

# GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		192	
GEF Agency project ID		519	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Integrated Management of Jigme Dorji National Park (JDNP)	
Country/Countries		Bhutan	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		4- Mountain Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Royal Government of Bhutan Forestry Services Division, Forest Services Division (FSD), Ministry of Agriculture (MOA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		No involvement	
Private sector involvement		No involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		7/21/1997	
Effectiveness date / project start		8/27/1997	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		5/29/2002	
Actual date of project completion		9/1/2003	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.5	1.5
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.59	0.27
	Government	0.77	0.38
	Other*	0.06	
Total GEF funding		1.5	1.5
Total Co-financing		1.42	0.65
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.92	2.15
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		09/2003	
TE submission date		10/24/2003	
Author of TE		Stephan Fuller	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Baastel	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Lee Risby	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		5/6/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	N/A	N/A	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	MU	N/A	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	U
M&E Implementation	S	N/A	N/A	MS
Quality of Implementation	HS	HS	N/A	HS
Quality of Execution	HS	S	N/A	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			N/A	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of this project, as described in the project document, is the in-situ conservation of the globally significant biodiversity of Jigme Dorji National Park. The benefits are to include the conservation of a prime sample of the Eastern Himalaya ecoregion (one of the world's biodiversity "hotspots") and much of its attendant biodiversity.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of this project is to ensure that the livelihoods of local communities are enhanced through proper management and sustainable utilization of the natural resources existing in the Park area. The project's specific objectives are to: 1) fully establish Jigme Dorji Park as an operational protected area by instituting a participatory management program and bolstering the infrastructure of the Park and the Park staff's management capacity; and 2) strengthen the Park by catalyzing a process with the citizens of Jigme Dorji National Park to develop and implement sustainable economic activities based on an integrated conservation and development approach.

### 3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There has been no change to the global environmental objective during project implementation. However, minor changes were made in the development objectives during project implementation. The mid-term review resulted in some adjustments to the original design, including development of a log frame, and the project was extended for an additional year to allow some of the funds from Component 2 to be used for the successful element of Component 1. The terminal evaluation states that when the Project Advisory Group noticed that some of the objectives could not be achieved given the amount of resources and time left, the funds were reallocated to priority areas needing additional budget support. However, there are no clear indications in the TE as to which particular objectives have been officially changed/dropped, but there was significant under spending in some areas, particularly in terms of the implementation of sustainable economic activities deemed too ambitious.

#### 4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

This project aligned well with the GEF priorities for bio-diversity conservation. It was approved within the framework of the operational program on mountain ecosystems (OP-4). The project also responds to UNDP's priorities in Bhutan, which focus on sustainable livelihoods, governance, and environmental conservation. According to the terminal evaluation, the Royal Government developed its own strategies for the protected areas within the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Biodiversity Action Plan II (2002) that stress the need to improve the management of protected areas. The Royal Government adopted a concept of integrated conservation and development in the park. Accordingly, community development plans were developed within the Park in line with the RGOB's overall decentralization policies and strategies to achieve balanced development.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The effectiveness of the project is rated Moderately satisfactory because Component 1 was successfully implemented, while Component 2 was less successful.

The project contributed to establishing and extending protected areas and improve their management. Component 1 of the project contributed to the establishment of a well-functioning national park. The TE mentions that the project has demonstrated significant benefits to the target human populations within the protected areas. The trail construction activity in particular has dramatically improved the quality of human life and reduced the human population stress on the natural environment. Additional projects such as the construction of livestock, forestry and agricultural extension activities, and the construction of community schools have contributed additional benefits.

Although the project directly reduced the human population stress on the natural environment, the project did not contribute to conserve and ensure sustainable use of biological resources in the production environment as originally planned. Additionally, stakeholder participation has been fair and

holds considerable potential for greater public participation in conservation activities. However, there is a perception that the slow pace of activities could cause some frustration at the Geog Yargay Tshogchung level and weaken the enabling environment.

Moreover, the extent of rugged field conditions and logistical difficulties in the eastern Himalayas was not fully anticipated during the GEF project design phase. The short field seasons, the need to divert staff to anti-poaching patrols and the involvement of the staff in infrastructure projects also contributed to delays in some aspects of Component 2.

In short, staffing limitations, the operational workload and expertise limitations have constrained the undertaking of many activities: fewer staff members than originally planned have been hired, demarcation of the internal park zoning system could not be achieved, tourism management plans were not fully developed, baseline natural resources and land use information collection and analysis systems have not been realized, activities to empower local communities to develop and implement alternative income-generating activities could not be implemented. In addition, activities promoting the use of sustainable herding and natural resources could not all be implemented due to political sensitivity.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	----------------------

The efficiency of this project is rated Satisfactory.

