

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	10/19/05
GEF ID:	216		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Strengthening of National Capacity and Grassroots In-Situ Conservation for Sustainable Biodiversity Protection	GEF financing:	\$2.529	?
Country:	Lebanon	Co-financing:	\$0.763	?
Operational Program:	4	Total Project Cost:	\$3.292	\$0,00
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment	Work Program date		May 1995
		CEO Endorsement		10/02/1995
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		11/08/1995
		Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2001	Actual: Nov 2004
Prepared by: Josh Brann	Reviewed by: Claudio Volonte	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 6	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 8 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 2 years
Author of TE: Roy Hagen, Jocelyne Adjizian-Gerard		TE completion date: January 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 6/21/05	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1.5 years

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	None given		U/A
2.2 Project outcomes		None given		MS
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	None given		MS

2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	None given		HU
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A		MU (3.4)

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? **NO** Why? There is no information presented in the TE on the projects final costs, and there is not a good discussion of sustainability of outcomes and impacts.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The project will put into place an effectively managed system of protected areas to safeguard endemic and endangered species of flora and fauna, conserve their habitats and incorporate biodiversity conservation as an integral part of sustainable human development. The project will test a specific model of three demonstration parks where the Ministry of Environment, local NGOs, and in-country scientific institutions will cooperate and coordinate their activities to promote both the long-term ecological and the short term economic objectives of wildlife conservation.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

“The project’s overall development objective is to conserve endemic and endangered wildlife and their habitats, incorporate wildlife conservation as an integral part of sustainable human development, strengthen the institutional capacity of government agencies and NGOs, and promote national reconciliation.”(PD)

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

According to the TE, “All of the available information indicates that the project has been very successful at the most basic level of protecting the biodiversity and habitats of the reserves from well-known human pressures.”

“In spite of major social and political divisions, there is clearly a strong base of support for conservation of the reserves amongst a wide range of stakeholders and authorities.”

“There has been very significant progress on the development of capacities to manage Pas. However, capacity development has been far below what it could have been. This is especially true for the Ministry of Environment.”

“The three reserves all have functional management systems and are managed by local management teams. Management plans were prepared and approved for all three reserves. However, the plans are very general and lacking in much of the detail that is critical for effective management.”

“One of the project objectives calls for efforts for defining an overall strategy of conservation in Lebanon. This has not been achieved. There is no overall strategy defining conservation priorities and the means for conserving them.”

“None of the site-level capacity building was focused on the enhancing the internal systems of management and governance of the local NGOs that were responsible for hiring and overseeing the Management Teams at each reserve for the first five years. The Evaluation Team believes that this may have been a strategic error in project design and implementation.”

“The awareness raising at the local level has been quite successful. The reserves are generally respected by the local populations and are increasingly a source of pride for them. The impact of awareness raising at the national level is much more difficult to judge.”

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Rating:MS

A Relevance	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain 	
The project outcomes are highly relevant to and consistent with the focal area and operational program strategies. The project focused on three protected areas in Lebanon, and has been mostly successful in meeting the immediate objectives outlined in the project. The next step for the country, as described in the TE, will be to move from focusing on specific individual PAs within Lebanon to a comprehensive plan and capacity development for the full national PA network.	
B Effectiveness	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	
For the most part yes – see previous highlights of outcomes and impacts. There are, however, three minor weaknesses in the achievement of project outcomes as described in the project document. The first is that the management plans developed for the three PAs are generic and weak and do not provide sufficient guidance for the full and proper management of the reserves. The second is that the project failed to develop a comprehensive conservation strategy at the national level, which was one of the intended outcomes. Third, the institutional capacity built at the national level fell short of what was anticipated. Other than these issues, the project was effective in achieving the expected outcomes. The main problem is that there is little to no data to understand how the achievement of project outcomes has affected biodiversity.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems? 	
There is no discussion of cost-effectiveness in the TE. There is also no real discussion of the financial aspects of the project, so it is extremely difficult to make any real assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the project. The TE does not include any discussion of the implementation aspects of the project in any way. In general the rate of disbursement was anticipated to be approximately half the GEF average for biodiversity projects, and this decreased even further with the three year no-cost extension.	

