



To Do

Projects

Reports

Administration

Help Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: [Select](#)

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

Collapse all sections

Project

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| GEF ID | <input type="text" value="1836"/> |
| Project Title | <input type="text" value="Integrated Ecosystem and Wildlife Management Project in Bolikhamxay Province"/> |
| Project Type | <input type="text" value="Medium Size Project"/> |
| Funding Source | <input type="text" value="GEF Trust Fund"/> |
| Focal Area | <input type="text" value="Biodiversity"/> |
| Agency | <input type="text" value="World Bank"/> |
| World Bank ID | <input type="text" value="80765"/> |
| Country | <input type="text" value="Lao PDR"/> |
| Project Status | <input type="text" value="Project Completion"/> |
| Duration | <input type="text" value="5"/> years |
| CEO Endorsement | <input type="text" value="01/28/2005"/> |
| Agency Approval | <input type="text" value="5/2/2005"/> |
| Project Effectiveness | <input type="text" value="04/14/2005"/> |
| GEF Agency Execution Partners | <input type="text" value="(Select Execution Partners)"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other |
| If other, please specify | <input type="text"/> |

Terminal Evaluation Staff

[EO Staff](#)

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|
| TE Author | Viengkeo Phetnavongxay - WB T |
| TE Reviewer | Josh Brann |
| TE Peer Reviewer | Baljit Wadhwa |

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Expected Completion | |
| Project Actual Completion | 1/31/2010 |
| Project Completion Difference | Months |

TE Completion

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| TE Completion | 10/26/2010 |
| TE Submission to EO | 11/30/2011 |
| TE Submission to EO Difference | 13 Months |

TER Completion

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| TER Completion | 03/13/2012 |
| TER Submission to EO | |
| TER Submission to EO Difference | Months |

Comments on Delays

Although the TE submission to EO date is given as 11/30/11, in fact only the final Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) report was submitted to the EO by the World Bank, and the GEF EO was only able to track down the Implementation Completion Memorandum on its own due to de-facto access to internal World Bank databases.

A comment by the Task Team Leader at the end of the ICM states: "The ICM preparation has been initiated since December 2009 [World Bank Trust Fund closing date was January 31, 2010] but was delayed since the project was facing FM issues (mistakes coded in expenses categories). The task team was able to resolve the issue just one day before to the end of grace period."


Funding and Co-Financing

| | Amounts at CEO Endorsement | Amounts at Completion | Ratios |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| GEF Amount (US\$) | 974,025 | 974,025 | 100.00 % |
| Cofinance Amount (US\$) | 613,575 | 987,427 | 160.93 % |
| Total Amount (US\$) | 1,587,600 | 1,961,452 | 123.55 % |

Comments on Cofinancing 

The TE states: "GEF funds were instrumental in leveraging other support from other donors, namely: IDA grant from LEnS activities \$151,366; Luxemburg Development \$26,995; WCS \$129,625; Macarthur Foundations \$261,000; EO Wilson foundation \$10,000; GAMUDA \$15,416 [private sector hydropower developer]; THP \$44,961; US Embassy \$5,000; Boupna Thailand \$3,983; misc income \$4,045. Furthermore, successful implementation resulted in leveraging further natural resources conservation funding (Theun Hinboun Power Company, CEPF, MacArthur, Lao Environmental Protection Fund, CI-TEAM network and others)."

 **Logical Framework**

Quality of Logical Framework 




Project Objectives -

Regarding the quality of the logical framework - there are numerous shortcomings, as discussed in the M&E section below.

TE: "The Project Development Objective is to conserve the globally significant biodiversity found in Bolikhamxay Province's keystone Nam Kading National Protected Area and at least one provincial PA. Specific objectives are (a) to strengthen the capacity of management staff of protected areas in Bolikhamxay Province; (b) to implement sustainable conservation activities in the Nam Kading National Protected Area and at least one provincial protected area in Bolikhamxay Province; (c) to increase local awareness around Nam Kading National Protected Area for biodiversity and sustainable natural resource use; and (d) to encourage protected areas' provincial and national officials to replicate the Project approach in Bolikhamxay Province."


