thus, a rating of “Moderately Satisfactory” for the project’s outcome effectiveness is justified.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	<b>Rating: Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	--

In a 6-point scale, the TE rated the project’s outcome efficiency as “Moderately Satisfactory”. This TER will adopt the same rating based on the evidence presented by the TE. The project was implemented efficiently, but there were minor problems.

The TE provided a direct assessment of the project’s cost-efficiency: “The estimated (adjusted) ratio of admin costs: program costs = 25%: 75%, which is acceptable taking into account that all admin costs were booked under one project output.” (TE, p.11). The project’s overall achievement at a moderately satisfactory level was supported by a limited level of budgets, but the project’s expenditures and costs are acceptable. The unit costs of interventions and staff salaries were in line with the market prices and that of other projects. The external audits of the project were all clean. However, the TE pointed out that the rental price at the project start was quite high. (TE, p.11)

The project implementation period was 7 years, which is the same as its original design. The TE didn't report any significant project delays or any extension, but it did identify a few constraints such as natural disasters- including an earthquake in 2005, major floods in 2010/2011, and a cyclone in 2007- security situation, and political decisions (18th amendment to the constitution in which powers were devolved from federal to provincial level). These issues distracted staff from the priority of wetlands management, which delayed implementation or caused cash flow problems.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	<b>Rating: Unlikely</b>
---------------------------	-------------------------

The TE rated the project's overall sustainability as "Moderately Likely". This TER rates the project's sustainability as "Unlikely". Based on the evidence presented by the TE, although there is little socio-political, institutional, and environmental risk to sustenance of outcomes, there are significant financial risks that need to be taken into account.

**Financial Resource Sustainability- Unlikely**

This TER rates the project's financial sustainability as "Unlikely". The project didn't develop a sustainable financial mechanism to support the project's further scale-up. The project did trigger the formulation and implementation of a number of projects related to wetlands management and conservation and mobilized some external financial resource as supplementary support for the project (such as WWF-P mobilized externally funded projects related to wetlands management worth USD 4 million). But in the end, it was not able to "develop mechanisms for securing long-term financial resources that would sustain institutions for wetlands management and conservation". (TE, p.65)

**Socio-political sustainability-Moderate Likely**

This TER will rate the project's socio-political sustainability as "Moderately Likely." Some of the project's interventions for wetland conservation are socially acceptable and economically attractive for local communities and therefore are likely to continue after the project completion, such as village conservation committees (VCC) at the Makran Coast for protection of turtle nesting sites, and sustainable livelihood activities (e.g. sustainable fishing/off-season vegetable growing) developed through this project. Meanwhile, the TE also concluded that the acceptance at the community level of the management plans developed through the project and their participation in these plans remains to be seen. (TE, p.66)

**Institutional Sustainability- Moderately Likely**

The project's institutional sustainability is moderately likely. A significant part of institutions established through the project will have a long-term presence. 60% of the village conservation communities (VCCs) established through this project (68 in total) were officially registered at the government, which indicates their attainment of long-term legal status. The project also led to some permanent investment of

government in wetland conservation, such as the KPK (Khyber Pakhtoon Khwah Province) government provided a Deputy Range Officer and 10 watchers to the newly declared Broghil National Park. Also, guards were inducted in the Balochistan Wildlife Department for the mangrove plantation in MCWC (Makran Coastal Wetlands Complex) and the watch of turtle nesting sites. Meanwhile, some of the institutions developed through the project do not have a clear picture for long-term sustainability, such as wetland management plans developed through the project are still pending for approval by the cabinet, and the sustainability of GIS labs are not promising in absence of solid financial support from government. (TE, p.66-67) Some future evidence is still necessary to confirm the institutional sustainability of the project.

### **Environmental Sustainability-Moderately Likely**

It is only after the full implementation of the wetland management plans developed through this project that one can draw the conclusion about the project's environmental impacts. But as the management plans developed are yet to be implemented, the project's environmental sustainability is at best 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?

