



- 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="1943"/>
Project Title	<input type="text" value="Integrating Watershed and Biodiversity Management in Chu Yang Sin National Parkv"/>
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="68249"/>
Country	<input type="text" value="Vietnam"/>
Project Status	<input type="text" value="Project Completion"/>
Duration	<input type="text" value="5"/> years
CEO Endorsement	<input type="text" value="03/13/2003"/>
Agency Approval	<input type="text" value="6/27/2005"/>
Project Effectiveness	<input type="text" value="06/24/2005"/>
GEF Agency Execution Partners	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px;"> (Select Execution Partners) Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other </div>
If other, please specify	<input type="text" value="Birdlife International, Government"/>

Terminal Evaluation Staff

[EO Staff](#)

TE Author	<input type="text" value="Ross Hughes"/>
TE Reviewer	<input type="text" value="Baljit Wadhwa"/>
TE Peer Reviewer	<input type="text" value="Baljit Wadhwa"/>

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	<input type="text"/>	
Project Actual Completion	<input type="text" value="5/30/2010"/>	
Project Completion Difference	<input type="text"/>	Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	<input type="text" value="11/30/2010"/>	
TE Submission to EO	<input type="text" value="11/21/2012"/>	
TE Submission to EO Difference	<input type="text" value="24"/>	Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	<input type="text" value="03/17/2012"/>	
TER Submission to EO	<input type="text" value="03/17/2012"/>	
TER Submission to EO Difference	<input type="text" value="0"/>	Months

Comments on Delays

No project completion delays. Original closing date May 30, 2010. Some delays in implementation schedule - stakeholder engagement but without impact on overall schedule.

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="973,000"/>	<input type="text" value="973,000"/>	<input type="text" value="100.00 %"/>
Cofinance Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="19,979,000"/>	<input type="text" value="796,000"/>	<input type="text" value="3.98 %"/>
Total Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="20,952,000"/>	<input type="text" value="1,769,000"/>	<input type="text" value="8.44 %"/>

Comments on Cofinancing

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework

5 - Satisfactory



Project Objectives -

The project objective is to establish public support and effective management for Chu Yang Sin National Park. This project falls within the Forest Ecosystems Operation Program in Biodiversity.








Comment on Changes

The original objectives were adjusted downwards to five (essentially by integrating capacity-building into the first objective) in a revision to the logical framework undertaken in November 2006 (finalized in early 2007). The logframe also made adjustments to the impact indicators to make these more measurable and to reflect the emphasis given to landscape level watershed management in the goal statement. The adjusted indicators adopted in November 2006 were then used in subsequent reporting, including a final self-assessment report prepared by BirdLife International in Indochina.

The revised objectives from November 2006 were:

- Build capacity for management and enforcement in the park management team.
- Establish a foundation of knowledge to guide park management and facilitate integration of conservation principles into selected policies and plans applicable to the surrounding landscape
- Create an enforcement environment to stop illegal exploitation and encroachment in the park.
- Generate local community, decision-maker, and key stakeholder support for the management goals of Chu Yang Sin National Park.
- Monitor the impact of project activities

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
Build capacity for management and enforcement in the park management team	Training in ethnic languages and English Developing managerial and information technology skills Developing knowledge and expertise in biodiversity survey, species and habitat identification	Effective control of illegal exploitation in the park achieved by patrols of park staff, supported by relevant commune and district institutions					Edit Delete
Establish a foundation of knowledge to guide park management and facilitate integration of conservation principles into selected policies and plans applicable to the	Baseline of knowledge and information required for effective park management; field-tested local-level park management approaches including co-management; and	Foundation of knowledge established to guide and engender integrated park management and integration of biodiversity conservation and watershed management	Politically & socially stable environment to carry out all project activities	Provincial and park management board support environmentally friendly development e.g. tourism potential of the Park	Socio-economic master planning for the region considers the unique environmental services and conditions of the protected area.	Reduction of annual amount of forest cleared within the park Biodiversity attributes of Chu Yang Sin conserved in the long term within a wider	Edit Delete