All informants indicated that the strong relationship among a relatively small group of actors during the implementation of the project ensured expediency and efficiency during implementation. There was some delay in constructing and establishing the Park Headquarters and transferring the staff into a fully operational office. There have been resultant problems in communications among UNDP, NCD and JNDP due to the fact there are still no phone lines to Damji. But, according to the TE, with the completion of the road within 1 or 2 years and the VHS phone lines installed and operational by end of this year, then this issue will have been substantially resolved.

On the other hand, the TE explains that the GEF definition of cost-effectiveness suggests that a comparison to benchmark project performance should be made between the JNDP project approach and either of a similar project in another country, or an alternative approach with the same objectives within Bhutan. However, none of these comparisons could be made at the time of TE. The baseline information on the species that may be considered as the principal indicators of the maintenance of global biodiversity is not available, and therefore a quantitative calculation is impossible. On the long term, with additional research, the assessment on species status and population dynamics could be possible. According to the TE, “the vast area, remoteness and limited human intervention in JNDP ensure that there is adequate time to undertake the longitudinal research necessary to assess the incremental benefit to global biodiversity” (pg.17).

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

According to the TE, full project financial and resource sustainability has not been achieved during the first six years of management planning and implementation at JDNP. Projects such as the preparation and implementation of the next Five Year Management Plan require outside project assistance. Continuing capital costs will be also borne by this project and possibly from the Bhutan Trust Fund and other donors. Specialized research activities related to wildlife population status and dynamics as well as human use of grasslands will also require additional external support and partnerships.

In terms of ecological sustainability, monitoring of anti-poaching especially on cordyceps has been weak. Although poaching activities in the Park has reduced with monitoring from JDNP, it has remained ineffective due to thinly spread Park guards. A further significant difficulty at the moment is lack of data on cordyceps. Not much is known about the life cycle and its regeneration process. People have to be made aware of the sustainability issue and that by adopting certain techniques be able to harvest year after year.

On the other hand, the socio political sustainability is strong. The Royal Government of Bhutan has taken full ownership of the JDNP project. First, it was nationally executed through the NCD. Second, the RGoB continues to pay all its staff salaries, allowances and other recurrent expenditures, although the GEF and the UNDP country program (TRAC) provided the capital investment. Also, JDNP's integrated conservation program is participatory, as park residents contributed to its conservation and development plans (ICDP). As a result, there is already a sense of responsibility and ownership with regard to conservation and development activities, which might have a positive impact on project sustainability.

Finally, JDNP's good relations with key organizations have proved to be a considerable advantage. The cooperation received was excellent and as a result, the project was able to achieve much. These relations could contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes by raising awareness and interest within various organizations that might result in long-term commitments and collaboration.

Overall, Bhutan's experience in this park development model (IUCN Category V) proves that both people and the park can exist harmoniously. The needs of local inhabitants are being met through the relatively benign development of minimal infrastructures such as mule tracks, bridges, power, etc. Although these services have to be supported by external donor agencies, the potential exists within the park to meet its own needs in the longer term.

## **5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

**5.1 Co-financing.** To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

With US \$1.5 million commitment from GEF and another US \$0.270 million from UNDP country programme (TRAC fund), the project became operational. RGOB contribution was in kind which amounted to US \$0.380

million to cover cost of local staff salaries and other recurrent maintenance costs. The GEF primarily supported activities under Component 1, UNDP TRAC covered funds required under Component 2.

There is no explanation provided in the TE and in the PIRs to explain why the actual cofinancing was lower than expected.

**5.2 Project extensions and/or 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The mid-term review resulted in some adjustments to the original design including incorporation of a log-frame, and the project was extended for an additional year to allow some of the funds from Component 2 (Develop and implement sustainable economic activities based on an integrated conservation and development approach in JDNP) to be used for the successful elements of Component 1 (Fully develop and implement JDNP as an operational entity.

The rugged field conditions and logistical difficulties in the eastern Himalayas were not fully addressed during the GEF Project design phase. The short field seasons, the need to divert staff to anti-poaching patrols and the involvement of the staff in infrastructure projects also contributed to the delays in some aspects of Component 2.

**5.3 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:

According to the TE, the commitment of the Royal Government of Bhutan to biodiversity conservation is of the highest order. It is not merely a "paper park" commitment – it exists on the ground throughout the country and it is being implemented by committed staff throughout the protected areas system. The Royal Government of Bhutan has its full ownership of the JDNP project. First it has been nationally executed through the NCD with its Park Headquarter based in Damji. Secondly, the RGOB continues to pay all its staff salaries, allowances and other recurrent expenditures although the GEF and the UNDP country programme (TRAC) provided for the capital investment.

JDNP's integrated conservation programme is participatory where park residents contributed to its conservation and development plans (ICDP). Therefore, there is already a sense of responsibility and ownership over the conservation and developmental activities.

## **6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system**

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	------------------------

The project design did not incorporate a Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) specifying indicators, means of verification and results. According to the TE, “had there been a project LFA prepared at the beginning, it would have made the project design stronger”.

However, the Project Document includes a short M&E plan:

- (1) The project management will follow the NEX M&E guidelines and will submit an inception report soon after the active implementation of the project.
- (2) The project will be subject to the annual tripartite reviews (TPRs), the first review to be held within the first 12 months of the start of full implementation. The NPM shall prepare and submit to each TPR a Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) which will be the basis for project progress reviews. Additional PPERs may be requested, if necessary, during the project.
- (3) Mid-term and final evaluations will be undertaken by external evaluators (STAP roster specialists) following monitoring and evaluation guidelines for GEF.
- (4) Quarterly progress updates will be submitted by project management to the Head of NCS and the Resident Representative of UNDP.
- (5) The NPM will submit the GDRs and the status of fund statements as requested under the NEX manual.

Therefore, the M&E design at Entry is rated Unsatisfactory.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

There has been monitoring in the form of field visits by the staff based in the park and by the JDNP management staff who visited the park at least once a month. Quarterly warden meetings were conducted as part of ongoing management activities. UNDP/GEF has been making at least biannual visits to the Park. According to the TE, such visits served as a morale boost for the field staff working in remote and harsh terrains. The Project Implementation Review (PIR) has been a regular exercise carried out annually by UNDP and the park staff. There was also a Tripartite Review Meeting (TRM), which is again an annual feature conducted by UNDP and NCD. An independent external mid-term review was also fielded in March-April 2000.

However, performance indicators were not clearly presented and it is not clear whether adequate baseline studies have been conducted. Appropriate and comprehensive data collection and analysis

systems have not been implemented. Baseline natural resource and land use information data collection has not been implemented as projected.

The mid-term review resulted in some adjustments to the original design; the project was extended for an additional year, and the existing project elements were restructured according to the current GEF Project Planning Matrix and an LFA was developed in 2000. According to the TE, following the mid-term review, the Logical Framework Analysis became the guiding project management tool for the final 2 years of the project and the organizing tool for the subsequent quarterly and annual reporting

However, specific adaptive management measures taken were not adequately documented in the TE. For instance, it is not clear which objectives under component 2 were abandoned in order to reallocate the project funds to component 1. This situation makes it hard to assess whether all project specific objectives have been achieved, as it is not possible to distinguish between objectives that have been abandoned or changed and objectives that were not achieved.

Therefore, the M&E implementation is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to executing agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Highly Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

While GEF funds can be accessed through UNDP, World Bank and UNEP none of these except the office of the UNDP was available in Bhutan at the time of JDNP project formulation. It has proven advantageous for the Royal Government and for JDNP in particular because it facilitated communication with UNDP and GEF much easier in terms of financing arrangements and technical assistance.

According to the TE, the management activities of the UNDP country office in Bhutan were excellent. With the UNDP office itself being located in Thimphu this facilitated easy access for the Park staff on all matters related to the park, especially with respect to access to funds channeled through the Department of Aid and Debt Management. Secondly, the park staff benefited from visits by the UNDP officials for advice and necessary guidance which served a morale boost for staff in the field.



According to the TE, financial planning activities have been fully consistent with the accounting and control standards established by UNDP and GEF as well as the Royal Government of Bhutan. Independent annual audits have been conducted by the Royal Audit Authority

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---	---------------------------------

According to the TE, the execution approach has been good. The Nature Conservation Division under the Department of Forests, MoA has its headquarter in Thimphu is the executing body for all parks and sanctuaries in the country. JDNP received its financial support from the Global Environmental Facility and the UNDP Country Programme (TRAC) channeled through the Ministry of Finance to the Project.

While the project emphasized strengthening staff capability in planning and reporting systems, 2 UN volunteers and an Eco-tourism consultant were deployed to backstop the project management.

