

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	1859		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	744	GEF financing:	1.0	
Project Name:	Conservation of the Eg-Uur Watershed	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Mongolia	Government:		
		Other (private sector) *:		
		Total Co-financing	1.03	
Operational Program:	OP 2 : the Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	Total Project Cost:	2.03	
IA	World Bank/IFC	Dates		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Nature and Environment Sweetwater Travel Hovsgol Travel The Taimen Conservation Fund (TCF) WWF Mongolian Business Development Agency (MBDA)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		April 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: April, 2008	Actual: October, 2008
TER Prepared by: B. Wadhwa	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 60	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 66	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 6
Author of TE:		TE completion date: February 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: August 2010	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 18

* 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	N/A	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MU	N/A	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	S	N/A	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	MS	S	N/A	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	HU

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

The Project Completion Report served as the main source of information at project end. An independent terminal

evaluation for this project was not completed.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
No.

3. Project objectives

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?
To ensure the sustainable conservation of the Egin-Uur watershed ecosystem through the realization of economic benefits from the sustainable use of wildlife, resulting in equitable sharing of financial benefits between the local communities and private operators.

There were no changes to GEOs during implementation.

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 main objectives of the Project are to: (1) conserve biodiversity-rich taiga riparian, forest, and prairie ecosystems; (2) monetize a previously unvalued natural resource through implementation of a natural resource use concession and licensing system for sport fishing rights; and, (3) demonstrate to the local inhabitants, and other communities with comparable natural resources, that sport fishing ecotourism can provide a competitive rate of return as compared to alternative, higher impact industries, such as mining, logging, and hunting, while complementing the traditional pastoral nomadic way of life.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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)

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
In 1997, the Mongolian Parliament passed the National Program on Protected Areas to increase coverage of protected areas by up to 30 percent of its total land area. In 1997, Mongolia also ratified the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. The project is consistent with the Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan of Mongolia (1997), which stresses the importance of wetland protection and natural resources management by the local peoples. The Mongolian government supports privately managed conservation initiatives. The project addressed a market failure – poorly defined property rights for a fresh water fishery. It also responded to Mongolia’s national emphasis on tourism development as an engine of economic growth. Both issues were successfully addressed by the client.	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: S
The project achieved its key deliverables at a satisfactory level. Natural resource management plans were developed for the various districts in the project area. In addition, a sustainable resource use plan was developed for a local community in the core project area. This was confirmed from client reports and interviews with stakeholders.	

The level of achievement of the key outcome – a working user rights system – was at a satisfactory level, with additional testing planned post-project by the client in several areas.

In addition, a national catch and release policy for taimen was adopted by the Ministry of Nature and Environment. This rating was based on presentations at a closing workshop and interviews with several stakeholders.

The most important impact of the project was the conservation of the Taimen fishery in the Eg-Uur Watershed. This was confirmed by extensive monitoring data carried out by the science team of the project. The counterfactual was what happened in other watersheds where healthy taimen populations were known to exist at the start of the project. While this project did not monitor in those rivers, national fishery agency personnel and members of the sport fishing industry reported that there were significant declines in fish catches in the other rivers, in contrast to what happened in the Eg-Uur during the same time period (2003-2008). The obtention of a national system by which local communities can derive benefits from tourism is however not 100% clear.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: S
<p>The project was very cost-effective. With a rather small staff, TCF was able to develop watershed management plans, pioneer a new user rights system, expand the enforcement system, change national fishery policy, and attract sustainable finance to keep the conservation activities going after the project. There was no formal assessment of the economic benefits generated by these activities and hence, no cost-benefit analysis, but the resulting health ecosystem for the taimen fishery should provide an ongoing flow of economic benefits from the sport fishery that depends on taimen. In addition, there should be ongoing direct benefits to the local community through the benefit sharing and user rights system established under the project.</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. 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: L
<p>As the project period ended, TCF will continue to operate after the project with a five year, \$400,000 grant from the Boroo Mining Company, a Canadian-Mongolian joint venture. TCF will continue to run activities in the Eg-Uur Watershed, and at least one additional watershed.</p> <p>The science camp will remain open with base funding from TCF. The science team from the University of Wisconsin and University of Nevada - Reno is pursuing other sources of funding to continue their research on taimen habitat and conservation.</p>	
b. Socio-political	Rating: ML
<p>This project used a model for greater benefit sharing with local communities to encourage conservation. Comments in PCR indicate local community satisfaction. The PCR also states that of the 17 rangers trained and employed by TCF in the past, at least 9 will be picked up on local government budgets for permanent positions.</p>	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
<p>The project governance shows strong sustainability and replication potential. TCF will continue to operate after the project with a five year, \$400,000 grant from the Boroo Mining Company, a Canadian-Mongolian joint venture. TCF will continue to run activities in the Eg-Uur Watershed, and at least one additional watershed with a narrower focus on (1) management oriented science and (2) engagement of local communities in resource protection. The science camp will remain open with base funding from TCF.</p> <p>The science team from the University of Wisconsin and University of Nevada - Reno is pursuing other sources of funding to continue their research on taimen habitat and conservation.</p> <p>The Watershed Management Councils will continue to operate at the provincial level, with some district activity as well. Of the 17 rangers trained and employed by TCF in the past, at least 9 will be picked up on local government budgets for permanent positions.</p>	
d. Environmental	Rating: ML
<p>Monitoring data carried out by the science team confirm conservation of the taimen fishery in the watershed area. The counterfactual was what happened in other watersheds where healthy taimen populations were known to exist at the start of the project. While this project did not monitor in those rivers, national fishery agency personnel and members of the sport fishing industry reported that there were significant declines in fish catches in the other rivers, in contrast to what happened in the Eg-Uur during the same time period (2003-2008).</p>	