surrounding landscape	integration of park management goals into land-use and development plans at various administrative levels	in regional planning				framework of integrated watershed and biodiversity management.	
Create an enforcement environment to stop illegal exploitation and encroachment in the park	Expand the area, frequency and scope of patrols. Radio communication system in place to link rangers to the park headquarters Improved cooperation between the Forest Protection Department, the State Forest Enterprise and Lak Reserve.	Develop and institutionalize patrolling systems and strengthen the active support and involvement of district forest protection departments, and the communication of intelligence on high-risk areas and potential offenders.		Key stakeholder and the general public support the management goals of CYS National Park			 Edit  Delete
Generate local community, decision-maker, and key stakeholder support for the management goals of Chu Yang Sin National Park.	A marketing and awareness strategy to establish a baseline situation of knowledge and attitudes in buffer zone communes and the provincial capital Village level presentations made by rangers, media activities and public events in and around the Park	Key stakeholder and the general public support the management goals of CYS National Park	Local communities are engaged and have actual influence in environment planning in buffer zone districts	Decisions taken at central level and which have impacts on the integrated watershed scale take into consideration and involve provincial level authorities (with whom the project works)			 Edit  Delete
Monitor the impact of project activities	Park staff proficient in the execution of monitoring requirements, either directly or by contracting outside parties.	Impact of project activities measured and evaluated			Monitoring and evaluation framework for the Park is used following project closure		 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...							

 **Project Performance**

[Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings](#)

[Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments](#)

Overall Project Rating





4 - Moderately Satisfactory 










Comment

Overall, the project succeeded in putting in place much-improved information on the biodiversity of the park, improved public awareness amongst key decision-makers of the importance of the park, strengthened capacity for day-to-day conservation management. The project also put in place a workable monitoring and evaluation framework for the Park. Regarding results, there has been minimal loss of forest coverage within the Park but continued deterioration of biodiversity inside Park due to hunting, selective logging and infrastructure development. There is improved information on the Park's biodiversity. It was determined that this is the only site known to support all of the restricted range bird species that characterize this Endemic Bird Area. Seventeen species of amphibian and reptile were collected and are expected to be new to science. The East Truong Son National Highway will go through the Park. The Krong K'Mar hydropower plant approved prior to startup and built inside the Park during project implementation. The Park management could exert little influence on plans for road and hydropower development. A feasibility study was carried out for the expansion of CYSNP to include Lak Landscape Protection Area and some forest blocks belonging Lak and Krong Bong districts.





Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes ⓘ	Last PIR:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory ▼	
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	Overall, the outcome of the project is rated as satisfactory. The project has delivered a firm foundation of capacity-building across different components and especially forest protection and enforcement. There is now a very good understanding of the Park's very considerable biodiversity values and this information has been translated effectively into management tools, public awareness materials and events that have increased the public profile of the Park at local, provincial and national level. This should translate into better integration of the Park into provincial and national planning, albeit in ways that will always be difficult to monitor and evaluate.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory ▼	
Relevance ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	The design considerations gave rise to the objective and component structure of the project – and these remained relevant to the end of the project – improving the information base needed for planning, strengthening enforcement systems, and building management capacity and public awareness.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	
Effectiveness ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO	4 - Moderately Satisfactory ▼	












	Review:		
Efficiency 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project has been managed efficiently by BirdLife, despite a number of significant management challenges, particularly during the early implementation phase. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional efficiency: Institutional arrangements were appropriate to achieving objectives at park level. However, these same institutional arrangements proved inadequate for working at the broader watershed management level. • Outcome efficiency: Project support for building basic capabilities necessary for protected area management were appropriate, given that the site lacked even basic capacity and equipment and there was limited information available of the biodiversity of the park. • Financial management, procurement and disbursement efficiency: Reporting, procurement and auditing reports have been submitted in accordance with World Bank requirements. An independent audit of project accounts was undertaken by KPMG to May 30 2010 and this identified no issues of concern regarding financial management. BirdLife submitted the audited statement and management letter to the World Bank on 19 October, 2010.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability 	Last PIR:	3 - Moderately Likely 	
	Terminal Evaluation:	3 - Moderately Likely 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	