Field execution was little slow initially because of the emphasis given to strengthening staff capacity and staff build-up. Besides, the limited staff has been often kept busy attending to official visitors, attending regular park meetings and submission of reports. Despite all these, field execution gradually picked up its momentum over the time.

Moreover, according to the TE, the JDNP good linkages with key organizations have proved to be of considerable advantage. The cooperation received was excellent and as a result of which the project was able to achieve many things. Its good linkages with Dzongkhag administration, the RNR RCs and the RNR Sector Heads and agents, the Royal Institute of Management through its collaborative efforts have been able to produce geog ICDP plans available for execution. Further they also received excellent cooperation from the Institute of Traditional Medicines and RSPN for research on traditional medicines and environmental campaign respectively. Its collaboration with Department of Tourism and WWF helped in the implementation of at least two workshops and production of Eco-tourism Development Strategy although it was not related to JDNP alone. The Integrated Horticultural Development Project funded by UNDP and the National Mushroom Centre has helped to inventory of mushrooms and its potential for cultivation.

Overall, staffing and training limitations continued to limit the ability of JDNP to execute all of the originally proposed GEF and UNDP Project activities. This caused by a lack of suitable recruits, difficult working conditions and by a staffing limitation from central government.

## **8. Assessment of Project Impacts**

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

This project has made significant progress towards the establishment of a well-functioning national park almost unaltered by human activity. The practice of shifting cultivation (tseri) in many parts of Gasa has decreased and forests are being regenerated. Forest felling has also been reduced in the vicinity of the community, partly due to JDNP patrolling. According to people in Laya, animals such as leopards, tigers, bears and deer have reappeared in the last two years as a result of wild animal habitats being restored.

According to the TE, the status and population dynamics and trends of many of the keystone species that JDNP protects is not yet well understood. This understanding may take many more years to achieve, so it is unclear whether the GEF and UNDP interventions achieved the longer-term biodiversity conservation objectives that are the basis of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the GEF. Time and commitment will be needed to continue the complex work of measuring the success of biodiversity conservation programming in Bhutan.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

According to the TE, it is clear that the project has demonstrated significant benefits to the target human populations within the protected areas (in addition to the overall biodiversity conservation objectives). The trail construction activity in particular has dramatically improved the quality of human life. Additional projects such as the construction of livestock, forestry and agricultural extension activities (along with experimental vegetable and medicinal plant demonstrations), and the construction of community schools have contributed extra benefits.

The JDNP project has successfully executed a variety of social development activities, such as the provision of basic services in remote villages. These activities are directly in line with UNDP objectives related to sustainable livelihoods, poverty reduction and economic development, as well as the advancement of good governance. In doing so, the park activities that serve to help people then directly reduce the human population stress on the natural environment.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

## a) Capacities

According to the TE, there has been significant and continuous annual training available for the JDNF staff. The opportunities to undertake training have been determined annually using a participatory process (which in itself is somewhat of an innovation). The principal methods have ranged from long-term educational opportunities to short term study tours.

There have also been inputs made to strengthen the monitoring capability through training and workshops. In 2000, a total of six wardens and Deputy Wardens plus three park guards were trained in wildlife management, survey and monitoring techniques at the University of Philippines, Los Banos. (sponsored by The Bhutan Trust Fund) There has also been a snow leopard survey training held for the Park staff in Laya from 8-20 April 2000 conducted by the International Snow Leopard Trust. A Blue sheep field survey was also been carried out in the same year.

In 2001, a warden and a park guard were trained in wildlife management, survey and monitoring techniques at the University of Philippines, Los Banos under WWF and Park scholarship. Under the same scholarship, the Park Manager, JDNF attended an intensive course in Biodiversity monitoring and adaptive management in May/June organized by the Smithsonian Institute.

In 2003, the Warden from Lingshi and the Warden REMO based at the HQ were trained in wildlife management, survey and monitoring techniques at the Wildlife Institute of India. Their sponsorship have also been provided by the Bhutan Trust Fund and the Park.

However, the TE mentions that it is important to re-iterate that an annual training plan development (undertaken with the MOA HRD unit and with the senior management of NCD) does not represent a fully developed long-term training and capacity development program. An internal capacity for on-going staff training and development, specific to the protected areas system still needs to be developed.

