

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:		1296	Review date:	
IA/EA Project ID:			<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:		Vietnam Green Corridor Project	GEF financing:	1.0
Country:		TF052526	IA/EA own:	1.0
			Government:	0.73
			Other*:	0.25
			Total Cofinancing	0.98
Operational Program:		OP#3: Forest ecosystems; Focal area: Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	2.98
				1.0
IA	World Bank	Dates		
Partners involved:	World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Aug. 28, 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: 9/30/2007	Actual: 12/30/2008
TER Prepared by:	TER peer reviewed by: B. Wadhwa	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 48	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 64	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 16
Author of TE:	Douglas J. Graham	TE completion date: Aug. 28 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: August 2010	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 12

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	MS	MS	-	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MS	-	U
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	N/A	-	UA
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	S	-	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

No the TE report (ICM) does not provide information on actual project costs or co-financing amounts. There is also no assessment of the project's M&E system.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings were noted in the report.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The project's global environmental objective, or goal, was to maintain the globally significant biodiversity in the forests of Vietnam and the Annamites ecoregion.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

The primary objective of the project was "to protect and maintain the high global conservation value of the productive landscape in the Green Corridor" (ProDoc). The secondary objective was "to establish a replicable model for protection, management and restoration of high global conservation values in multiple-use forest areas of strategic importance for biodiversity conservation" (ProDoc).

The project had three expected outcomes:

1. Immediate threats to endangered species and forest habitat halted through effective control mechanisms and strengthened capacity for conservation management
2. Productive landscape established for the Green Corridor and maintained through locally initiated protection, management and restoration initiatives
3. The biodiversity value of the Green Corridor is secured through development of informed policies and responsible planning measures which can be replicated at other sites

Project activities were divided into four components:

1. Strengthen management of the green corridor
2. Improve incentives for maintaining forest cover
3. Strengthen capacity and awareness at the landscape level
4. Establish a participatory monitoring and evaluation system

There were no revisions to project objectives or components. Following the Mid-Term Review (Dec 2006), the project's component level indicators were modified and a 1-year extension granted.

The revised set of indicators:

- Area of natural forest is maintained or increased.
- Number of flagship species is maintained or increased (gibbon, douc langur tiger, tiger prey).
- Threat to forest from illegal activities is reduced.
- Capacity of stakeholders to manage forests for sustainable management and conservation is increased.
- Number of community and provincial regulations for conservation is increased.
- Standard of living of local communities is maintained or enhanced.
- Attitude of local communities towards using forest resources in sustainable manner is enhanced.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
			X		
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)					
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)	
				Indicators modified	

