

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	1303		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	951	GEF financing:	0.750	NA
Project Name:	Strengthening Protected Areas Network for Sikhote-Alin Mountain Forest Ecosystems Conservation in Khabarovsk Krai	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Russia	Government:		
		Other*:	1.00	NA
		Total Cofinancing	1.00	NA
Operational Program:	OP 3	Total Project Cost:	1.75	NA
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	NA	Work Program date		NA
		CEO Endorsement		Jul 2001
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Oct 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: Oct 2005	Actual: Dec 2005
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: Claudio Volonte	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 48 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 50 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 2 months
Author of TE: NA		TE completion date: June 2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: June 2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 0 months

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if	GEF EO

			applicable (e.g. IEG)	
2.1 Project outcomes	S	NA	NA	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	NA	NA	UA
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	HS	NA	NA	UA
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

No.

The TE gives good account of the level of achievement of project outcomes and outputs. It also adequately describes the potential impacts of the project. However, it doesn't comprehensively address the issues related to sustainability and has not assessed the efficacy of project's M&E system.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

No such issues have been mentioned in the TE.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the project proposal document the goal of the project is *"conservation of highly endangered habitats in mountain forests of Sikhote-Alin on the territory of Khabarovsk Kray."* The TE lists a slightly different version according to which the project was initiated to *"strengthen conservation of the highly endangered habitats in the Sikhote – Alin mountain forests in Khabarovsk Kray in the Russian Far East."* The difference between the versions in the project proposal document and the TE is not substantive.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According the TE the project's development objective was to *"finalize establishment in the South of the Khabarovsk Kray of an integrated system of protected areas combining areas with different types of protective regimes"* to ensure that habitats of critical conservation importance are preserved and that biological resources of the region are used in a sustainable way. There has been no change in projects development objective during implementation.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The TE describes following outcomes:

- Establishment of an integrated PA system for forest ecosystems conservation in areas of the highest biodiversity in Khabarovsk Kray: new protected areas were established; operational capacity of PA's was increased; and, regional PA regulations were strengthened.
- Increased public awareness in issues of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of the regional biological resources.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain 	
<p>The listed outcomes of the project such as establishment of new protected areas, improvement of efficiency of the protected area network, public awareness and environmental education and biodiversity monitoring are consistent with the strategies of the biodiversity focal area, especially OP 4.</p>	
B Effectiveness	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	
<p>According to the TE, the project outcomes (development results) were fully achieved. The TE gives an overall satisfactory rating for the outcomes and elaborates on each of the outcomes.</p>	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	
<p>According to the TE, the project was managed adequately and the grant funds were used effectively through competitive procurement of services and goods. There was hardly any delay in implementation of the project. This implicitly suggests that the project was implemented in a cost effective manner.</p>	
Impacts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? 	
<p>The TE discusses the impact of the project in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity building - Sustainability - Follow up activities or investment 	
<p>According to the TE the project has helped the government of Khabarovsk Kray to finalize the establishment of integrated network of PAs in the region; improved the region's legal framework for biodiversity conservation and PA management; strengthened individual PAs through the improved management planning and critical operational support; provided information on the regional population of Amur tiger and its prey base; and, improved public understanding and support on issues of biodiversity conservation. The TE informs that projects impacts are likely to be sustainable due to financial support from the local government.</p>	

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

A Financial resources	Rating: L
<p>Based on the discussion in the TE it could be said that the risk to financial sustainability is very low and it is likely that the project outcomes are financially sustainable. The TE suggests that the service established with a mandate to manage the regional PA system is properly funded and the allocations from the government in 2006 alone were expected to amount to US \$ 300,000.</p>	
B Socio political	Rating: UA
<p>Unable to assess because the TE has not addressed this issue.</p>	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: UA
<p>Unable to assess because the TE has not addressed this issue.</p>	
D Environmental	Rating: UA
<p>The TE has not discussed this issue.</p>	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

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

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good:

The catalytic role of the project is not directly discussed in the TE. Nonetheless, based on the narrative it could be inferred that the project did lead to production of a public good. However, it did not have inbuilt mechanisms to facilitate its replication or scaling up.

2. Demonstration

3. Replication

4. Scaling up

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

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities) **Rating: MU**

The TE does not address this issue. The review of the project proposal documents shows that the project had an M&E plan that described major risks to the project; a separate budget had been allocated to monitoring activities; and, responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation activities had been broadly assigned. The MSP didn't have a log frame but had specified indicators to track achievement of expected results.

B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure? **Rating: UA**

The TE does not address this issue.

C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? **Rating: UA**

As per the project proposal document there was a budget for M&E activities. However, it is not clear whether the allocated budget was sufficient and whether M&E activities were adequately funded during the implementation of the project.

Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?

NA. The TE does not provide sufficient information to facilitate conclusions on this dimension.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?

An important lesson listed in the TE is:

- In a changing governmental institutional setting, the execution of projects through a competent and reputable local NGO, which is able to take the lead and constructively cooperate with all project stakeholders, including the government, helps insure the continuity of commitment and implementation processes. This could be especially effective for small and medium size grant financed projects of regional scope.

Other lessons listed in the TE are very general and do not give real insights on what could be learned from the project.

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

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
No such documents were available to the author.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? TE has adequately assessed and described the relevant outcomes and impacts.	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Although the report is internally consistent, it does not cover all the issues and is, therefore, incomplete.	MS
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Only the issue of financial sustainability has been addressed as the TE has only discussed issues related to financial risks. On other dimensions the coverage is inadequate.	MU
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Only a few lessons are insightful. Others are not informative.	MS
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? TE has not addressed this issue.	U
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? There is no assessment of the M&E systems.	U

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

Yes:	No:
X	

Explain:
According to the TE one of the lessons of the project was that in a changing governmental institutional setting, the execution of projects through a competent and reputable local NGO helps ensure continuity of commitment and implementation processes. The role of the executing NGO could be explored further so that the efficacy of this model in a changing governmental institutional setting can be understood in a better manner.

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)
Project Appraisal Document; PIR 2003, 2004, 2005.