## b) Governance

No governance impacts have been reported in the TE.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are reported in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been

established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

In terms of the project's contribution to replication or scaling-up of innovative practices or mechanisms, management systems similar to that used at the JDNP have been used in the establishment of the Jigme Singye National Park and Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary. Lessons learned from the implementation of the JDNP are now available in the form of the mid-term evaluation and terminal evaluation reports, and can be useful for the future direction of the JDNP and other relevant conservation projects. For instance, according to the TE, the JDNP's delegation of a more specialized environmental campaign to the Royal Society for Protection of Nature is a good example that can be replicated in developing other park managements.

## **9. Lessons and recommendations**

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

According to the TE, in many respects one of the biggest lessons learned from the UNDP/GEF project at the JDNP is the value of maintaining a flexible and adaptive approach to project design and implementation. Given that the project was formulated relatively early in the existence of the GEF system, that the designers intended to be as progressive as possible, that a "people and parks" model was in use for one of the first times in Bhutan and that many of the logistical difficulties could not be fully anticipated (by the short mission), it would have been very easy for the project to fail if the original program had been rigidly adhered to.

There is a strong political will and commitment from the government and the King of Bhutan to preserve the country's biological diversity.

The JDNP used an integrated participatory program from the beginning of the project. All stakeholders are actively participating in the planning and implementation of conservation and development activities. As a result there is already a sense of responsibility and ownership in the minds of the people with respect to the results of the conservation and development program. People are beginning to realize that conservation and development can coexist.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE contains 27 recommendations. These recommendations address the concerns that need to be addressed in the next phase of the JDNP project. A few of these recommendations are presented below:

- Phase II of the JDNP park management plan implementation should concentrate on consolidating the successful elements of the GEF project before extending work into more complex or more difficult tasks.
- The new draft of the park management plan needs to be completed as quickly as possible.
- NCD and the JDNP should undertake an IUCN-based management effectiveness review every 5 years (and take advantage of the international resources available for these reviews).
- The JDNP should continue the original effort to complete the natural resource assessments, with an emphasis on establishing the conservation status and trends of the principal wildlife species in the park.
- The JDNP should continue with the implementation of the original GEF project activity to develop a park-specific tourism plan (in conjunction with ICDP implantation and park zoning).
- NCD and the JDNP should develop a gender equity program that endeavors to develop opportunities for new female employees within the park management structure during the next 5-year planning cycle.
- An ongoing policy dialogue between UNDP, the GEF, NCD, the JDNP and other Bhutan protected areas should remain a high priority.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Project environmental outcomes or impacts are not clearly presented in the TE. Also, it is not clear whether adequate baseline studies have been conducted. The TE places much emphasis on the results at the output level without making a good assessment of the outcomes and impacts achieved.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Several aspects of the project have not been formally rated, in particular the project M&E and project results and the quality of the analysis is doubtful in certain instances. For example, the TE suggests that the “rugged field conditions and logistical difficulties in the eastern Himalayas could not be fully anticipated during the GEF project design phase,” when such circumstances could normally have been anticipated during the project design and preparation stages. In addition, the methodology used by the evaluators lends itself to anecdotal reporting. They seem to have concentrated on park staff and bureaucrats for the main source of evidences, as opposed to having structured focus group / semi-structured interviews	MU

	with beneficiaries - relegating them to 'informal interviews'.	
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE provides a satisfactory assessment of the potential sustainability of project achievements.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Most of the lessons learned and recommendations presented are relevant.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE contains a summary of project expenditures up to June 2003 in Annex 3. This annex is not included with the report, making it impossible to assess the reporting on fund management.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE fails to provide any analysis of the M&E design or its appropriateness. It is astonishing that the comment "rugged field conditions and logistical difficulties in the eastern Himalayas could not be fully anticipated during the GEF project design phase," is detailed without any critique of how this can happen as it implies a lack of bio-physical and social contextualization of the project from the outset. The TE needed to pay more attention to this critical aspect, but it did not.	U
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>	<p>Quality of the analysis is doubtful due to lack of qualitative and / or quantitative evidence. There is much emphasis on the results achieved at the output level without a good assessment of the outcomes and impacts achieved or potentially achievable.</p> <p>The overall quality of the report in terms of organization, clarity of the argumentation and quality of the language is poor.</p> <p>The TE contains some pertinent details about the project problems and successes but these are not backed by qualitative and / or quantitative evidence. Most of the lessons learned and recommendations presented are relevant. However, all recommendations are project-specific and no generalization has been attempted.</p> <p>The annex presenting a summary of project expenditures is missing, which makes it impossible to assess the TE reporting on fund management.</p>	MS

**11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).**