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
<p>Project outcomes are consistent with GEF’s Operational Program for Forest Ecosystems and the Biodiversity focal area. The Green Corridor between Phong Dien Nature Reserve and Bach Ma National Park in Thua Thien Hue includes globally important habitats and species. The corridor is of critical importance to the integrity of the larger landscape and the Annamites ecoregion. Vietnam ratified the CBD in November 1994. In accordance with the Convention, the Government of Vietnam (GoV) formulated and issued the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BAP) (1995-2005) and the draft National Environmental Action Plan 2001-2010, which included measures for conserving biodiversity. This project mirrors the principles and priorities of both plans, thereby supporting government efforts to meet its priority needs. Project outcomes have strengthened the conservation management regime in the Green Corridor and piloted community forest management systems. Outcomes are also in line with the overall Government’s Forest Development Strategy (FDS) 2001-2010 and contribute to five result areas of the Forest Sector Support Program.</p> <p>Project outcomes are also relevant to the WB/GEF country portfolio for Vietnam. Previous WB implemented projects focused on forest protection and biodiversity conservation mainly in and around protected areas or protected forests. This project’s focus on productive landscapes complemented the comprehensive approach being undertaken by the WB both conceptually and geographically. Project outcomes (tools, databases, maps) were adopted by the recent Forest Sector Development Project (FSDP) which focuses on production forests (i.e., reforestation of barren forest lands) as well as testing a financing mechanism for protected areas.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<p>Based on the information in the TE report the project made valuable progress towards the realization of objectives, namely a strategic environmental framework for the Green Corridor. While outcomes fell short of achieving this objective, the project completed all planned activities and produced key outputs and tools to guide future efforts. The project worked with forest managers, local communities and governments, including sectoral development planners. A wide range of different activities were promoted, including biodiversity surveys, remote sensing of forest resources, ranger training, promotion of ecotourism, community forestry piloting, environment impact assessment and monitoring.</p> <p><u>Strengthening the Management of the Green Corridor</u> The key output from this project is a coherent Conservation Zonation Plan for the entire Green Corridor, which was developed through extensive stakeholder participation. This plan was finalized and it now provides the basis for conservation management in the Green Corridor. The project conducted a Wildlife Trade Study and created an action plan to combat illegal wildlife trade that will be implemented after closure. The project also created a GIS monitoring system to map incidence of fire for the province-wide Fire Prevention Plan, and trained staff on its use. The Fire Prevention Plan was developed and adopted by the Provincial People's Committee. This is the first such plan in Vietnam and is a model for other Provinces. A series of training courses have been carried out including identification of high conservation value species, enforcement, and forest fire prevention.</p> <p><u>Improving incentives for maintaining forest cover</u> Project activities have piloted innovative strategies to reduce the rates of forest loss in select areas, but there is no indication that local authorities are implementing these incentives and mechanisms on a broader scale. The project implemented a community-based micro-enterprise scheme which disbursed 40 grants to support activities that provide for biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources while improving incomes. This scheme stimulated much public participation and interest in the project. Four community forest management (CFM) areas (total 400 ha) were initiated through these grants. The project also produced Guidelines for Forest Landscape Restoration, which promoted better site mapping and selection of native species for cultivation. The project reviewed past experience (under the National Target Program on Forests) in restoring natural forests in combination with Acacia cultivation, to determine if the approach could be applied in the Green Corridor.</p> <p><u>Strengthening capacity and awareness</u> The project provided extensive training for community members and forest management staff in conservation practices and forest landscape management. A program of activities to increase the level of environmental education and awareness was implementing in cooperation with Bach Ma National Park (BMNP) and the Phong Dien Nature Reserve. The project team also produced a Training Needs Assessment and Plan for the Green Corridor as well as an Environmental Education and Conservation Awareness Action Plan. The ICM notes an increase in the METT scores of watershed management boards and BMNP authority, indicating enhanced capacities. Project experiences and results were disseminated to policy makers and practitioners at all levels.</p> <p><u>Establishing a participatory M&E system</u> The M&E component was successful in establishing environmental baselines for the Green Corridor. The project</p>	

collected large amounts of data on the status of habitats and species, and developed several tools for decision-making by local authorities and forest managers. The project has generated some lessons, although better analysis and documentation of lessons learned by the project would have greatly helped in disseminating them more widely.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

The project completed activities within the expected timeframe. Project start-up was slow, but once disbursement of funds began, implementation proceeded smoothly without any evidence of lags or delays. The full GEF grant amount was disbursed. Although there is no information on actual project costs, the ICM notes that the project has efficiently managed a broad range of activities and provided valuable tools to guide future conservation efforts in the Green Corridor.

Nevertheless the outputs have not led to achievement of all expected outcomes and progress toward objectives has been limited. The primary reason behind this, according to the TE report, is that project activities were too diffuse and interventions spread too thinly across many sectors (local governments, communities, private business, park enforcement, etc) to have deep impacts on any one institution or agency. But, ultimately the failure to fully achieve outcomes and realize the objective of a new model for landscape level forest protection and regeneration is tied to issues of project design. The threats and challenges identified in the project brief cannot be addressed through a single medium sized program.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources

Rating: ML

The ICM did not identify financial risk to sustainability of project outcomes. The 2009 GRM rates overall risk to sustainability of outcomes as “uncertain.” However, based on information in the GRMs, the executing agency, WWF, has leveraged significant co-financing and additional resources. This means that WWF will likely continue some activities and ensure sustainability of at least some project outcomes.

b. Socio political

Rating: ML

Overall, poverty levels in the area are decreasing. Attitude surveys show increased awareness of forest conservation issues among local communities and more constructive relationships with forest guards, partly as a result of project support. The ICM notes that this trend is likely to be sustained.

c. Institutional framework and governance

Rating: ML

Decentralization of national government activities and greater delegation to local governments means the number of community and provincial regulations for conservation will increase. Capacity and willingness to better manage forests by management boards is improving - as measured by METT scores. CFM capacity is constrained by policies of the current Dept. of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD), which may affect the long-term sustainability of these pilot projects.

d. Environmental

Rating: U

The decision to build a major highway through the project area has the potential to destroy the environmental integrity of the Green Corridor and will likely erase any progress made under this project. Illegal activity (logging, hunting) remains a critical risk affecting sustainability of outcomes. The market demand for illegal products combined with weak, ineffective forest law management means that outcomes are unlikely to be sustained. Another potential threat was identified in the National Tourism Master Plan which calls for significant increases in tourism revenue over the next five years through the expansion of tourism facilities and encouragement of private-sector development. Widespread, poorly planned tourism in the Green Corridor Project would negatively affect project sustainability. The province has plans to develop ecotourism in some forested areas as part of a provincial sustainable tourism development program and this may mitigate some of the risk to outcomes.

4.3 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There is insufficient information on project costs in the ICM to assess how co-financing contributed to project activities or outcomes. Actual co-financing was greater than what was committed at the time of project endorsement. The 2009 GRM notes that “substantial additional resources were leveraged for this project by WWF and their counterparts in DARD.” According to the 2007 GRM, the GoV committed co-financing amount of \$0.73 did materialize. No

information is available on other cofinancing sources.
b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages? Project start-up lagged due to slow approval of the grant agreement by the GoV. While the pace of implementation (after the start-up) was good, the 2007 GRM notes that "some aspects of the M&E system were significantly delayed." Following the MTE the project was granted a 1-year extension to get up to speed. Another 3-month extension was granted in late 2008 to permit completion of the last remaining activities.
c. 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. Unable to assess. There is insufficient information in the ICM and GRMs to assess the degree of country ownership.

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): MS
<p>The ProDoc set out a detailed M&E plan including an implementation timeframe, a logical framework with output and outcome indicators, an extensive set of baseline information compiled from government data, and arrangements for monitoring. This plan was part of an M&E project component which included both project level M&E, as well as a long-run research and monitoring program. The project log-frame included in the ProDoc was overly complex and impractical. It contained numerous, often repetitive, indicators and here was no explanation method of measurement/verification or assumptions. Many of the indicators did not meet smart criteria.</p> <p>Project performance was to be monitored at several levels. A field-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system was to be developed in the first year of the project and implemented. Execution of activities was to be monitored through reports, GRMs, supervisory missions, and mid-term and final evaluations in accordance with the indicators defined in the Logical Framework. A Provincial Working Group, comprised of various stakeholders, would monitor and guide implementation meet annually to review operations and provide advice on possible adaptations. The ProDoc further specified that the GEF-Vietnam office would monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the project during the project implementation.</p>	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): UA
<p>There is insufficient information in the ICM on implementation of the project's M&E plan to make an assessment. Monitoring of environmental indicators and impacts (as part of Component 4) as good. The 2009 rates Implementation M&E as Moderately Satisfactory noting that "Monitoring indicators were well defined but only at end of project."</p>	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS
<p><i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i></p> <p>The implementing agency was the World Bank Country Office-Vietnam. The project design was clearly relevant to addressing the identified environmental threats in the Green Corridor. The selection of the WWF to execute the project also appears to have been appropriate given the WWF's 20+ years of experience in Vietnam. However, both the Mid-term evaluation and the ICM note that project objectives were unrealistic and overambitious given the large size of the target area and the complexity of environmental threats. The TE report notes that most of the project's problems stem from project design. More input from the WB during the preparation phase might have resulted in more realistic objectives. The WB could also have provided more guidance on developing the log-frame and selecting appropriate indicators and targets for project M&E.</p> <p>Based on the limited information in the TE report, the project received regular and high-quality technical supervision. Following the mid-term evaluation, the WB encouraged the project to adjust its approach, agreed to a revised log frame and facilitated a 1-year extension. The WB also approved another extension in 2008 so that the project could finalize its activities. The TE report also notes that the WB soft assistance was useful in bringing the project to the attention of senior level provincial officials.</p> <p>The GRMs produced by the WB provide only brief updates on the project's implementation and progress towards</p>

objectives. More detail might have been useful in identifying areas where the project was lagging or where achievement of outcomes seemed unlikely.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) MS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The project was executed by the World Wide Fund for Nature-Vietnam (formerly World Wildlife Fund), which was also the project proposer. Based on the limited information in the ICM and GRMs, project activities were well managed and executed. The TE notes that the quality of execution by the field team in Hue province was satisfactory and the focus on results was strong. According to the TE report: “Project resources were efficiently deployed, a strong working relationship was developed with the local partner and the project worked with impressive diligence and commitment at field level.”

Performance at the WWF country program office in Hanoi was viewed as less than satisfactory by the IA- particularly in relation to financial management systems, compliance with agreements reached during supervision missions on the use of these systems; and procurement issues. The 2007 GRM notes delays in submitting financial and procurement reports; however, there were no critical lapses in execution.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?

Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Scientific analysis and participatory consultation to support development of regulations and a zoning policy	A strategic environmental framework, a finalized conservation zonation plan and participatory conservation agreements.	Informed policymaking and planning which recognizes benefits of conserving biodiversity.	Species diversity and natural forest cover and quality enhanced
Training and infrastructure investment for enforcement of forest regulations	A Training Needs Assessment and Training Plan produced, over 50 courses conducted for park and local government staff.	Strengthened capacity and awareness landscape level to implement policies and enforce regulations.	Productive landscape established and maintained through locally initiated protection, management and restoration initiatives
Improve the quality of management and planning of land and natural resources to increase the level of biodiversity conservation and provide for a productive landscape	40 Conservation grants approved and implemented.	Immediate threats to endangered species and priority habitats reduced.	A replicable model for protection, management and restoration of high global conservation values in multiple-use forest areas of strategic importance for biodiversity conservation
Developing and implementing a monitoring and evaluation system	Communities trained in conservation.	Improved incentives for maintaining forest cover and greater understanding of benefits of biodiversity conservation at the community level.	
Disseminating the progress and results of the project to district, provincial, national policy makers and practitioners	Community-based micro-enterprise scheme operational.	A participatory monitoring and evaluation system used as an input for decision-making	
	M&E system in place and operational with indicators along the four results areas		

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

<p>b. What are the actual (<i>intended or unintended</i>) impacts of the project?</p> <p>Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts <u>and to impact drivers</u> (Impact drivers are the <i>significant factors</i> that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence</p>			
<p>Given the large area of the Green Corridor, it is difficult evaluate environmental impacts. The impact monitoring conducted by the project indicates that while the extent of overall forest cover remained constant, the areas classified as ‘rich’ and having high conservation value declined in extent by 10%. ‘Rich’ forests now comprise only 7% of the Green Corridor area. The impact monitoring also shows that levels of indicators species declined over the project period. There is no data on threat reduction impacts. The project may well have had positive impacts in reducing the rate of loss of ‘rich’ forests, or contributing to threat reduction, but given the data at hand it is not possible to disaggregate these positive impacts from the overall trend.</p> <p>The project has piloted innovative strategies for community based natural resource management and these have enhanced stakeholder awareness and understanding of biodiversity conservation. The community managed forests implemented as pilot programs have been successful examples of community conservation agreements and may lead to impacts at the national level. The conservation zoning plan developed in partnership with local stakeholders will be used to guide future development in the GC area and will help ensure that social and environmental considerations are addressed by decision makers at all levels from the commune up. This will reduce the threat to areas outside of special use forest from conflicting plans and strategies and will ensure that conservation goals become achievable throughout the Green Corridor.</p> <p>Project efforts in training and capacity building have had good results. Monitoring showed increases in the management capacity of some forest management units and watershed management boards as measured by METT. It is clear that the project has succeeded in developing a close working relationship with its institutional partner in the Green Corridor - the Thua Thien Hue Forest Protection Department, and so there are prospects for the project catalyzing changes and approaches in the mainstream working of FPD.</p> <p><u>Impact Drivers:</u> The ICM did not identify specific drivers within the ability of the project to influence. Outside of the project’s control there are two main factors that will detract from impacts. (i) During the implementation period, there were shifts in provincial policy which will impede prospects for developing community forest management more widely in the Green Corridor. The provincial Department for Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) resisted delegation of decision-making and forest resources to local communities. This shift was outside the scope of project influence, but served as a major impediment to efforts to develop CFM as a major tool for forest management in the corridor landscape. (ii) The decision to build a highway through the Green Corridor obviously will inflict serious environmental damage and detract from the path to impacts.</p>			
<p>c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?</p>			
<p>As noted in the section on sustainability, the critical risk facing the project is the decision to construct a highway through the Green Corridor. It is possible that the national government may re-examine this decision or conduct an environmental impact assessment in an attempt to minimize the environmental costs. Considering this risk, the likelihood that impacts will be sustained is low.</p>			
<p>d. Evidence of Impact</p>			