Financial 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
---	----------------------	---	--

			<p>No new project funds have been levied. however, regular government funding continues to flow for this national park. Provincial authorities have now committed substantial financial resources for the management of the Park and this should help ensure that conservation management levels are maintained at reasonable levels. However, a major challenge for the management board will be to ensure that provincial financing can be translated into effective conservation management - rather than over investment in infrastructure. In the case of investment in patrol trail construction, this has damaged the Park's ecological integrity and there is a danger that further ill-advised investments may lead to further problems. This is a problem facing protected areas management throughout Vietnam and is being addressed at national policy and institutional level by the Forest Protection Department, with support of</p>
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	The Park's management board now manages a considerable amount of national funds to engage local people in forest protection activities within the Park.
Socio-political	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	Less than 50% of those surveyed before project closure in 2010 claimed to have knowledge of where the Park's boundaries were - or the rationale that lay behind the Park's regulations.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	There is now greater awareness of Park values and boundary locations, although further and continuous work is required to maintain and build further public support, especially as pressure in land and resources outside the Park boundary continue to grow.
Institutional and Legal	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The project did prepare a comprehensive Operational Management Plan which will be the foundation of future management activities of the park authorities.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	





















			<p>The project was instrumental in helping the management board to increase the frequency and quality of patrolling within the Park (see figure below), and this is likely to have been a major factor in the increase of recorded violations reported and recorded in patrol records. This was achieved through targeted training activities, improving equipment and by upgrading two guard stations that improved working and living conditions for up to 20 park guards. Without this, it is likely that levels of encroachment, illegal logging and hunting would have continued at very high levels. It is likely that these improved enforcement systems will continue post-project.</p> <p>Management capacity is now much better than pre- project, although there is a risk that capacity levels will fall as staffing changes over the next few years. Continuity in capacity building efforts is required across Vietnam's protected areas network</p>
Environmental 	Terminal Evaluation:	3 - Moderately Likely 	The achievement of grant objectives can only be considered moderately satisfactory given that the decision to build a highway through the park is still on track. This will be a serious future threat to the integrity of the park.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	Controlling illegal logging within the Park, mostly of the valuable Gymnosperm species, Fokenia hodginsii, has improved but this issue continues to pose a problem. Pressure from illegal hunting remains a major and growing problem as market prices and demand continues to increase.



Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	No real plan indicated for M&E of project activities. There was satisfactor attention to biodiversity monitoring.
M&E Design 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	The project design document did not include a LFA per se.
M&E Plan Implementation 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO		




	Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory ▼	Progress reports were submitted to GEFSEC. Terminal Evaluation 1 year late in arriving.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess ▼	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess ▼	No separate budget indicated for M&E so difficult to assess.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	
Quality of Implementation - IA ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	The recipient expressed the view that World Bank TTLs and staff have been highly supportive of the project throughout the prolonged approvals and start-up process - and throughout implementation. World Bank made possible a visit by a large number of donors and senior Vietnamese officials to the Park during the semi-annual donor consultative group meeting in 2008 and this provided an opportunity to focus attention on the vales of the Park and the challenges it faces, especially from noorlv-planned infrastructure
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	
Quality of Execution - EA ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	BirdLife managed the project effectively - despite some difficult management challenges posed by political sensitivities in the central highlands. These factors constrained early progress and forced the project to adjust its staffing and implementation strategy. The project gradually developed a good relationship with provincial authorities and a very strong relationship with the National Park management board. The project team and Park management board, working closely together, implemented this project professionally and to a high standard and adapted well to a number of unforeseen setbacks. The technical quality of work, especially ranger training, forest cover analysis and biodiversity surveys have been undertaken to an extremely high standard.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	