Co-financing was provided by UNDP, EKN (Embassy of Kingdom of Neverland), and WWF Pakistan. Compared to the expected level of co-financing 11.79 million USD, cofinancing of 11.72 million USD materialized. Relevant project document didn't specify any linkages between project outcome and level of co-financing.

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 has been implemented for 7 years as originally designed with no extension or major delays reported. However, during the project period some occasional delays did occur due to disasters and security situation which shift government staffs to other priorities (TE, p.10), which didn't affect the project outcome or sustainability in the end.

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 project’s country ownership is at a high-level. The project is a nationally owned project, with a part of the country’s central government as executing agency. Its positive role in providing knowledge and organizational support to the environmental governance of local communities (especially in the form of village conservation committees), are important contributions to the project’s national ownership. At the same time, the projects national ownership could be strengthened through more participation of local communities in developing the wetland management plans to especially ensure the plans are socially and culturally acceptable, which is instrumental to the project’s sustainability. (TE, p.14)

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

The TE rated the M&E design at entry as “Moderately Satisfactory” This TER will adopt the same rating. The project’s initial M&E design was specific and comprehensive, but there were some weaknesses in the choice of specified indicators.

The Annex 8 project document rolled out a comprehensive M&E plan in detail. The project’s M&E activities were based on a comprehensive and well-designed project logic framework. (PD, annex 2) Specifically, 10 expected outputs were designed to measure the two project immediate objectives. Under each of the expected outputs, a number of concrete sub-outputs were specified to measure the achievement of each output. In addition, a detailed timeline for achieving each sub-output as well as the source of verification were also specified. For example, the output “Elements of long-term sustainability of wetlands conservation initiatives developed and adopted” was identified to measure the achievement of the project’s immediate objective 1 “To create and maintain an enabling environment for effective and sustainable conservation of natural wetlands at federal, provincial/territorial and local levels.” Under this output there are three sub-outputs: a. Funds are secured for continued management and maintenance of wetland sites; b. A financial instrument for securing annual recurrent costs of appropriate wetlands management activities is established, legally registered, financially operational and managed by independent parties by the project year 6.0; c. by Project Year 5.0, 100% of annual recurrent costs of ongoing conservation measures not secured from the Government of Pakistan are covered through sustainable financial arrangements. (PD, annex 2, p.7) Overall, it is fair to draw the conclusion that these



proposed expected outputs, which are acting as the indicators measuring the achievement of the project's immediate outcomes, are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-related. But as pointed out by the TE, the project logic framework was output-oriented rather than outcome-oriented (TE, p.32).

The M&E plan specified the M&E responsibility of key stakeholders, and set up arrangements for progress reporting (APR/PIR), an MTR and terminal evaluation and complementary studies. Also an M&E coordinator was part of the organizational chart. It also specified the level of M&E budget was US\$ 250,000 (PD, annex 8)

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

The TE rated the M&E implementation as “Moderately Unsatisfactory” without specifying the reasons in detail. This TER will rate the M&E implementation as “Moderately Satisfactory”. As compared to the lack of evidence presented by the TE in support of its rating for M&E implementation, project PIRs provided more clear evidence in this area which indicates a moderately successful M&E implementation.

The highlight of success of M&E implementation is the consistency of project logic framework in measuring the project progress toward achieving expected outputs. For all of the 10 expected outputs, every PIR compared their current status against the status of previous years, baseline level and the target level. The 10 expected outputs, which are the backbone of the project's logic framework, has undergone no change throughout the project period of 7 years and has been constantly utilized in all progress report (including the TE) for measuring the project's outcome achievement. Following a standard UNDP PIR format, the PIR of each project year also assessed the periodic progress in project implementation, the financial status at the moment, and the risks involved (except for PIR 2011/2012). An MTR, two EKN (Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands) reviews, and a number of impact studies were undertaken. Corrective actions were also undertaken following the MTR. (TE, p.81)

The TE did point out a number of shortcomings of M&E implementation, such as “the project sponsors did not develop an aligned progress monitoring system leading to an excessive burden of report writing with the PMU; The M&E coordinator came after the MTR and his task was mainly confined to report writing; the updated project logic framework was not submitted to the PSC for approval, and no references were found regarding progress against the original M&E plan prepared in the project document; Numerous surveys and site assessments took place during the project life. However, these data were never used for project monitoring.” (TE, p.41/p.74) But these shortcomings are less significant as compared to the consistency of project's logic framework and utilization of it in project progress monitoring.