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

<p>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?</p>
<p>Co-financing was secured to a total of US\$ 1.03 million. No information available on how importantly it figured</p>
<p>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?</p>
<p>No information or comment given on delays. High turnover in transaction leader at Agency seemed to affect management of project. Two issues were raised by the client in final discussions: (1) turnover in IFC staff reduced the effectiveness of supervision, (2) TCF would have benefitted from stronger involvement of the local IFC office.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Taimen Conservation Fund (TCF) was established by American flyfishing company, Sweetwater Travel and its Mongolian partner, Hovsgol Travel, who had been operating a successful flyfishing ecotourism business on the Eg and Uur rivers since 1995. TCF was established to work with local communities and develop a conservation management system to protect the natural resources of the Eg-Uur Watershed Area (EUWA). TCF was strongly committed to successful completion of the project and expressed appreciation to IFC for its support.</p>

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

<p>a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MS</p>
<p>The Project supporting documents included a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for US \$ 30,000 budgeted for project evaluation, which will include independent mid-term, five year project completion and two-year post-project follow-up evaluations. The M&E plan in the ProDoc did include a log-frame matrix, a project workplan and the detailed budget. Funds allocated for the M&E were very low given the scope of activity expected.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MU</p>
<p>Supervision and completion reporting lacks the detail of evidence based assertion. The project benefitted from an independent mid-term review which emphasized the need to more sharply focus the project and reworked the logframe to make it more relevant for project management. There was also an effective management mission 7 months before the end of the project which focused the project staff on finishing strongly with an emphasis on replicability and sustainability. A final/terminal evaluation was not completed by the project.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS</p> <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>FC signed a grant agreement with a local NGO, the Taimen Conservation Fund (TCF), to deliver the project. There was a high turnover in the IFC project team, with 4 different task managers.</p> <p>The project team worked closely with a large number of local, district and provincial government officials.</p>
<p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) S</p>
<p>The TCF project team had strong and consistent leadership with a single executive director throughout the project who worked well with conservation agencies, local governments and the sport fishing partners. While time intensive, this approach was particularly effective in establishing a coordinated approach to enforcement against poaching and in establishing watershed management plans and councils. The latter was important in fending off pressure for mining licenses in the EUWA, which could have threatened biodiversity conservation.</p>

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.

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a Collaborative Management System (establish, train, equip and operate an EUWA-wide Anti-Poaching Brigade). Design Natural Resource Management Plan (evaluate the conservation status of the watershed and reviewing the socio-economic parameters of the project in the context of potential threats to the biodiversity resource) Sustainable Use Systems & Alternative Livelihood (Long term financing plans for ecotourism businesses) Mining Activities versus Conservation 	<p>Establish an IUCN threatened species classification for the Hucho Taimen.</p> <p>Formation and operation of Watershed Management Council (WMC) results in a more coordinated management of natural resources at the inter-district, watershed level within the first year</p> <p>Develop Action Plans for each of the districts in coordination with the TCF and WMC. Increased dialogue between local inhabitants and watershed decision-makers</p> <p>The WMC designs a Natural Resource Management Plan for the watershed within the first three years</p> <p>Identify sensitive habitat areas (e.g. spawning grounds) and areas that are most suitable to support higher margin flyfishing ecotourism and based on this information determine how to divide the watershed in to user zones.</p> <p>NRMS: Anti-Poaching Brigade formed, trained and operational, and is actively monitoring watershed hot spots within the first two years of project inception</p> <p>TCF to develop a replication strategy to apply this model on other watersheds in Mongolia</p>	<p>Formation and operation of District Councils (DC) results in more effective management of natural resource use at the local level within the first year</p> <p>Increased use of adaptive research findings in developing conservation and natural resource use strategies (for example stable populations of taimen are maintained through wild reproduction, as a result of the establishment of user zones and user limits based on migrations patterns and breeding requirements)</p> <p>Sustainable (no-kill, do minimal harm) catch and release fishing standards are adopted in the most commercially viable and biodiversity strategic zones</p> <p>Fishing and hunting activities are monitored and appropriate natural resource use fees are levied on a fully participatory watershed level within the first three years</p> <p>Licensing, outfitter fee and concession system is operational within first three years, including an open and transparent tender process (for example concessions)</p> <p>Revenues collected are appropriately distributed to fund on-going conservation efforts within the first three years</p>	<p>Successful conservation and sustainable use of the freshwater biodiversity resources in the Egin-Uur watershed</p> <p>Surplus revenues collected are appropriately distributed to the local communities to further promote development activities in the watershed</p> <p>Conservation activities are financed by the revenues on a long-term financially sustainable basis by year five</p> <p>Replication of model on other watersheds in the country</p> <p>Replication of model on other watersheds outside of Mongolia</p> <p>Private outfitters receive commercial credits to establish or expand operations in this watershed, or other watersheds that have adopted similar sustainable use systems</p>

