

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		02/19/2009
GEF Project ID:	1952		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	GF/2740-03-4645	GEF financing:	1.000	1.000
Project Name:	Support for World Parks Congress, September 8-17, 2003, Durban, South Africa	IA/EA own:	3.863	3.863
Country:	Global (Developing country members of IUCN)	Government:	2.345	2.345
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	6.208	6.208
Operational Program:	OP 12	Total Project Cost:	7.208	7.208
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	IUCN	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		1/2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: 9/2004	Actual: 01/2005
Prepared by: Florentina Mulaj	Reviewed by: Neeraj Kumar Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 20	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 24	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 4
Author of TE: Peter Hunnam		TE completion date: 06/2005	TE submission date to GEF EO: 09/2005 ¹	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 3

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

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

¹ Earlier projects that primarily pertained to organizing conferences and workshops were not included for APR. From 2008, such projects are being included in the APR.

The TE provides a good account of the Congress' accomplishments and drawbacks. The author does a good job presenting information regarding the entire process that took place pre- and post- congress and identifies some important and key issues. However, TE is limited by the lack of some specific information regarding the GEF support to the project, which was required to be managed as a discrete project rather than as an integrated part of support to the whole Congress. Also, the TE makes no concessions to the limitations of the evaluation methodology when applied to an event rather than to an in-field project. Despite these failings, the TE is thorough in terms of appraising the available information, and provides some valuable lessons and recommendations for designing, organizing and managing similar events in the future.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No. There are no evaluation findings that require follow-up.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project brief document:

"...the Vth World Parks Congress will examine the challenges and opportunities facing protected areas in coming decades. The goal is to secure the multiple values of the global system of protected areas through the application of our best science, information and experience. The Congress will explore and propose new and innovative policies, strategies, and practices for expanding the network of protected areas, and adapting them to a world of rapid change."

There was no change in project objectives 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)?)

According to the project brief document, "... the objectives of the project are to support the participation of developing countries in the Parks Congress, through a variety of mechanisms including:

- Convening of regional and national meetings
- Preparation of case studies
- Preparation of exhibits
- Training on information technology
- Forming a network of protected area managers
- Supporting participants from developing countries to participate in the Congress"²

The TE doesn't report any change in the development objectives of the project during its implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

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, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

² See TE paragraph 13.

		ambitious		
-	-	-	-	-

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 (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities)
Rating: S**

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) The national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

According to the project brief, the project is relevant to national development agenda as it will “enhance the human capacity to manage protected areas, through sustained education and conservation awareness in local populations, and better training for protected areas personnel in order to continue this education; enhance institutional capacity to manage protected areas; and enhance the scientific capacity to manage protected areas.”

(ii) The national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

According to the project brief, the project is relevant to national environmental framework and national priorities, as it complements existing activities in the countries it is staged at. “All countries in which the project is being implemented have identified protected areas as a priority in their National Biodiversity Action Plans...They have also set aside protected areas made laws to govern them, and are committed to the expansion of the protected areas network at the national and regional levels.”

Furthermore, the project brief indicates that the “Congress is country-driven and based on national priorities, plans, and programs as it is the largest gathering of professionals that is instrumental in setting the policy for the world’s protected areas...the project will also contribute to integrating protection of the global environment into national activities. All Congress workshops and symposia will focus on international issues that are applicable to regions and countries. As well, cross-cutting themes, including such globally significant issues as gender and equity, world heritage, and marine, will be included in all workshops, again emphasizing the broader relevance of these issues, and their relevance to all regions and countries.”

(iii) The achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?

The project is relevant to the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate. The operational programme that it addresses is Operational Programme on Integrated Systems Management (OP 12).

(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

The project supports implementation of the Convention on Biodiversity. According to the project brief, “the project will enhance an enabling environment at the global level through incorporating national action plans into global objectives and conventions, making those international agreements functional and respected.”

One of the project outcomes, as identified in the project brief, is “enhancing an enabling environment at the global level:

- Increase in global awareness - a ‘celebration’ of PAs at the beginning of the 21st Century
- Report on the state of the world’s PAs - a new and improved UN PA List; and a report on the ‘State of the World Parks’;
- Deliver global policy & recommendations on PAs; Deliver 10 & 100 year vision for PAs - The Durban

<p>Accord;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver specific guidance to the CBD on PAs – focus of COP7 in 2004; 	
<p>A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership³</p>	
<p>Yes, the project has promoted international cooperation and partnership. According to the project brief, “the WPC is taking place following GEF’s successful replenishment. One of the indicators for progress in biodiversity, as noted by GEF donors, is the expansion of the network of protected areas. The WPC will promote by national governments to this expansion, and will set benchmarks for monitoring progress.”</p>	
<p>b. Effectiveness</p>	<p>Rating: S</p>
<p>Four main outcomes of the project were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhancing human capacity to manage protected areas: According to the TE, 2,897 delegates from 160 countries attended the Congress. Of these, 1,258 (43% of delegates) were from 103 developing countries⁴ (64% of the total). It is not apparent how effectively this was done and that there was a highly skewed representation that cannot be considered an appropriate global forum. - Enhancing an enabling environment for protected areas at the national level: TE concluded that the “the overall Congress process does not seem to have provided or been used as a systematic mechanism for individual countries to focus on their PA systems, review the issues each is facing, share this knowledge with regional neighbours and globally, contribute to the development of improved tools, and use these to strengthen domestic conservation strategies. The GEF project does not seem to have been used to facilitate such a process in its target beneficiaries, developing countries.” - Enhancing an enabling environment at the global level: The TE concluded that “Although the effectiveness and real impacts of staging the Congress are difficult to measure and evaluate, the Vth WPC can be considered highly successful in providing a global stage for protected areas world-wide, their values, potential and issues to be tackled.” - Enhancing financial mechanisms for increasing support for protected areas: The GEF project planned to contribute to three particular strategies: forming alliances between PA programmes and other resource sectors; securing new initiatives for PAs in Africa; and organising increased long-term financing for PAs. Some progress appears to have been made through the Congress in drawing other sectors into protected areas and conservation work. Less progress was made on particular new initiatives than had been hoped for by IUCN. A concept for a pan-African PA Initiative (APAI) was given a high-profile launch at the Congress but remains in a developmental stage at the time of this evaluation. <p>The Congress included Workshop Streams on Sustainable Finance and Building Support, and there was also an important involvement of other sectors (like the mining and tourism industries) in PAs issues. Other initiatives related to PA support in the African region still remained in the developmental stage at the time of the TE (almost two years after the Vth WPC).</p>	
<p>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</p>	<p>Rating: MS</p>
<p>The TE makes no direct mention of the project’s efficiency/cost-effectiveness. The TE author explains that the project document and summary provided the only plans for the support activity and were not well developed, making it very difficult to monitor, supervise, and finally evaluate the project. In addition, the TE notes that details provided by IUCN to UNEP were limited to consolidated data on the downstream disbursements made by IUCN.</p> <p>However, the TE does point out that the financial management of the grant appears to have been straightforward and efficient.</p>	
<p>d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when</p>	

³ Please consider for regional and global project only

⁴ 2003 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) listing

resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

Unable to assess

4.1.2 Results / Impacts⁵ (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

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: 2
According to the TE, the funding pattern for this WPC does not seem sustainable since it is almost completely dependant on overseas aid funds from European and North American government sources. There is no indication that alternative sources of financial support would be feasible for the next WPC.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: 3
The TE concludes that <i>“it was a major success of the Vth WPC’s organizers to have achieved the range and depth of participation it did”</i> and that <i>“Participants were motivated, inspired and informed by many aspects of the event.”</i> According to the TE, the summary participation data indicates that the Vth WPC was almost exclusively a gathering of people who are committed stakeholders in the cause of strengthening and extending PAs and PA systems as key components of nature conservation programmes and systems.	
The level of stakeholder ownership was sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained. The Congress achieved stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives the project. All of the participants had a vested interest in project benefits and outcomes. However, it is impossible to assess whether project benefits continued to follow beyond the congress. Furthermore, the TE notes that most of the stakeholders did not necessarily have any decision making power in their respective governments.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 3
The TE describes the IUCN as having an enormous capacity to reach out to a specialist global audience and to draw in a wide array of participants to the cause of conservation. But it is also critical of the entire planning and organization process, and recommends the IUCN to reevaluate the current framework for the WPC, suggesting that the function of the WPC <i>“should be played down, and a more limited strategic purpose should be adopted.”</i>	
The size and complexity of the Vth WPC reduced the effectiveness of many of its elements, and perhaps this provides another reason for a new approach. The Durban Congress demanded such a tremendous organisational effort that it tended to overshadow the long-term programme of conservation work and PA development. An indication of this is the inadequate development of the strategic objectives for the Congress, which should be drawn straight from the programme’s objectives.	
The Vth WPC was primarily an ad hoc gathering of individuals with direct involvement in the management of protected areas but with no formal mandate. A lesson from the WPC is that separation of deliberation and planning from decision-making and implementation to such an extent is not effective. Between reflection, resolution, decision and action, there are many opportunities for a message or recommendation to be diluted, misunderstood or lost. There would surely be advantages in reassessing the question of representation at the Congress	

⁵ Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

d. Environmental	Rating: 4
There are no environmental risks that can undermine the future flow project benefits.	
e. Technological	Rating:
Not relevant for this project.	