## **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>	<b>Rating: Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--	--

The project’s implementing agency is UNDP. The TE rated the “Quality of UNDP Implementation” as “Satisfactory”. In a same scale, this TER rates the quality of project implementation as “Moderately Satisfactory”. Based on the evidence presented by the TE, UNDP has been able to fulfill its role in a substantial manner, with some shortcomings.

According to the TE, UNDP participated in the project development (TE, p.28), and it was a member of the Project Steering Committee and Program Management Committee.(TE,p.34) It assisted in the development of the project document, facilitated the availability of the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (EKN), and topped up the project budget. However, the EKN identified a communication gap between it and UNDP, and the EKN was not kept informed on project developments. Also, reports were delivered late to EKN which affected disbursements. UNDP was not able to agree upon an aligned reporting system with GEF/EKN and WWF-P. As a result, reporting laid a heavy burden on the project (TE, p.81).

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

Based on GEF’s concept, the project has two executing agencies: WWF-Pakistan (WWF-P) and MoCC (Ministry of Climate Change). The TE rated the quality of execution by WWF-P as “Moderately Satisfactory”, and it also rated the quality of execution by MoCC as “Moderately Satisfactory”. Combining the evidence on the performance of WWF-P and MoCC provided by the relevant project documents, this TER will rate the project’s overall quality of execution as “Moderately Satisfactory”. Ineffective staffing has been the most significant problem of project execution, otherwise project execution has been adequate.

The execution of the project was severely affected by the country context, particularly natural calamities. (TE, p.10) This affected the staffing of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) which featured high staff turnover and inefficiency as government staffs had to shift to other priorities. But on the other hand, high staff turnover did contribute to raising awareness of a large number of PSC members on wetland management, and its negative impact was mitigated by the creation of program management committee. (TE, p.10)

Considering the performance of the Ministry of Climate Change (MoCC) as the executing agency, the TE particularly mentioned its failure in assignment of staff. MoCC did not assign staff to the Project Management Unit, and permanent GIS staffs were not assigned by the MoCC to the central GIS lab in Islamabad. At provincial level, assignment of project directors (PO) was late, and POs were bureaucrats rather than field staff as intended. Field staffs were not assigned according to the size of a demonstration area, and all demonstration areas received 7 staff members. In case of CIWC (one of the 4 demonstration sites) covering a stretch of 700 km, it made the spread of human resources very thin and almost insignificant. (TE, p.10) In addition, the coordination with the provinces by the MoCC was limited to PSC meetings. (TE, p.81)

Considering the performance of WWF Pakistan (WWF-P) in general as another executing agency, the TE gave a high rating: The WWF-P organized a hard working team. The team delivered good technical work with some outstanding outputs, such as impressive survey/research reports; the robust awareness raising and capacity building components. The project team was subject to frequent changes of staff both at PMU level and demonstration sites and to delays in recruitment, such as a site manager and organizers to incorporate women into project activities. The finance was well kept as external audits were clean. WWF-P was deficient in organizing the M&E component of the project. It partially took corrective actions with respect to the M&E function after the MTR. (TE, p.81)

Overall, from the evidence presented by the relevant project documents it is clear that the ineffective staffing is looming large as one of the most significant problem of project execution, and the project has been executed smoothly in general judging from other relevant aspects.

## **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 the developed wetland management plans are still pending for approval and are yet to be implemented, the project's environmental impact (especially for long-term) is not clear.

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.

Although the environmental impact of the wetland management plans are yet to manifest, the part of the project which supports sustainable livelihood has been already implemented at the project demonstration sites. These include cottage industry (e.g. stitching, embroidery and basket making) and farm activities such as drip irrigation, introduction of orchards, and off-season vegetable growing. For each of the sites an ecotourism plan has been developed, but some infrastructural arrangements have not yet been implemented. (TE, p.13) These livelihood projects have brought social and economic changes in local communities, although the TE didn't specify the degree of the changes.

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

The TE reported the following change in capacities: (TE, p.12-14)

The project conducted a comprehensive nationwide survey and collected key information and data on conservation and biodiversity of the country's 75 wetlands. The survey involved a large number of scientists of universities and research institutes.

One GIS-lab for wetlands at the federal level and its six nodes at the provincial level were established. The national GIS-lab provided training for the staffs of its six nodes and produced valuable maps and information on wetlands.

Over 7,500 professionals, 600 villagers and 1,000 other people (e.g. customs, army staff, and bureaucrats) were trained on wetland conservation. 4 persons were sent abroad for Master's degree specializing in related area and degree training has been introduced in the University of Veterinary and Animal Science (actual 5 students).

The project has put wetlands successfully on the public and political agenda, and organized a number of activities for advocacy and raising awareness, which have helped build capacity among the general public for better understanding of the country's wetland conservation. Specifically, 149 events were organized at national, provincial and local level, including campaigns, competitions, festivals, presentations, walks. The project has reached out to schools, hunter associations, religious leaders, politicians and local communities, and has produced 106 different types of materials including posters, newsletters, brochures, books and scientific reference materials. The project used the mass media extensively for advocacy campaigns, in the form of 4,500 press releases, 3,000 TV broadcasts, 1,300 radio broadcasts, and 300 news reports. The project operated a website with about 100,000 visits and established 4 information centers.

The project introduced in each demonstration site alternative energy sources. About 120 biogas plants, 200 fuel efficient mud stoves, and 10 wind turbines were installed. Moreover, 620 solar lanterns have been introduced.

## b) Governance

The TE reported the following change in governance: (TE, p.12-14)

The TREC (Technical and Equipment Resource Centre), with specialized equipment for surveying has been established and was functioning well. Future of TREC is uncertain as equipment has to be returned to donors and no plan was prepared to ensure continuity. TREC and the survey program facilitated the research of Pakistani researchers, resulting in publications in international journals.

A National Wetlands Policy has been developed through a broad consultative process and is pending approval by the legislative authority. Punjab province has drafted a Provincial Wetlands Policy. The project managed to get 5 new National Parks approved and nominated 6 wetlands as Ramsar sites. The project also managed adjustments in the Wildlife Acts of Khyber Pakhtoon Khwah Province and Punjab Province.

The project developed 7 wetland management plans for the 4 project demonstration sites, but they are still pending for approval by the legislative authority and none of the plans have been implemented.

The project established 63 Village Conservation Committee (VCCs) in the 3 demonstration sites. The activities of the VCCs were focused on specific Issues, not on micro-planning. At each of the 4 demonstration sites immediate action plans were prepared.

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.

Relevant project documents didn't identify any unintended impacts led by 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.

There was no immediate scale-up or replication reported in the terminal evaluation. And the project was particularly not successful in developing mechanisms for its financial sustainability in order to support further its scale-up or replication. The project was not directly linked, but triggered a number of projects related to wetland management and conservation (such as some that are related to early recovery and alternative energy) during and after its implementation. (TE, p.57)

## 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 TE didn't summarize specific lessons learned and it concluded that "The recommendations could be seen as lessons for future projects."(TE, p.71)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided the following recommendations: (TE, p.16-17)

- **Relevance**

- **Long term strategy**

- The mission advises World Wide Fund for Nature, Pakistan (WWF-P) and Government of Pakistan (GoP) to develop, based on the national wetlands policy that has been formulated, a long term strategy and action program with concrete projects. It is recommended to associate such strategy with high profile initiatives such as the National Flood Management Plan of the National Flood Commission. The National Wetlands Management Council (NWMC) should be notified shortly by GoP in order to keep up the momentum created by PWP and take a leading position in this strategy.

- **Focus**

- UNDP and GoP should check during project preparation if areas for implementation or demonstration are of a manageable size. They should ensure that activities will not be spread too thinly over a project area and are sizeable enough to have impact.