b. What are the actual (*intended or unintended*) impacts of the project?

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 and to impact drivers (Impact drivers are the *significant factors* 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

The core element of the original project was to create economic value for a natural resource (taimen and a healthy taimen ecosystem) and enable local communities to capture that value through a commercial partnership with a private

sector tourism company. Much of the early project focus was on development of a national concession policy that would encourage investments and joint ventures in community-based natural resources management. In order to move the pilot community-conservation ventures to scale, national policy change was required.

While these national policy reforms were not achieved, due to political circumstances beyond the control of the sponsor, the development of a devolution model ("Nokhorlol") emerged which has increased the awareness and active engagement of communities in natural resources conservation through a user rights system.

Because of this model, large areas and several communities are now under new forms of participatory planning, which lay the foundations for future investments. The planning capacity improvements have been further reinforced by significant improvements in the scientific basis for sustainable management of watershed resources, particularly fisheries management. The project model is now being replicated in other watersheds with private sector and governmental support.

The project did not fully realize its development results due to delays in establishing the user rights system and delays on the part of private sector partners in signing the three party contract with the local community and district governor. On the other hand, the impact of the project on national conservation policy may in the long run still contribute to the sustainability of nature tourism in Mongolia and have a longer term development impact through this unexpected channel because it constitutes a better compromise with national laws and culture.

The project achieved its main goal of advancing integrated watershed management in the Eg-Uur Watershed and conservation of the taimen salmon (Hucho taimen) in particular. In contrast to other areas in Mongolia, the taimen population is stable and robust in the Eg-Uur at the close of the project.

- The project completed the first integrated scientific assessment in the world of the taimen in its native habitat.
- The project spurred the development of watershed management plans and councils, which raised awareness of importance of biodiversity conservation in local communities, and improved the enabling environment for nature based tourism in the project environment.
- Patrolling by rangers was strengthened throughout the Eg-Uur Watershed Area (EUWA).
- A widescale environmental education program was implemented through Ecoclubs in local schools and working with the local Buddhist community to build environmental stewardship.
- After encountering roadblocks on developing a concession based approach to benefit local communities, the project pioneered the application of a user rights cooperative approach (Nokhorlol) to monetize the benefits of an eco-tourism activity based on sportive fly-fishing.

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?

No risks discussed in completion reports

d. Evidence of Impact

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			
Evidence provided is based on interviews by project management and scientific assessments that are referenced. The scope of reductions is deemed to be significant compared to comparable watershed areas in the region. In contrast to other areas in Mongolia, the taimen population is stable and robust in the Eg-Uur at the close of the project. Scientific evidence and before/after numbers were not quoted in the completion report but rather alluded to.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic</u> level?		X	
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		
Monitoring data carried out by the science team confirm conservation of the taimen fishery in the watershed area. The counterfactual was what happened in other watersheds where healthy taimen populations were known to exist at the start of the project. While this project did not monitor in those rivers, national fishery agency personnel and members of the sport fishing industry reported that there were significant declines in fish catches in the other rivers, in contrast to			

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.

what happened in the Eg-Uur during the same time period (2003-2008).			
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. Of the 17 rangers trained and employed by TCF in the past, at least 9 will be picked up on local government budgets for permanent positions			
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?		X	
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

6. 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

The project design was overly ambitious with its plan to implement a concession system to monetize the tourism resource. However, the importance of flexibility and adaptive management paid off after the project team encountered resistance in the national legislature to the use of a concession system for freshwater fisheries management. The team then decided to take advantage of existing regulations for community user rights systems and adapted this to fishery management.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

No recommendations in completion report.

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

7.1 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.

7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	UA
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?	UA
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	UA

d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	UA
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	UA
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?	UA

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.
Mid-Term Review.