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: 4
The TE does not specifically discuss sustainability issues, but it does discuss some aspects of financing of PA management, including revenue from the government, tourist revenue, and national level fundraisers. It seems as though the government contribution will continue to be important, and tourist visits have been increasing at 30%/year for 5 years. As a follow-up the TE strongly encourages seeking additional GEF funding, which is not exactly a plan for long-term sustainability.	
B Socio political	Rating: 5
The project has succeeded in raising awareness and support at the local level for the three protected areas involved in the project. According to some examples given in the project, this has been a remarkable change.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 3
Apparently the Government Appointed Committees have not been completely successful in meeting the management challenges of the three protected areas, and the TE mentions some “structural” issues that need to be addressed. At the national level the MoE apparently did not live up to its commitments to the project, and the level of capacity built was less than desired.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: MS
According to anecdotal evidence cited by the TE, the status of biodiversity has been mostly secured within	

the three protected areas. This is not supported by systematic data collection however.
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability Rating: U/A
During the course of the project the number of Pas in Lebanon increased from 3 to 7, but there is no discussion about whether the activities and lessons from the 3 pilot protected areas in the project have been or will be applied to the other protected areas.

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

A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.? Rating: 1
According to the TE, "There are no functional monitoring systems and almost no monitoring data that show that biodiversity is successfully being conserved in these three reserves." Further, "The lack of impact indicators in the design document...has been an important constraint for both project implementation and for this final evaluation." However, the TE does include as Annex E Addendum 1 copies of the Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool which has been completed at least once for each of the three reserves included in the project. It is not clear if the METT has been applied more than once, which would enable the evaluators to identify changes to the baseline level. There is no analysis of the tracking tools included with the report.
B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management? Rating: U/A
There is no discussion of adaptive management within the TE, and there is no discussion of implementation aspects of the project upon which some assessment of the project's experience with adaptive management could be based.
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? NO

4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?
<p>In order to focus resources where they are most critically needed, conservation priorities for each PA should be identified, prioritized and presented in easily understandable cartographic form. In order to properly protect and manage a protected area, it is critical to identify and prioritize the threats and to analyze the root causes of the threats. This knowledge base on threats is essential for developing effective strategies and interventions for countering the threats to the PA.</p> <p>The statement of objectives in a PA management plan should define what one hopes to achieve during the life of the management plan. Objectives should be as specific and quantifiable as possible. Objectively verifiable indicators should be defined to allow managers and oversight agencies to monitor the level of achievement of the objectives that have been set.</p> <p>The management plan should define appropriate measures that seek to make the experience of visitors to PA as rewarding as possible while ensuring the objective that the conservation of the reserve and its biodiversity is not endangered and while contributing to the costs of PA management. The definition of the carrying capacity for tourism must</p>

be given especially high priority in Lebanon, given the very small size of many reserves.

PA management plans should define and prioritize the management-oriented research needs. M&E should be seen primarily as a management tool – a tool to measure whether or not management objectives are being met and to indicate whether management strategies and interventions need to be modified.

Local community/stakeholder support for PA is critical. Developing such support is often complicated. Incentive programs need to be very carefully thought out and should be included in PA management strategies.

It is critical to develop a law that authorizes the collection of park entrance fees and that allows the local managers to reinvest these fees directly in the management of the park.

4.5 Quality of the evaluation report 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 the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

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.

4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	2
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	2
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	1
There is no information on actual project costs or co-financing.	
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	5

4.6 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes:	No: X
-------------	--------------

Explain: The technical explanation in the TE is comprehensive. What would be recommended would be a scientific assessment on the ground of the project’s impacts, which would be accomplished through a long-term monitoring plan. The project appears to have been mostly successful, at least in terms of its immediate impact on biodiversity resources, but there is no way to know how or if impacts actually occurred.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? NO.

4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)
Project document, GEF database, Biodiversity Program Study project review sheet.