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?	X		
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project. The report notes that there has been no decrease in extent of forest cover. It is possible that the project reduced rates of forest loss.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?		X	
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)	X		
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Forest quality is reported to have declined in the 2004-2007 period.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?		X	
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?	X		
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Although not assessed in the ICM, there may have been economic benefits from the small grant program, and the small-scale investments in sustainable livelihoods.			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?			
e. Monitoring of impacts			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?	X		
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?	X		

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

- An important lesson is that the diverse challenges inherent in any landscape level approach require a serious commitment of official support and resources to address effectively. MSP support has been useful in terms of introducing a range of approaches, piloting these on a small scale and encouraging provincial partners to adopt a more integrated approach to resource management. However, the scale of resources available was not sufficient to create incentives to adopt more far reaching changes - CFM most prominent of these, nor to sufficiently scale-up new approaches to the extent of widespread adoption throughout the Green Corridor.
- In approving this project, GoV agreed to pilot CFM as per the project document. This agreement was respected in a rather minimalist way, with only a few small pilots allowed to start up. CFM remains an important element to future conservation strategies in Vietnam and it needs to be further promoted by the Government.

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

- A further lesson is raised by the construction of the Ho Chi Minh Highway through the Green Corridor landscape. This construction project has inflicted damage on the integrity of forest systems in the corridor and will make future management of these forest much more difficult in future. Infrastructure development in this manner, especially in areas receiving support from the international community, inflicts reputational damage on Vietnam’s international credibility on matters relating to conservation and environmental management.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

- Most of the shortcomings of this project relate to project design issues – notably over-ambitious objectives for such a small project addressing such complex issues. More rigorous and critical assessment of project design will be needed to avoid this issue recurring in future. To some extent, this is a recurring problem specific to small GEF projects, which are obliged to adopt over-ambitious targets as part of the review/approval process.
- As with other GEF projects, the World Bank needs to adopt a clear position regarding the construction of infrastructure on high biodiversity value forest areas receiving GEF support. Similar issues apply to the ongoing GEF project at Chu Yang Sin, and previous GEF supported interventions at Nahang Nature Reserve and Ba Be Yok Don National Parks. These issues need to be tackled at strategic and land use planning level, since they ultimately undermine the purpose for which global conservation funds have been awarded.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The ICM assesses achievement of objectives relative to the primary indicators (forest cover, species levels), and also evaluates project impacts. The ICM does not assess actual outcomes or outputs relative to expected outcomes/outputs for each component (i.e. How many people were trained? Was the training useful? etc).</p>	MS
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</p> <p>The report is internally consistent. The evidence is convincing and confirms IA ratings.</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The ICM identifies risks to the revised set of indicators, rather than risks to outcomes or impacts.</p>	MU
<p>e. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>The lessons learned are supported by the evidence, but they are not comprehensive. There should be more lessons, particularly with regard to the CFM experience, and the difficulties in getting the provincial government on board.</p>	MS
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>The ICM only presents the GEF grant amount. No other costs are presented.</p>	HU
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?</p> <p>There is no mention of the M&E system.</p>	HU

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.