4.3 Catalytic role⁶

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders
The project did not provide any direct incentive to catalyze change in the stakeholders other than providing with a platform to come together and deliberate and facilitate knowledge sharing.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
It is difficult to assess the extent to which this congress will lead to an institutional change among the participating institutions. Its direct impact on this front is likely to be minimal.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
The Congress will have little direct impact on getting PAs on the political agenda of state and provincial governments, or in making drastic policy changes. This is particularly due to the fact that almost all of the participants did not possess any decision making power in their respective governments.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
One objective of GEF assistance is to stimulate the development of mechanisms that will continue to yield benefits after the assistance ends. The following mechanisms were developed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some progress appears to have been made through the Congress in drawing other sectors into protected areas and conservation work. - There was also considerable discussion in workshops about tourism in relation to PAs, and some tangible results in the form of sustainable tourism agreements negotiated between IUCN and a number of tourism operations. - A partnership was announced between UNEP, the World Tourism Organization and IUCN to publish a handbook on ‘Sustainable Tourism & Ecotourism Policy Implementation Guidelines’. - A major Trust Fund for African PAs (APATF) was conceived in the lead-up to the Congress, but has not yet been organized. The Congress called upon the international community to support the capitalization of the Fund. <p>Nevertheless, information provided in the project documents is insufficient to assess whether these mechanisms have in fact mobilize financial resources for protected areas.</p>
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
N/A

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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
--

⁶ Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

<p>project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p> <p>The only information that the TE provides on co-financing is that "IUCN and the Congress organizers were successful in raising funds for the staging of the Vth WPC overall." It also notes that the Vth WPC was supported by governments to a much greater extent than had been planned (73% received compared to 41% planned), and received much less support from the private sector than had been anticipated (2% rather than 19%). <u>In sum, there was no difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing.</u></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>The duration of the Vth WPC extended for longer than had been anticipated. The delay did not affect the project's outcomes. The TE notes that "an enormous amount of Congress work has been carried out in the 18 months since September 2003, and IUCN has had to extend its support structure. Many of the ideas, information, proposals and plans that were generated by the Congress have not yet been assimilated or further developed. As was intended, the Congress has set the agenda for the protected areas movement for years to come."</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no indication of adaptive management of the project specifications by IUCN or UNEP, such as changes to the project plan, apart from an extension of 4 months to allow completion and revising line item allocations in the budget.</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>Conference was organized by IUCN/WCP and the South African Government. 43% of the participants at the conference were from the developing world. The TE concluded that the "Congress will have had little direct impact on getting "PAs on the political agenda of state and provincial governments", although it is not known whether this project indicator has been measured; it is not readily measurable. The overall Congress process does not seem to have provided or been used as a systematic mechanism for individual countries to focus on their PA systems, review the issues each is facing, share this knowledge with regional neighbours and globally, contribute to the development of improved tools, and use these to strengthen domestic conservation strategies."</p> <p>In terms of cofinancing contributions from the participating countries, the data in the TE indicates the dominance of European and North American government funding to the Vth WPC and the relative lack of support from Asian, Latin American and African governments. The governments of developed countries contributed a total of USD 3 million cash to the Congress, 50% of all cash donations, plus a further USD 1.37 million (23%) through multilateral agencies.</p>

4.5 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 M&E plan as defined in the project brief defined a plan to monitor results and track progress. However, the TE concludes that the project lacked a logical framework, baseline information, and benchmarks for assessing project's achievement of objectives, outcomes, and activities.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MS</p> <p>The TE observes that a significant feature of the management of the Vth WPC by IUCN was a thorough approach to monitoring and evaluation. But the rating given to M&E is only "Moderately Satisfactory" and in the rest of the TE there is strong criticism for the project's lack of a logical framework, baseline information, and benchmarks for assessing project's achievement of objectives, outcomes, and activities.</p> <p>According to the TE, the quarterly progress reports produced by the WPC Secretariat do not give a clear indication whether the WPC was planned and conducted as effectively as they could have been. The project</p>

document and summary budget provided the only plans for the support activity and, as noted above, were not well developed; a more developed logical framework, work plan and budget would have enabled monitoring, supervision and evaluation to have been more rigorous.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? UA
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? UA
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? UA
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? Information on the M&E system of the project is inconsistent. Although the TE mentions that there were a number of surveys, reviews and evaluations during the course of the Congress gathering and in its aftermath, there is no explanation on the effectiveness of these methodologies. Also, it is not clear if the information collected was useful to the evaluator.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): 5
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): 5 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. The project was completed more or less as scheduled. The TE notes that the institutional arrangements between GEF, UNEP and IUCN appear to have been straightforward and worked efficiently. UNEP’s role was limited to administering the grant and receiving quarterly and semi-annual financial and technical progress reports. Good liaison and communications were maintained on a regular basis between the individual officers responsible in UNEP and IUCN. There is no indication of adaptive management of the project specifications by IUCN or UNEP, such as changes to the project plan, apart from an extension of 4 months to allow completion and revising line item allocations in the budget.
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁷ (rating on a 6 point scale): 5 Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency. The TE describes the IUCN as having an enormous capacity to reach out to a specialist global audience and to draw in a wide array of participants to the cause of conservation. But it is also critical of the entire planning and organization process, and recommends the IUCN to reevaluate the current framework for the WPC, suggesting that the function of the WPC “ <i>should be played down, and a more limited strategic purpose should be adopted.</i> ” The TE does not make an assessment of the performance of the EA. Therefore, it could be argued that the EA performance was satisfactory (if not highly satisfactory). It does note in several sections of the report that the institutional arrangements between GEF, UNEP and IUCN appear to have been straightforward and worked efficiently. Good liaison and communications were

⁷ 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.

maintained on a regular basis between the individual officers responsible in UNEP and IUCN. There is no indication of adaptive management of the project specifications by IUCN or UNEP, such as changes to the project plan, apart from an extension of 4 months to allow completion and revising line item allocations in the budget.

5. 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

One of the main lessons identified by the TE relates to the planning and organization design of the Congress. The TE mentions that the Vth WPC would have been much more effective and efficient if IUCN had developed a more rigorous design for staging the whole Congress, which could then have been used to frame subsidiary plans for specific components (including the ones funded by the GEF). In the letter sent by the IUCN to the TE author⁸, the organization contends that the Congress was adequately planned. To backup their claim they point out that the evaluator did not read the detailed Workshop Stream planning papers, even though, according to the TE author himself, these Workshops were “*highly significant to the development of the Congress*” (paragraph 87).

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

- A single more rigorous plan and logical framework should be prepared for the overall programme initiative, and each donor’s “project”, including the GEF contribution, should be specified within the overall framework and planned and evaluated accordingly.
- It is important to incorporate an adequate evaluation tool into each technical publication, resource series and capacity building exercise.
- It would be feasible and useful to be more rigorous in planning, organising and monitoring capacity development efforts in association with the WPC. These were valid and important outcomes for IUCN, UNEP and GEF, yet it is not known how relevant or effective they were.
- Dedicated grants like the GEF contribution should be used to target and provide tailored packages of support to individual sponsored participants from particular developing countries.
- Different approaches and fora will need to be developed in order to encourage and enable resource industries to make substantial progress towards using protected areas as an integral strategy for ecological sustainability.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 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.

In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

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.

6.2 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?	S
b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any	MS

⁸ See TE Annex VIII

major evidence gaps?	
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	HS
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE does provide details of the WPC costs. In Annex V it presents information on the WPC total budgeted amount and the expenses per main item, but there is no information on expenses regarding the GEF component itself (which was supposed to be managed as a discrete project). The TE was constrained by the quality of the information available.	MU
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The TE assessment of the M&E systems in the project was a bit superficial. Although it did describe the M&E actions taken during the WPC, it did not provide enough information on how the data produced was used.	MU

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

Key IUCN and WCPA people include:

- Achim Steiner, Director General, IUCN.
- David Sheppard, Secretary General, World Parks Congress.
- Kenton Miller, Chair, World Commission on Protected Areas and Chair, World Parks Congress International Steering Committee.
- Bob Stanton, Congress Ambassador, former Director, US National Park Service.
- Mavuso Msimang, CEO South African National Parks and Chair World Parks Congress National Steering Committee

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)