 **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 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	TE indicates country ownership at regional/local level with planning committees/boards; however ownership at more central strategic levels also needed so as to not erode results.
Financial Planning 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Preparation and Readiness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Stakeholders Involvement 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Implementation of this component of the project fell well behind schedule – making it difficult to assess the overall impact of this component’s activities. Nonetheless, the component did support some promising initiatives. For example, a Communication Strategy for the Park was developed which has helped the Park to identify objectives, messages, tools, - together with the financial and human resource needed for its implementation. Public awareness activities then were implemented at both provincial level and grassroots (district/commune/village) level. The project also supported a campaign to “Say NO to illegal forest products”, which was included a provincial level event that attracted four thousand people and indirectly reached hundreds of thousands local people through live television broadcast.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Key stakeholders in the Ministries responsible for infrastrucute development - hydro and road needed to be much more involved and aware of the protected areas initiave.
Need for Follow Up 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	Yes 	It would be important to know from a progress to impact perspective the status of the proposed infrastructure within park boundaries - i.e hydropower and road that were being planned.






Gender Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
Effects on Local Population 	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction 	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
Crisis Prevention and Recovery 	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
Democratic Governance 	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>

 **Progress to Impact**





Progress to Impact 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderate Progress <input type="button" value="v"/>	The project has succeeded in putting in place the elements needed for increased biodiversity conservation in terms of research base, capacity and operational enforcement. The risk to progress, however, have to do with the integration of environmental considerations into broader regional economic planning for the area.









Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment





<p>Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks </p>			<p>The longer-term vision for the Park includes an expansion of its boundaries to include the adjacent forests currently under the management of a range of different management authorities, including the Lak Landscape Reserve, the Lak Forest Enterprise and the Krong Bong Forest Enterprise. To this end, the project supported a feasibility study for the expansion of CYSNP. The management authorities for these various forest management units currently lack the expertise, capacity and financial resources to implement appropriate management. Expansion therefore provides an opportunity to coordinate conservation management across a larger forest landscape and introduce improved incentives for local communities to participate in forest management, for example through community forest management, the expansion of existing comanagement arrangements and development of community-based ecotourism. These approaches could help balance sustainable use with biodiversity conservation and the protection of environmental services such as watershed protection and carbon storage – both of which could generate</p>
<p>Implementing Structures and Arrangements </p>	<p>Terminal Evaluation:</p>	<p>Y - Yes </p>	<p>The project facilitated and encouraged working level cooperation (including joint planning and patrolling) with the adjacent Bi Doup Nui Ba National Park and supported efforts to integrate the Lak Landscape Nature Reserve into the National Park. The project facilitated and encouraged working level cooperation (including joint planning and patrolling) with the adjacent Bi Doup Nui Ba National Park and supported efforts to integrate the Lak Landscape Nature Reserve into the National Park. These two strands of work continue post-project and will extend improved forest and resource management to a significant part of the forests remaining in the upper watershed</p>
	<p>Agency Review:</p>	<p>NA - Not Applicable </p>	
	<p>GEFEO Review:</p>	<p>Y - Yes </p>	<p>ASEAN Competence Standards for Protected Area Management were used to monitor changes in staff capacity and these demonstrated a strong improvement in basic skills – in 2005 only 30% of CYSNP staff members had received some form of training in key skills areas and this had risen to over 70% by the end of the project.</p>




<p>Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational</p>	<p>Document</p>	<p>Verification</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>Piloting / Demonstration of</p>	<p>Terminal Evaluation: Agency</p>	<p>NA - Not Applicable </p>	







technologies and approaches 	Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	








Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	The project has developed training and capacity-building modules that can be replicated for further use post-project. The project assisted the Park's management board to adopt the Operational Management Planning format developed at national level for use in Special use Forests. The communications strategy should provide a useful resource to guide further communication and awareness efforts.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Upscaling 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	The monitoring framework developed by the project, based on BirdLife's global IBA monitoring framework provides a very practical and potentially-useful approach for integration into national protected areas monitoring and reporting. However, this will require continuing efforts to promote the uptake of this framework at national level, and this may not happen following project closure. Survey approaches for assessing and monitoring illegal wildlife trade and consumption also have relevance for wider application and take-up.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	



