Comment on Changes

According to the TE, there were no significant changes to the original trust fund activities/components. "This project did not change or modify its scope, scale, goals or objectives. There were no major mid-term revisions to the project document or turnover of WCS or Government of Lao staff during the course of the project. Some implementation methods for activities were modified, as part of adaptive management."

| Activities | Outputs | Outcomes | Assumptions & Risks | Impact Enablers | Intermediary States | GEB / Impact | |
|--|---------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|---|
| | | | | | | |  Edit  Delete |
|  Add New Row... | | | | | | | |

 **Project Performance**











[Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFE0 Ratings](#) [Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFE0 Comments](#)

Overall Project Rating 

Comment



An overall rating of moderately satisfactory is assessed based on the combination of project design, achievement of outcomes, and sustainability. The project did successfully produce its outputs, which are contributing to the expected outcomes. There are a number of questions around sustainability, relating primarily to the hydropower development plans and other development aspects, such as road construction. The hydropower development plans were clearly known ahead of time, so it is not clear why the project was approved and implemented in a situation in which the sustainability would be questionable.


An "overall project rating" from TE would be "satisfactory" based on the fact that the TE rating for outcomes, bank performance, and recipient performance area all satisfactory. The TE does rate risk to development objectives as "significant" as further highlighted below under sustainability.




| Criteria | Document | Rating | Comment |
|---|----------------------|---|--|
| Outcomes  | Last PIR: | 5 - Satisfactory  | The PIR (actually GRM) rates the first component (capacity development) highly satisfactory, and the other two components as satisfactory, without providing an overall summary rating. |
| | Terminal Evaluation: | 5 - Satisfactory  | TE: "Rating of overall outcome is satisfactory. The project was completed on time and within budget achieving all of its output/outcome indicators (see Annex 1 for results framework)." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER. |
| | GEFEO Review: | 5 - Satisfactory  | Overall the project carried out the expected activities and produced the necessary outputs. These have and are continuing to contribute to the achievement of outcomes. There are multiple sustainability questions. |
| Relevance  | Terminal Evaluation: | NA - Not Applicable  | No specific rating on this aspect. In the section on relevance the TE highlights the general government priority on biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction, while identifying key government policies supporting these goals. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | The project objective and strategy is relevant at a general level, and supports government policies and strategies on biodiversity conservation and protected areas, generally. However in the context of the specific province and protected areas targeted, given that the area is apparently planned for large scale hydropower development, it seems likely that interventions in other areas with stronger prospects for sustainability may have been more relevant in contributing to the general biodiversity conservation goals and objectives. On the other hand, the area is a key biodiversity area to which the participating stakeholders are strongly committed. |
| | Terminal Evaluation: | 5 - Satisfactory  | |

Effectiveness 

TE: "The achievement of Project Development Objectives is rated Satisfactory. Capacity for the management staff of protected areas in Bolikhamxay Province has improved; staff capacity has increased and is evident in the number of staffs that are able to undertake conservation activities, and display good understanding of primary and secoand relevant intervention options, and monitoring of intervention outcomes. The Nam Kading National Protected Area and Phou Chom Voy Provincial Protected Area management plans have been completed and activities of those two PAs are now being implemented by the Province with WCS technical support... Three project staff, plus district staff (from education, DAFO, Women's Union, and Information and Culture) have undertaken awareness raising training on the value of forest and wildlife and threats to wildlife. In one year, 56 villages plus 18 schools participated in this course. The project worked with eight target villages, to improve livelihoods in line with sustainable forest management. Alternative livelihood support activities progressed well at project target villages."












| | | |
|----------------|---|---|
| Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| GEFEO Review: | 5 - Satisfactory  | Based on the information available in the TE, the majority of project outputs were achieved (with some delays), and these are contributing to the expected outcomes. There is clearly a significant ways to go before the necessary intermediate states will be achieved to eventually secure the expected Global Environmental Benefits. |


Efficiency 

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Terminal Evaluation: | NA - Not Applicable  | No specific rating given for efficiency. TE: "The IEWMP project was completed within its planned timeframe and budget. Provincial Protected Area Management Unit in Bolikhamxay province is now able to plan and implement the protected area management plan. The link to WCS allowed the project to draw on expert advice from the WCS networkto support activity implementation. Such support/partnership meant that more funds were able to be reallocated for implementation from consultancy services. The World Bank supervision missions (technical and financial) also were carried out efficiently by combining IEWMP reviews with other project review." |
| Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | |

As cited in the TE comments section for this parameter, there were some approaches that contributed to project efficiency. It is impossible to assess certain metrics such as project management costs however, as this level of detail for financial information is not provided in the TE. The issues related to financial management and reporting appear to have required significant time and effort from the IA and EA.


| Criteria | Document | Rating | Comment |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Sustainability ⓘ | Last PIR: | 4 - Likely ▼ | PIR (actually GRM) gives a rating of "likely" for "overall outcome and its sustainability, while a rating of "modest risk" is given for activity risk. This is translated by the TE reviewer here as moderately likely rating for sustainability. Further, the PIR gives a rating of satisfactory for arrangements for sustainability. |
| | Terminal Evaluation: | 2 - Moderately Unlikely ▼ | The TE rating is on the scale of level of risk to outcomes, which is rated as significant, the third rating on a four point scale. This is translated here by the TE reviewer as moderately unlikely. TE: "The above mentioned development activities are external risks and are politically sensitive and therefore beyond the capacity of the project to stop them, despite much effort and dialogue. and could compromise the sustainability of the NKD-NPA. Thus, the risk to the development outcome is considered as significant (S)." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable ▼ | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 2 - Moderately Unlikely ▼ | Based on the lowest rating of the four below criteria. |
| Financial ⓘ | Terminal Evaluation: | 3 - Moderately Likely ▼ | TE: "money always presented a risk. Currently the IEWMP has good base support with a 10 year agreement with THP and TEAM and potentially Lao Environmental Trust Fund. Projects in the US Fish and Wildlife Service grants." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable ▼ | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 3 - Moderately Likely ▼ | The TE identifies multiple sources of ongoing financial support that will contribute to the continuation of some project results. Other aspects of the project, particularly the education and awareness activities and alternative livelihoods development seem to have lacked an adequate exit strategy. Financial sustainability for the overall region remains an issue, and is dependent on ongoing donor funding, but is not the most significant sustainability risk. |
| | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess ▼ | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|--|
| Socio-political  | | | The TE provides separate, and different, ratings for social and political. Also, separate ratings are provided for "government ownership/commitment" and "other stakeholder ownership". TE: "Social, (M) There is uncertainty about the impacts new resettlement villages on the edge of the Nam Kading NPA will have operations. All parties are aware of the potential problems and are working on ways to mitigate them. Political, (S) There is good commitment from provincial authorities and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Support from the Prime Minister's Office is still developing." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 3 - Moderately Likely  | There appears to generally be good stakeholder support from local government and community levels for the project objectives. There are some issues related to the resettlement of minority groups into the project area, which is likely to increase pressures on natural resources. |
| Institutional and Legal  | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess  | The TE provides separate, and different, ratings for "institutional support" (rated low risk) and governance risk (rated moderate). |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Likely  | There do not appear to be significant institutional and legal risks for the project, although governance and institutional capacity among relevant government agencies remains weak. |
| Environmental  | Terminal Evaluation: | 1 - Unlikely  | The TE provides a rating of "high" risk on this aspect, the highest on a four point scale. This is translated here as "unlikely" by the TE reviewer. TE: "Environmental (H) Hydropower development could greatly affect the biodiversity within the Nam Kading NPA. Currently, no corridor exists linking the protected areato the Annamite Mountains, which decreases the resilience to climate change impacts." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 2 - Moderately Unlikely  | The most significant risks for sustainability relate to environmental risks, most notably the hydropower development planned for the region. The dam and reservoir do not seem to be as much of an issue as the overall dam construction process, which will bring roads, and an influx of people to the region. This is discussed further in the TE. |

| Criteria | Document | Rating | Comment |
|----------|----------------------|---|--|
| | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess  | No specific rating is given on M&E in the TE. Little information is provided on this aspect in |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| M&E | GEFEO Review: | 3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory | The quality of the logframe indicators and baseline data was a significant shortcoming, given that this is the primary tool to assess project implementation progress, guide a results-based approach, and assess progress toward outcome at the end of the project. |
| | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess | See above overall comment on ME under the TE field. |
| M&E Design | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory | The Prodoc includes an M&E section which identifies some M&E activities, and roles and responsibilities. Overall the logframe is significantly lacking, as indicators do not meet SMART criteria, are primarily at the output level, and baseline information is not provided. |
| M&E Plan Implementation | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess | See above overall comment on ME under the TE field. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory | Overall, M&E activities appear to have been implemented in a satisfactory manner, which supported some adaptive management measures. The most significant issue was with financial and implementation progress reporting, which, according to information in the TE and PIR was significantly problematic. |
| M&E Funding and Budget Utilization | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess | See above overall comment on ME under the TE field. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | UA - Unable to assess | No information on this aspect is provided. This does not appear to have been a significant issue. |


| Criteria | Document | Rating | Comment |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Quality of Implementation and Execution | Terminal Evaluation: | 5 - Satisfactory | No overall rating on this aspect is given in the TE - the rating given here is assumed, based on the below ratings of satisfactory for both implementation and execution given in the TE. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory | Overall rating based on both ratings below. |
| | Terminal Evaluation: | 5 - Satisfactory | |

Quality of Implementation - IA 

The TE section on "Bank Performance" is transposed here for quality of implementation. TE: "During the course of the project (5 years) the TF had three TTLs. All had a very good understanding of the aims of the project, the concepts/methods of capacity building, issues surrounding biodiversity conservation, the realities of working on the ground in Laos and all were very practical and helpful. Government agencies and WCS (recipients) confirmed this. Support was also provided by World Bank Country Office (CMU) to WCS and Government in their efforts to resolve issues relating to hydropower development in Laos and particularly Nam Kading NPA.

 Fiduciary; both Bank financial and procurement procedures are new to the project implementing unit. The flow of funds was also unusual for Lao portfolio; it was the only project that was paid directly from the Bank's Payable Account. However, in practice, it was impossible for the team to track expenses by project category in the system. The project was operating with different sources of funds; some expenses were recorded incorrectly under the GEF funding. It took a long time for the team to resolve this issue."

| | | |
|----------------|--|---|
| Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | No agency TER |
| GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> | The World Bank appears to have played an adequate oversight role, and assisted the project in dealing with some of the political issues faced. At the same time, the financial management, and project design both face some issues that the World Bank must share some responsibility for. |









Quality of Execution - EA 

















Terminal Evaluation: 5 - Satisfactory
 Transposed here from "borrower performance" section of the TE. TE: "The partnership between the Bolikhamxay Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office and Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) worked very well. The Bolikhamxay Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office staff were capable and motivated. They rapidly learned to implement project activities with a high level of professionalism and care. The WCS Lao program has been able to mobilize dedicated professionals within its organization to address technical needs. Strong support provided by the WCS New York program for advancing and carrying the project expenses in the early years while the accounting and invoicing problem was resolved was very helpful. Without this support, the project would not have achieved its PDO."


| | | |
|----------------|--|---------------|
| Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | No agency TER |
| GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> | |




While the project seems to have proceeded well from a technical perspective, there were a number of project management issues related to planning and financial reporting.

 **Agency Specific Project Criteria**





| Criteria | Document | Rating/Verification | Comment |
|---|----------------------|---|--|
| Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results | | | |
| Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority  | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess  | The TE does not provide a specific rating on this aspect, but in the context of risks to outcomes (i.e. sustainability) it does give a rating of "moderate" risk, which the 2nd lowest (least risky) on a four point scale. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | There is an inherent tension between the project goals and objectives, and the drive for economic development in the project's targeted region, where there are plans for large scale hydropower development. At the ground level, among communities and regional stakeholders, stakeholder ownership appears to be reasonably strong. The same can likely be said for the relevant national government institutions whose mandate includes protected areas and biodiversity conservation. The TE and PIRs however note that the prime minister's office is yet to be brought fully on board, and clearly, the threat of the hydropower development remains. The project is aligned with the country's biodiversity conservation priorities. |
| Financial Planning  | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess  | No specific rating is given on this aspect. The TE notes numerous issues with financial accounting and reporting, but other aspects of financial planning are not extensively commented on, except that the TE notes that adaptive management was applied with respect to some project activities. TE: "Fiduciary; both Bank financial and procurement procedures are new to the project implementing unit. The flow of funds was also unusual for Lao portfolio; it was the only project that was paid directly from the Bank's Payable Account. However, in practice, it was impossible for the team to track expenses by project category in the system. The project was operating with different sources of funds; some expenses were recorded incorrectly under the GEF funding. It took a long time for the team to resolve this issue." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | |







| | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|--|
| | | | The project appears to have produced the expected outputs in the period expected, with the resources available. There were significant financial management and reporting challenges along the way however. |
| Preparation and Readiness  | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess  | No specific rating given on this aspect in the TE, and this aspect is not specifically addressed, although there are numerous lessons identified in the TE that could be considered to be related to preparation and readiness, particularly, for example, the amount of time and resources required for meaningful capacity development. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 5 - Satisfactory  | This does not appear to have been a significant issue, although it might be said that the time and resources necessary to do capacity development work may have been underestimated. |
| Stakeholders Involvement  | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to assess  | The TE does not provide a specific rating on this. The TE does discuss various aspects of the project related to the involvement of different types of stakeholders, from the private sector hydropower developers to the PA staff to the local community members to the local government institutions. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 5 - Satisfactory  | The project involved a diverse range of stakeholders, including PA management staff, local community members, local government, national governmental institutions, and the |
| Need for Follow Up  | Terminal Evaluation: | No  | No issues specifically identified in this section of the TE, beyond the issues of sustainability. The final PIR, in the manager's comments, states: "Obviously the main issues going forward will be the sustainability of the interventions. Additionally there are political economy aspects to be considered with encroachments. I hope the Team will continue to follow up with the Govt. on these issues post project." |
| | Agency Review: | Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | Yes  | There were numerous activities identified by the TE that need additional support for sustainability. In addition, considering the significant risks to sustainability posed by some of the development activities (most notably the hydropower plans), it would be very helpful to monitor the situation and assess the results in the future through ex-post evaluation. |
| Gender Mainstreaming  | Terminal Evaluation: | Unable to assess  | No information on this aspect provided in the TE. |
| | Agency Review: | Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO | Unable to assess  | |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|--|
| | Review: | | No information provided on this aspect. Appears relevant considering the alternative livelihood and community involvement activities. |
| Effects on Local Population  | Terminal Evaluation: | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | One component of the project was to increase community participation and awareness with respect to biodiversity conservation and sustainability use. This included an alternative livelihoods component. Indicators for this component included socio-economic indicators. |
| | Agency Review: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | See comments under TE section of this parameter. In addition, see comments under poverty reduction section below. The project specifically engaged local communities in the vicinity of the targeted protected areas. |

| Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus | Document | Verification | Comment |
|--|----------------------|---|--|
| Poverty Reduction  | Terminal Evaluation: | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | TE: "The project worked with eight target villages, to improve livelihoods in line with sustainable forest management. Alternative livelihood support activities progressed well at project target villages. Activities undertaken to help generate/improve income included: (a) establishment of fish conservation zones in deep pools; (b) NTFP zoning, management and sales groups; (c) agriculture and livestock training; (d) credit and village revolving fund operation and (e) handicraft and marketing promotion. These activities showed positive impact on the community in supporting their livelihood and minimizing threats to the NKD-NPA, particularly the NTFP management, fish conservation zone and handicraft support activities." |
| | Agency Review: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | According to the TE, the project contributed to poverty reduction. The TE indicates that socio-economic indicators were used, but no detailed results information is presented. |
| Crisis Prevention and Recovery  | Terminal Evaluation: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | Not applicable in the context of this project. |
| | Agency Review: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | Not applicable. |
| Democratic Governance  | Terminal Evaluation: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | Not applicable in the context of this project. |
| | Agency Review: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> | Not applicable. |

 **Progress to Impact**

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|--|
| Progress to Impact  | Terminal Evaluation: | UA - Unable to Assess  | No specific rating provided on this aspect in the TE. If the overall assessment of the TE is synthesized in this regard, the TE considers that the project produced valuable results that could be considered "moderate progress" toward impact, but that there are significant sustainability questions. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 2 - Moderate Progress  | This review echos the synthesized assessment of the TE - the project made notable contributions in capacity development related to PA management, through individual capacity enhancements, and measures such as improved management plans. The education and awareness campaigns, and community-based livelihood activities also contributed to progress toward the long-term overall goal of effective biodiversity conservation in the region. However, based on the information in the TE, it appears there remains a great deal of work to be done; the project has barely scratched the surface. On top of this, as previously mentioned, there are numerous potential sustainability questions. |



| Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational | Document | Verification | Comment |
|---|----------------------|---|---|
| Information, Knowledge and Awareness  | Terminal Evaluation: | Y - Yes  | The project included an education and awareness component. TE: "To date, due mainly to the project contributions, two staff members are able to conduct training on conservation outreach and awareness raising" "Three project staff, plus district staff (from education, DAFO, Women's Union, and Information and Culture) have undertaken awareness raising training on the value of forest and wildlife and threats to wildlife. In one year, 56 villages plus 18 schools participated in this course. The methods are interactive and involve numerous materials (posters, books). Pre-tests (one month prior) and post tests (three months after the course) show that villager understanding of conservation issues increased through this activity." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | Y - Yes  | See comments in TE section of this parameter. |
| Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks  | Terminal Evaluation: | NA - Not Applicable  | This was not a focus of the project. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |



| | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | GEFEO Review: | NA - Not Applicable | See comments in TE section of this parameter. |
| Implementing Structures and Arrangements | Terminal Evaluation: | NA - Not Applicable | This was not a focus of the project. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | NA - Not Applicable | See comments in TE section of this parameter. |





| Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational | Document | Verification | Comment |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches | Terminal Evaluation: | Y - Yes | The overall project was intended to serve as a demonstration of an approach to biodiversity conservation in Laos. TE: "The project has been able to demonstrate effective implementation of a protected areas project within Lao PDR. The knowledge and lessons from this GEF MSP is being shared within the country." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | Y - Yes | See comments in TE section above. As the TE also notes, this project demonstrated the minimum level of effort necessary to conserve biodiversity in a national protected area. |

| Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment | Document | Verification | Comment |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches | Terminal Evaluation: | N - No | This was not a focus of the project. |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | N - No | This was not a focus of the project. |




| Criteria / Causal Pathway | Document | Verification | Comment |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Replication | Terminal Evaluation: | Y - Yes | Also see comments under upscaling below. TE: "IEWMP success and lessons learned have influenced natural resources and biodiversity conservation policy such as the Global Tiger Initiative. For example, the methods for patrolling and data base management have since been recommended as standard approach for protected areas in the GTI related Tiger National Recovery Plan, and for use in other protected areas, such as Nakai Nam Theun NPA." |
| | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO | | |



















| | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|---|
| | Review: | <input type="text" value="Y - Yes"/> | See comments under TE section of this parameter, and under upscaling parameter below. |
| Upscaling  | Terminal Evaluation: | <input type="text" value="Y - Yes"/> | TE: "IEWMP demonstrated a successful model for National Protected Area and Provincial Protected Areas for the Department of Forestry. These lessons learned are influencing implementation policy and fulfilling recommendations for the Lao Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. For example, DoF has endorsed a simplified version of the Living Landscapes approach, first trialed for Laos in this GEF MSP, as the planning tool of choice for Lao protected areas." Also TE: "The Division of Forest Resources Conservation adopted the approach of the Rare Pride Campaign as the national methodology for conservation outreach. They invited IEWMP staff to conduct conservation awareness at the 25th South East Asia Games." Also TE: "The Nam Kading NPA management experience is used for the NPA management staff Bachelor's degree thesis both in and outside the country." |
| | Agency Review: | <input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/> | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | <input type="text" value="Y - Yes"/> | See comments under TE section above and under replication parameter. |
| Mainstreaming  | Terminal Evaluation: | <input type="text" value="Y - Yes"/> | The project is by its nature a protected area rather than mainstreaming project, but based on the context in which it is working (facing significant development pressures) it could also be seen as contributing to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in development planning. |
| | Agency Review: | <input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/> | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | <input type="text" value="Y - Yes"/> | See comments under TE section of this |

| Criteria / Evaluative Evidence | Document | Visibility | Boundary | Intent | Comments | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------------|----------|--|---|
| | Terminal Evaluation | Y - Yes | Demonstration Site | Intended | TE: "Early enforcement results show a decline in threats per unit effort at three substations with patrol areas covering approximately 600 km2 or around 35% of the NPA area. When baseline surveys were conducted (see Vanderhelm et. |  Edit  Delete |



















| | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Environmental Stress Reduction  | | | | al. (2007)) threat levels in the areas surveyed were up to 24 per 100 km surveyed. Present threat encounter rates are well below this level with an average of 0.52 /100km." |
| | | + Add New Row... | | |
| | Agency Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | GEFEO Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| Environmental Status Change  | Terminal Evaluation | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | Agency Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | GEFEO Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | | | | |
| Socioeconomic Status Change  | Terminal Evaluation | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | Agency Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | GEFEO Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | | | | |
| Arrangements for Impact M&E  | Terminal Evaluation | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | Agency Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | GEFEO Review | No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row. | | |
| | | | | |

 **TE Report Quality**

| Criteria | Document | Rating | Comment |
|---|----------------|---|---------------|
| TE Quality  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | |



| | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|
| | | | Based on the ratings below, the overall TE score is 3.7, which equates to a moderately satisfactory rating. The TE has shortcomings in several areas, but provides an acceptable summary of the project implementation and results. |
| Outcome Assessment  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | The TE does an acceptable job of assessing project outcome. Although adequate outcome indicators were generally lacking, the METT was used, and the TE provides a qualitative summary assessment of outcome level results. |
| Consistency  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | UA - Unable to assess  | No information available on this aspect. |
| Sustainability Assessment  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | The TE does discuss risks to outcomes, as the means of assessing sustainability issues. The TE provides a detailed, but brief, summary of the issues. The TE provides an 11 point breakdown of sustainability issues with ratings for each, with 1-2 sentences of summary for each. While this information and detail is appreciated, it does not seem to fit into any framework of sustainability assessment, and simply seems to be a list of factors potentially affecting sustainability, which reduces its utility when trying to make a synthesized analysis. |
| Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | The lessons and recommendations identified are evidence based, but many of the issues identified are not discussed or analyzed in the main body of the report. |
| Clear Financial Assessment  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory  | The TE provides an overall project financial summary for both GEF funding and cofinancing, but does not break this down by project component. Details are provided on actual cofinancing though, which is helpful. But given the challenging financial management issues the project faced, it would have been helpful to have more detailed financial information, particularly at least to break down financing by component. |
| M&E Assessment  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 2 - Unsatisfactory  | The TE does not provide an assessment of this aspect, and only briefly mentions some of the reporting issues faced by the project. |




| Agency- | Document | Rating | Comment |
|---------|----------|--------|---------|
|---------|----------|--------|---------|

| Specific Criteria | | | |
|---|----------------|---|--|
| Attainment of Results based on Indicators  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 5 - Satisfactory  | The TE provides an indicator by indicator summary of results in an annex to the main report. Various highlights are also discussed qualitatively in the report. The main issue is that the project indicators are primarily at the output level, and without well-developed outcome level indicators it is difficult to assess the true level of progress. The provides statements about the positive nature of certain outcome results, which certainly do have value - but without appropriate indicators it is very difficult to assess the actual level of achievement, and the level of outcome achievement expected at the beginning of the project. |
| Consultation with Stakeholders  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | UA - Unable to assess  | No information available on this aspect. |
| Compliance with Guidances  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | UA - Unable to assess  | No information available on this aspect. |
| Compliance with UNEG Norms  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | UA - Unable to assess  | No information available on this aspect. |
| Addressing of ToR requests  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | UA - Unable to assess  | No information available on this aspect. |
| Independence of Report  | Agency Review: | NA - Not Applicable  | No agency TER |
| | GEFEO Review: | 4 - Moderately Satisfactory  | The TE assessment and analysis does not present any indicators of overt lack of independence, and appears to fairly represent project information and results. The main issue is that some of the shortcomings, particularly sustainability issues, are not given a comprehensive analysis, which leaves an impression of inadvertent bias. The TE was completed by the World Bank Task Team Leader, and some of the challenges the project faced are not discussed in detail. |

 **Lessons & Recommendations**



| Type of Lesson | If other type, please specify | Lessons Learned | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Stakeholder | | Motivation was supported by the Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office, but it |  Edit  Delete |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Involvement | | was further reinforced with top-up salaries (from non-GEF funds). Top-up salaries were essential in an economy where civil servants are paid just above the poverty line (US\$ 2 /day). The project was very fortunate that there was no turn-over of the key senior staff within GoL. Stable and consistent staffing which is helped by salary supplements are keys to ensure success of projects. | |
| Capacity Building | | English skills training is an essential part of capacity development for government staff and need to support in any projects, particularly at the local level. Basic English language skill improves staff communication with consultant; operate computer and read useful materials which provided in English. |  Edit  Delete |
|  | | | |



No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new Recommendation.

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility