

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2152	
GEF Agency project ID		P085089	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Butrint National Park Biodiversity and Global Heritage Conservation	
Country/Countries		Albania	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems OP 12: Integrated Ecosystem Management OP 13: Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture	
Executing agencies involved		Albanian Ministry of Territorial Adjustment and Tourism, Butrint National Park, municipalities	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 29, 2007 (PMIS)	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2010	
Actual date of project completion		June 2011	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	
	Co-financing	0.01	
GEF Project Grant		0.950	0.275458 (TE)
Co-financing	IA own	0.9655	
	Government	0.19266	
	Other multi-/bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	0.05	
Total GEF funding		0.975	
Total Co-financing		1.21816	Unknown
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.19316	0.275458 (TE)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2011	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Drite Dade	
TER completion date		February 2015	
TER prepared by		Aditi Poddar	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Shanna Edberg	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	NR	Unable to Assess
Sustainability of Outcomes	U	U	NR	Unable to Assess
M&E Design	NR	NR	NR	MU
M&E Implementation	NR	NR	NR	Unable to Assess
Quality of Implementation	NR	NR	NR	Unable to Assess
Quality of Execution	NR	NR	NR	Unable to Assess
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	NR	HU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project, as stated in the Project Document (PD), is to support the long-term protection of coastal, marine, freshwater, and forest ecosystems by connecting biodiversity conservation and sustainable ecosystem management with world heritage conservation in the Butrint wetland complex as an integral part of the implementation of the Albania Integrated Coastal Zone Management and Clean-up Program (ICZMCP). The project will foster and strengthen the protection of coastal wetlands and wooded areas rich in globally significant biodiversity species.

The Butrint wetland complex, together with Karavasta and Nartan lagoons, are Ramsar sites important for migrating birds along the Africa-Paleartic flyway. Butrint has unique natural and cultural features, supports a number of globally endangered species, and offers important habitats for fish. However, the wetlands have been degraded as a result of reclamation of marshes and expansion of agricultural land into the woodlands throughout the 1950s. Currently, the main threats to Butrint's biodiversity include intensified farming and grazing, and uncontrolled development. Artificial fires, cause loss of woodlands, soil deterioration, and the destruction of reed beds in the northern part of Lake Butrint. Over-utilization of fertilizers, agricultural run-off, and sewage and solid waste pollution from ad-hoc village expansion are additional threats to biodiversity.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of this project is to develop a long-term coastal and marine protected area management regime in Albania, and to establish a model for community stewardship which may be replicated in other protected areas.

The project has 2 main components:

1. *Protected Areas Management Strengthening* The project will assist in piloting implementation of sustainable management of Butrint National Park through:

- (i) supporting the formulation of the protected areas management plan for the Butrint National Park and the Ramsar wetland complex, including the formulation of alternative options for the restoration of coastal wetlands and degraded habitat ecosystems as well as the formulation of forest and pasture management plans;

- (ii) supporting the establishment of a multi-stakeholder consultative group to oversee the development of the protected areas and site assets management plan;
- (iii) provision of the necessary equipment and tools for management, resource inventory, biodiversity monitoring and tourism interpretation;
- (iv) supporting the demarcation of the protected site and the construction of basic park infrastructure.

2. *Environmental Protection and Sustainable Economic Activities*: The project will support activities in the communes surrounding Butrint National Park, including:

- (i) participatory forests and pasture management;
- (ii) establishment of agri-environmental demonstration farms;
- (iii) establishment of a small grant scheme for environmental and sustainable economic activities;
- (iv) environmental improvements around Butrint.

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

No, there were no changes to the Global Environment Objectives or the Development Objectives. However, the TE (pg. 2) notes that some project activities were changed. In December 2009, the activities under the sub-component related to the setting up of the small grant facility were dropped and the funding was to be used instead to finance key park infrastructure.

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.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project’s objective was consistent with the policy priorities of the Government of Albania. Albania signed the UN Convention on Biological Diversity in 1994, and approved its Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan in 2000 together with the establishment of the National Council for Nature. The main objectives of the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan are the protection and enhancement of biological and landscape diversity, and the promotion of sustainable development. The conservation of the Butrint habitats and their species conform to the Plan’s priorities. Furthermore, the conservation of Albania’s biodiversity and restoration of degraded wetlands ecosystems is a stated national priority. The project

contributes to the goals and strategic directions of the 1996 Program on Coastal Zone Management in Albania, the National Environmental Action Plan, and the Country Assistance Strategy. The project will also support the goals of the newly drafted Law on Protected Areas, Law on Biodiversity Protection and Law on Cultural Heritage: the future application of these laws is linked to the scaling up successful pilots such as this project (PD, pgs. 5-6).

The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Program 2, Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems, and is related to Operational Program 3, Forest Ecosystems. Furthermore, the project supports objectives of the GEF Operational Program 12, Integrated Ecosystem Management, since it aims to manage natural systems across administrative boundaries and facilitate participatory approaches to natural resources planning and management approaches. The project is relevant to GEF-4 Strategic Priority 1 for biodiversity (*Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas*), which focuses on coastal and marine protected area systems. The project aimed to strengthen the Butrint National Park protected area management capacity and long-term sustainability. It would build on the larger Albania Integrated Coastal Zone Management and Clean-up Program (ICZMCP) to enable the scaling up of coastal/marine protected areas at the national level with the objective of establishing a national network. The project would also address biodiversity concerns in tourism, forestry and pasture management plans and support the creation of new employment and revenue-generating activities for local people based on sustainable habitat management.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unable to Assess
-------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates the progress towards the achievement of grant objectives as ‘Moderately Satisfactory’ and the progress in the implementation of grant activities as ‘Moderately Unsatisfactory’. This TER is unable to assess the effectiveness of the project because the TE does not provide details about project outcomes and activities.

The TE (pg. 4) notes that the progress on each of the two project components was rated as ‘Moderately Satisfactory’ in June 2010. It reports the completion of a few planned outputs, but does not provide details on these. Both of the two project components were still under implementation at the time the TE was written.

For component 1, on the strengthening of protected areas management, the TE mentions only one planned output, the preparation of the Butrint National Park management plan, whereas the PD includes four outputs for this component. The draft for the management plan had been prepared at the time of the TE’s writing, but it would not be endorsed until only after the completion of the social and legal assessment, and the TE did not specify expected dates for these events.

The TE reports three expected outputs for component 2, on environmental protection and sustainable economic activities. It notes that local consultants were hired for forestry, agriculture and legal issues, but the PD does not specify whether these achievements are expected outputs of specific

subcomponents. The setting up of the small grants facility was canceled due to lack of time and failure to hire a grants manager. The project redirected the funds that would have been used for the small grant facility to finance key park infrastructure identified in the management plan. However, these investments had not been finalized by project completion. Finally, the PD proposed three sub-components in addition to the small grants facility which the TE does not mention.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE does not provide an efficiency rating for the project. It does mention that the project experienced delays in start-up, and that the implementation has been slow (TE, pg. 2). The TE points to the low capacity of the Park management and the suspension of IDA credit for more than a year as reasons for the slow implementation. These delays led to incomplete implementation of several project activities. The project succeeded in developing a management plan and designs for new park infrastructure, but the management plan and the designs were not implemented, and the investment for the park infrastructure had not materialized, by project end.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to Assess
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Financial sustainability (U/A) – The TE does not report on the financial sustainability of the project.

Socio-political sustainability (U/A) – The TE does not provide information about the socio-political risks faced by the project.

Institutional sustainability (U/A) – The TE does not report any institutional risks.

Environmental sustainability (U/A) – The TE does not provide any information about the environmental risks associated with the project.

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?

At project start, co-financing was expected to contribute more than half of total project funds. However, the TE does not include any information about co-financing. It is unclear whether any co-financing materialized.

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?

As mentioned in the ‘Efficiency’ section, project start-up experienced delays. Additional delays were caused by the International Development Association’s credit suspension that lasted for more than a year. However, the TE does not mention the total length of the delay nor does it mention the reasons for the delays in project start-up. The TE (pg. 2) reports that several of the planned project activities could not be completed by the project completion date which might partly be a result of these delays, although TE does not state this. One of the reasons for canceling the sub-component related to the setting up of a small grants facility was the lack of time to complete implementation.

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:

The TE does not provide any information about country ownership and its impact on outcomes and sustainability.

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.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

The PD does not describe a sound and well-formulated M&E plan (pgs. 19-20). It has several shortcomings. While it clearly lays out monitoring and reporting responsibilities for various parts of the executing agency and presents indicators to measure its various activities, it does not provide baseline values for these indicators. But monitoring activities were to include establishment of baseline conditions. It only sets subjective targets for project outputs such as “significant reduction in threats” and “increased number of local income-generating activities”. The PD does not make provisions for further refinement of M&E indicators and targets during implementation. The PCU was to prepare quarterly and annual reports and beneficiaries were to be surveyed at the beginning, mid-term and completion of the project to evaluate impact. The PD does not provide a specific time frame for monitoring reports nor does it have a dedicated M&E budget.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide any information on M&E implementation. However, it mentions (pg. 5) that in June 2010, the M&E system was 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 execution 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.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
--	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide an assessment of the quality of project implementation through supervision and assistance by the implementing agency, the World Bank.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide much information about the quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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.

The TE does not provide any information on environmental changes.

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.

The TE does not provide any information on socioeconomic changes.

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

No changes in capacities are reported in the TE.

b) Governance

One of the sub-components of the project was to create a management plan for Butrint National Park to enable strengthening of the management of protected areas. The TE (pg. 4) reports that the draft management plan had been prepared at the time the TE was written but it was to be endorsed only after the social and legal assessment of the project was completed. If endorsed and actually completed, this plan would improve the management of the Park.

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.

The TE does not report adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

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.

The TE does not mention any lessons learned.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not provide any recommendations.

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?	The TE provides ratings for the progress of the project components but does not assess relevant outcomes and impacts.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE does not provide ratings for most aspects of project implementation.	HU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not assess sustainability on any dimension nor does it provide risk mitigation measures.	HU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	It does not provide any lessons learned.	HU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include details of co-financing and project costs by activity.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	It does not provide any information about M&E implementation.	HU
Overall TE Rating		HU

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