- **Efficiency**

- **Staffing GIS lab**

- The federal government is advised to assign permanent staff to the central GIS-lab immediately as well as budget, as the continuity of the GIS-lab is under threat.

- **Effectiveness**

- **Surveys**

- WWF-P is advised to make the survey results accessible to federal and provincial government staff, as well as any other interested institution or researcher.

- **TREC**

- The donors are advised to keep TREC intact as a specialized unit. EKN (Kingdom of the Netherlands), UNDP, Ministry of Climate Change and WWF-P could make a joint committee to decide on its future. It could be a self-sustaining unit under WWF-P or a university or research institute.

- **Ramsar sites and Provincial Wetlands Policy**

- Provinces are advised to declare the (potential) Ramsar site as protected areas and pursue the development and notification of a Provincial Wetlands Policy.

- **National Wetlands Policy and NWMC**

- The federal government is advised to expedite the approval of the National Wetlands

### **Degree training**

WWF-P is advised to ensure the utilization of the services of the MSc Wetlands students and to integrate wetlands issues in curricula of existing degree programs (e.g. zoology; biology) rather than to pursue a separate MSc Wetlands degree program. The budget balance (USD 81,702) may be used to honor the commitments made to the MSc students and universities.

### **Financial sustainability**

The Ministry of Climate Change is advised to pursue the integration of wetland management in the work plans of other government institutions such as the National Flood Commission and Water and Power Development Authority (WAPDA) to ensure financial and technical continuity.

### **Management plans**

WWF-P is advised to share and discuss the management plans with concerned stakeholders and to pursue the approval with provincial authorities and get clarity on the status and funding of the management plans.

### **Specific Interventions**

WWF-P is advised to discuss with local and provincial authorities on the continuation of specific activities in the demonstration sites, e.g. marsh crocodile protection with the Baluchistan Wildlife Department, and vegetation enclosure and hog deer management with the Punjab Wildlife Department, and make necessary arrangements.

- **Sustainability**

#### **Financial sustainability**

The Ministry of Climate change and WWF-P should join forces and lobby with other government agencies (like WAPDA; Flood Commission; provinces) to mainstream wetlands management in their work plans and develop pertinent projects.

#### **Socio-economic sustainability**

Inspector General of Forests (IGF)/ National Council for Conservation of Wildlife (NCCW) and WWF-P should ask new WWF-P projects, other colleague projects and provincial departments to follow-up on the interventions Initiated by PWP.

#### **Institutional sustainability**

Federal and provincial governments are advised to expedite the development and approval of wetlands policies and notify Wetlands Conservation Committees (WCC). The WCCs are asked to take the responsibility for Implementing the by PWP developed management plans. WWF-P projects or other projects should be asked to follow-up with the Village Conservation Committees (VCC). WWF-P should make arrangements for the MSc (in Wetlands Management) students to finish their studies and use their services. Also, WWF-P should pursue the Integration of wetlands management in curricula of other studies of UVAS, similar to Qalid-I-Azam University.

#### **Environmental sustainability**

WWF-P should, together with provincial governments, consult all relevant stakeholders on the management plans and subsequently pursue their status, ownership, approval and implementation through integrating activities in the work plans and projects.

## 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 EO 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 TE provided comprehensive and specific information on the comparison between the expected outcomes and the project's actual achievements	Satisfactory
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was internally consistent, evidence presented complete and convincing, with ratings well substantiated.	Satisfactory
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE discussed in detail the project's sustainability, and it discussed the project's exit strategy	Highly Satisfactory
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE provided recommendations and treated recommendations also as lessons learned. Recommendations are specific, but it would have been better if the TE could single out a section on lessons learned.	Moderately Satisfactory
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE reported the breakdown of project costs and actually co-financing used by activities (See TE part II, Annex 7, one of the best project cost/co-financing reporting seen by this TER reviewer)	Highly Satisfactory
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE assessed the project's M&E system in two short paragraphs, but more specific information will be preferable	Moderately Satisfactory
		Satisfactory

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

In the preparation of this TER, no additional documents were referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, and PD.