			Working level cooperation (including joint planning and patrolling) with the adjacent Bi Doup Nui Ba National Park and supported efforts to integrate the Lak Landscape Nature Reserve into the National Park. These two strands of work continue post-project and will extend improved forest and resource management to a significant part of the forests remaining in the upper watershed. The management authorities for these various forest management units currently lack the expertise, capacity and financial resources to implement appropriate management. Expansion therefore provides an opportunity to coordinate conservation management across a larger forest landscape and introduce improved incentives for local communities to participate in forest management, for example through community forest management, the expansion of existing comanagement arrangements and development of community-
Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	N - No 	

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document				
Environmental Stress Reduction 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	Agency Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments
		NA - Not Applicable			
		 Add New Row...			
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments
N - No		Demonstration Site	Intended	The last GRM referred to a risk from province's plans to develop hydropower and road infrastructure within the park. This project was assisting Park authorities by assessing the construction's potential impacts on biodiversity and recommending mitigation measures. A final report was disseminated to stakeholders. However, it would seem that the road will go	


Arrangements for Impact M&E 		project – approved prior to project start-up. In hindsight, improved indicators for pressure and state would have improved sensitivity, and this is an issue that the Park’s management board could be encouraged to improve.									
											
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.									
GEFEO Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y - Yes</td> <td>Appropriate indicators in place to monitor Global Environmental Benefits at demonstration site but more far-reaching ones needed to monitor status change.</td> <td>  Edit  Delete </td> </tr> <tr> <td>  </td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Comments		Y - Yes	Appropriate indicators in place to monitor Global Environmental Benefits at demonstration site but more far-reaching ones needed to monitor status change.	 Edit  Delete				
Visibility	Comments										
Y - Yes	Appropriate indicators in place to monitor Global Environmental Benefits at demonstration site but more far-reaching ones needed to monitor status change.	 Edit  Delete									
											








 **TE Report Quality**


Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	ICM was satisfactory.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	
Outcome Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	
Consistency 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	
Sustainability Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	
Clear Financial Assessment 	Agency Review:	5 - Satisfactory	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
M&E Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	No overt assessment of M&E arrangements of the Implementing Agency. Monitoring on part of Executing Agency for biodiversity indicators was satisfactory.



Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	
Consultation with Stakeholders 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	
Compliance with Guidances 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	
Compliance with UNEG Norms 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
Addressing of ToR requests 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Independence of Report 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	






 **Lessons & Recommendations**



Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Legal and Institutional Framework		Institutional efficiency: Institutional arrangements were appropriate to achieving objectives at park level. However, these same institutional arrangements proved inadequate for working at the broader watershed management level.	 Edit  Delete
Other	Implementation Timetable	Generate public and stakeholder support for conservation and the management goals of CYS NP: Implementation of this component of the project fell well behind schedule – making it difficult to assess the overall impact of this component's activities.	 Edit  Delete
Legal and Institutional Framework		Integration of biodiversity considerations in broader regional socio-economic planning was outside the influence of the project but had major impacts on potential for results achievement.	 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...			



Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Legal and Institutional Framework		1. Future development within the Park boundaries (e.g. ecotourism, infrastructure) needs to	 Edit  Delete

		<p>be carefully considered. Potential negative impacts on the Park's biodiversity as well as the ecological services it provides need to be assessed, closely monitored and mitigated.</p> <p>2. Enforcement efforts and effectiveness need to be further increased to cope with pressures that are increasing at an even greater pace.</p>	
Capacity Building		Continued investment in staff capacity building is necessary for CYSNP to reach the competence level recommended for protected areas staff in ASEAN.	 Edit  Delete
Financial Planning		A bigger proportion of the total funding from the Government for CYSNP should be allocated to its operation, staff training and scientific research activities (versus capital investment).	 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...			

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility