

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	9/8/05
GEF ID:	1328		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Barriers and Best Practices in Integrated Management of Mountain Ecosystems	GEF financing:	0.925	0.814
Country:	Regional / Global	Co-financing:	1.125	?
Operational Program:	OP12 (OP4)	Total Project Cost:	\$2.124	\$?
IA	UNEP	Dates		
Partners involved:	UNEP – WCMC	Work Program date		2001
		CEO Endorsement		March 2002
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		March 2002
		Closing Date November 2003 (terminated early)	Proposed: March 2005	Actual: November 2003
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 3 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 1 year and 5 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 year and 7 months (closed early due to financial and managerial irregularities)
Author of TE: V. Mathur and A, Rajvanshi		TE completion date: December Jan 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 11/2/04	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 10 months

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME 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). GEFME 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 applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	MS (4)	N/A	U
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	U	N/A	U
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	U	N/A	U

2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
--------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	----

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No Why? The TE is inconsistent, the poor performance on the project in terms of outcomes, sustainability, financial and project management and M&E all points toward a unsatisfactory outcome. However, the UNEP rating system is skewed towards giving project optimistic ratings – hence, the evaluators have given the project a ‘satisfactory’ rating which is at odds with the evidence contained in the TE.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

To assist developing countries in promoting and enhancing the protection and sustainable development of mountains and their resources globally, as a contribution to the International Year of the Mountains, World Summit on Sustainable Development and Bishkek Global Mountain Summit.

Through collaboration among GEF implementing agencies and other partners, this medium-sized project aims to identify best practices in GEF and non-GEF projects dealing with biodiversity, climate change and international waters in the context of integrated management of mountain ecosystems. Specific objectives are to:

- (a) To integrate available information on the status of mountain ecosystems through the Mountain Atlas process and support the publication of the mountain atlas as a tool for decision making in sustainable mountain development;
- (b) To identify the steps needed to accelerate the implementation and provide the experiences and lessons as the GEF contribution to the Bishkek Mountain Platform for dissemination at global events such as the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the Bishkek Global Mountain Summit in 2002;
- (c) To explore opportunities for building private–public partnerships on the upland-lowland nexus and promoting fair economic valuation of upland ecological surfaces

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

What are the Development Objectives?

Same as above

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts (TE – rated project outcomes ‘satisfactory’ /4 – on UNEP scale

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

Outcome 1: Environmental Asset Management and Partnerships (with private sector) (Not rated)

The TE notes that this outcome consisted of several activities – **firstly** the launch of a water / mountain initiative involving UNEP / Private sector companies and World Economic Forum (WEF) to be an incubator for public –private initiatives; to contribute to payments for environmental services and to establish best practice on environmental services. However, the project did not take the lead on this initiative, which was already underway at the project start and led by the WEF. The WEF are now hoping to get a ‘new MSP’ to develop the initiative. One initiative in India was developed between a college and a private swiss company to improve rainwater harvesting – but even this was not an output of the project and cannot claim to be catalyzed by the project. **Secondly**, WEF organized special events on public-private partnerships as part of its own program independent of the project. Various meetings led to the stakeholders defining UNEPs role as developing strategies for disaster prevention in vulnerable regions and mountain management ... It is evident that all the meetings and outcomes were produced by the WEF and that the GEF project has provided some (little) catalytic action. **Third**, establishment of the mountain commons trust fund from non-GEF resources – the trust fund was to be established by the WEF with contributions from various companies, how no action has taken place. **Fourth**, the establishment of mountain stakeholder association – this activity has not made any progress under the project. **Fifthly**, linkages with the CBD process – it was planned that the project would integrate with the mountain biodiversity theme an the work of SBSTTA – but it

was observed that the outcomes of the project have 'no place in the work of the SBSTTA on mountain biodiversity'. Linkages have not occurred. This undermines the replicability and sustainability of the project outcomes. **Sixthly**, UN General Assembly resolution on International Year of Mountains – a resolution was passed on 20th December 2002.

Outcome 2: Bishkek Mountain Summit (Not rated)

The TE noted that the summit was organized and consisted of 1,553 participants and delegations from the major donor agencies and from 30 governments. Consultations led to the issues of gender, economic incentives and legal instruments for sustainable mountain management to be included in the summit agenda. New global cooperation initiatives were developed although funding is uncertain. The project developed 10 thematic papers for the summit – they provide examples of best practice from around the world and are the best available synthesis to date on a range of mountain issues. However, good management needs to be translated widely to action on the ground. The thematic papers were not translated into other languages and just confined to Russian translations. One of the outcomes of the papers was to review contributions of the GEF and non-GEF funded activities to developing good management practice – this has not been done. The UNU has agreed to publish the thematic papers as an edited volume. The Bishkek Mountain Platform was the key product of the Summit – it provides guidance to governments and NGOs on how to improve the livelihoods of mountain people and protecting mountain ecosystems. Presently only Kyrgyzstan has benefited from the guidance in developing mountain related legislation.

Outcome 3: Best Practice Guidelines (Not rated)

The TE noted that the project proposed several sub-outcomes. **Firstly**, a special edition of the journal Mountain Research and Development to showcase best practices. The evaluators contacted the journal and found that they do not entertain institutionally sponsored works dedicated to project related outcomes. This outcome was not achieved and it was not appropriate in the first place to propose it as an outcome in the project design. The journal only referred to the 'best practices' contained in the thematic papers on page 86 of the vol 23: 1 (2003). The project manager has thus sought to convey the impression that a special issue of Mountain Research and Development exists whereas it neither exists nor can exist according to its public policy. **Secondly**, UNEP-WCMC and GRID centers produced the Mountain Watch as part of the GEF project – the report produced the first map-based overview of environmental change in the mountain regions and its implications for sustainable development. It presents new global maps which illustrate many of the pressures that are causing environmental change. Despite the quality and lucidity and coverage of the report the technical details and methodology used in assessing mountain ecosystems was found to be wanting. It does not provide practical examples or guide decision-making. Presently it is 'one off report' aimed at building awareness. **Thirdly**, the project listed a mountain atlas as a key outcome and key tool for policy makers. However the project funds could not be used to finance the production of the atlas and no co-financing could be found. **Fourthly**, the project developed a interactive internet mountain watch portal to support the Bishkek summit – a wide range of information was available and portal had heavy used through late 2002. But the portal has not been maintained since the end of the summit to provide governments with access to information in the post-summit period. **Fifthly**, support to International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) in Hindu-Kush regional activities. The project supported the development of hindu-kush mountain atlas, internet portal and mountain watch inputs. All of which were successfully completed.

Outcome 4: Coordination and Enhanced Inter-agency collaboration (Not rated)

The TE evaluators agree that the project brought together a large number of agencies and was able to get consensus over a large number of issues and processes culminating in the Bishkek Mountain Platform. There is however, no evidence that the inter-agency group on mountains which the FAO was to convene during 2001 – 2003 ever met. Neither is it evident that the project manager took measures to ensure the proper coordination with the FAO. These meeting would have been useful in building consensus and awareness but they did not take place.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Rating: U

A Relevance

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The project was consistent with OP4 and later the Biodiversity strategic priority 4. The project was supposed to integrate climate change and international waters aspects into implementation – however there is no evidence presented by that TE that this was achieved.

B Effectiveness
<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>The TE indicates that the project failed to achieve many of its outcomes and sustainability is not ensured beyond closure. The project was badly implemented due to poor project management, coordination and financially inappropriate practices. For example, GEF money was used to fund some elements of the Bishkek summit organization and administration, which was not permitted by the project design. Outcomes 1, 3 and 4 were not achieved, with outcome 2 (the summit and thematic papers) being the only tangible outcome. The project failed to meet its sub-objectives 1 and 3 and only achieved 2 (summit). But with a lack of financing and institutional sustainability there is a strong possibility that much ground will be lost in the post-project period.</p>
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)
<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?
<p>The project was not cost effective. There was significant mis-allocation of resources due to lax financial accounting and management procedures within UNEP. The project was rightly terminated by UNEP due to lack of project management competence. The project failed to produce sustainable outcomes or meet 2 out of 3 of the sub-objectives. GEF funds were also spent on activities, which were not permitted by the original project design. The TE gave no account of co-financing and to what extent the project secured the US\$1m + that at detailed in the prodoc. The TE states:</p> <p>“Financial planning for the project was weak and the financial management process was complicated as it involved multiple agencies geographically separated from each other. The multiplicity of coordination arrangements was not effective and allowed the project manager to operate without any stringent financial controls. The financial management also suffered due to improper functioning of IMIS at UNEP, Geneva.”</p>

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: HU
Although the project produced thematic report, mountain watch publication, coordinated meetings etc there is no financial resources currently available to continue the activities – and produce key outputs such as the mountain atlas and decision-making tools etc. Therefore, financial sustainability is rated highly unlikely	
B Socio political	Rating: U
Socio-political sustainability is largely dependent on keeping mountain issues in the spot-light of politicians and decision-makers as well as disseminating lessons and best practices to the grassroots. Without funding this is impossible. Therefore socio-political sustainability is rated unlikely	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: U
The project failed to institute public-private partnerships or engender lasting international / inter-agency collaboration. There is some hope that WEF may continue to try and foster public – private partnerships on on land – water issues however this was a non-GEF initiative and cannot be considered in terms of the 'project'. Again without funds to sustain rounds of meeting and coordination sustainability must be rated unlikely.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: N/A
On-the-ground activities are not documented.	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: HU
The project made a valuable contribution in terms of raising awareness and profile of environmental and livelihood issues concerning mountain ecosystems. However, as there is no financing available to continue awareness raising / dissemination of best practices and catalyzing the formation of public-private partnerships, replication is rated highly unlikely. Critically, the project missed opportunities (perhaps due to poor project management and leadership) to attract private investors or to work effectively with the WEF to build a level of sustainability into the promotion of issues, best practices and incentives.	

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

<p>A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?</p>	Rating: U
<p>The TE rated project M&E and management systems unsatisfactory. The well laid down monitoring and evaluation process for this project in the project document was never followed which ultimately led to a premature termination of the project. The M&E system design was not at fault, it was just never implemented because of poor project management and leadership on the part of the UNEP.</p>	
<p>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?</p>	Rating: N/A
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No</p>	

4.4 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p>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?</p>
<p>The TE contained few lessons that could be considered good practice given the poor performance of the projects. One lesson e-consultation may be generally applicable to projects focusing on knowledge management and dissemination:</p> <p>The TE stated: "E-consultation is a cost-effective way of ensuring multi-stakeholder networking and dialogues needed to identify and initiate innovative collaborative activities and to evolve consensus for action on local, national, regional and global scales."</p>

4.5 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.

<p>4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</p>
<p>In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.</p>
<p>N/A</p>

4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE contains a good description of the project outcomes and problems</p>	4
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Unfortunately despite the TE detailing the projects failure to reach many of the planned outcomes, evidence of financial mis-management and early closure of the project – the evaluators then gave the project a 'satisfactory' rating which contradicts the evidence they present. For this reasons the report is rated highly unsatisfactory.</p>	1
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? General comment is made on sustainability – although not according to GEF sub-definitions.</p>	3

D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons are supported by evidence, but tend to be too specific. The evaluators miss an opportunity to provide more telling lessons to aid similar knowledge management / dissemination and policy projects in the future	3
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes	4
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes	4

4.6 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: X	No:
---------------	------------

Explain: GEF often provides financing for 'best practice dissemination' / 'targeted research' projects. It would be advantageous to assess these projects as a 'cohort' for effectiveness, cost-efficiency and relevance.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? Yes, mis-appropriation and poor management skills – UNEP however should be commended for shutting the project down. However, they should seek to improve the skills of their project managers. The TE stated:
 "Efficient and effective project management by the project manager recruited for a P-5/L post should have ensured better project outcomes but this did not happen".

4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

N/A