

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		08/23/2006
GEF Project ID:	26		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	64521	GEF financing:	0.716985	0.718779
Project Name:	Conservation of Elephant Landscapes in Aceh	IA/EA own:	0.232900	0.256694
Country:	Indonesia	Government:	-	-
		Other*:	0.050000	0.003985
		Total Cofinancing	0.282900	0.260609
Operational Program:	3	Total Project Cost:	0.999885	0.979388
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Flora and Fauna International (FFI)	Work Program date		-
		CEO Endorsement		10/20/1999
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		12/13/1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2002	Actual: 12/31/2003
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 48 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 12 months
Author of TE:	?	TE completion date: 04/01/2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 03/02/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 23 months

* 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

GEF EO 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). GEF EO 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. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	MS	-	MU
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	-	-	U
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	-	-	MS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

<p>Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No. Even though this TE presents most of the required information very clearly, it fails to provide a complete assessment of the project (what worked, what didn't, and why).</p>
<p>Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No.</p>

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**
 The main objectives are:
 - To conserve biologically rich forest ecosystems in Northern Aceh, focusing on the lowland forests that are important wildlife corridors, especially for elephants.
 - To maintain biological corridors between the well-protected Gunung Leuser ecosystem and the Northern Aceh forests.
 The PIRs show that the objectives have not changed. The Project Document is not available.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**
 - Critical forest areas recognized and under more effective protection
 - Enhanced capacity among project implementers and partners to achieve and sustain planned conservation activities
 - An improved policy and practical framework for forest conservation in Aceh
 - Strong stakeholder support for, and participation in the project, its aims and activities
 - Established field based monitoring, enforcement and conflict mitigation by the Natural Resources Conservation Agency of Aceh (BKSDA) in critical areas.

The 2005 PIR concluded that the original project design was too ambitious, poorly focused and beyond the capacity of FFI Medan/Banda Aceh to achieve with its current staff and resources. Accordingly the work plan was revised to identify a critical path for project activities and key support activities which is more realistic.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**
 According to the TE, the project most significant achievements are:
 - Establishing a GIS database and the analytical skills necessary to map and model elephant conservation needs.
 - Assessing the attitudes of rural and urban communities toward elephant conservation.
 - Developing and implementing targeted public communication programs to build awareness of the needs and opportunities for elephant conservation on the part of decision makers and communities living in areas where human-elephant conflict is likely.
 - Playing an instrumental role in facilitating establishment of a moratorium on logging throughout Aceh.
 - Mobilizing communities and supporting provincial government agencies to initiate protection of critical areas of elephant habitat and community use forests.

4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts **Rating: MU**

A Relevance **S**

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

Yes. The project outcomes are relevant to the Forest Ecosystems Operational Program,

especially regarding OP3 second objective related to conservation of tropical systems in areas at risk.	
B Effectiveness	MU
<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)? 	
The project has done a good job at collecting data and information as well at awareness raising. But it was inadequate at effecting changes on the ground as it failed to get the new proposed reserve (an elephant sanctuary) with a legal status declared.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	MU
<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 and did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	
According to the TE, this project faced a series of obstacles when trying to implement their activities. Some project activities were delayed due to political instability in 2001, which led to restriction of access of project staff to some project field sites in Northern Aceh. A one year extension was then approved in November 2002, coinciding with the signing of the “Cessation of Hostilities Agreement” in Aceh which considerably improved the efficiency and effectiveness of field activities. But in May 2003 the government of Indonesia decided to implement Martial Law and prohibited all field activities in the forest. Additionally, all other activities had to be approved by the government and that entailed getting permits following extremely time consuming and lengthy bureaucratic procedures.	

Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?
Although the TE describes the project achievements as substantial, it recognizes that due to inadequate follow ups with local government and Ministry of Forestry there has been limited impact for changes on the ground.

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.

Overall Sustainability rating	Rating: MU
A Financial resources Rating: MU	
While the TE includes a follow-up Action Plan for Project Implementation for 2004-2008 with a detailed fundraising strategy, it is doubtful that FFI will be able to raise the needed funds (calculated at \$1.7 million) without further GEF assistance. Also, there is no mention of any kind of financial support from government or local authorities.	
B Socio political Rating: U	
The TE makes no indication of any expected future improvement regarding the dangerous socio political situation in Aceh.	
C Institutional framework and governance Rating: ML	
The TE makes no direct mention of possible risks concerning this issue, but it does observe that the project had weak institutional support from FFI’s headquarter office.	
D Environmental Rating: N/A	
No risks mentioned.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

A Financial resources	Rating: MU
B Socio political	Rating: MU
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
D Environmental	Rating: ML
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: MU	

4.3 Catalysis and replication.

1. Production of a public good Extensive information on elephant status, distribution, habitat, migration routes, incidents of human-elephant conflict, etc was produced.
2. Demonstration FFI shared the data collected during the project in easily understood formats with local and national government as well as with other environmental NGOs.
3. Replication No
4. Scaling up No

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE (Overall rating of the M&E system: MS)

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)	Rating: MU
The project puts an emphasis on data collection but no specific targets, or timeframes for activities are identified in the TE.	
B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?	Rating: MS
Project staff was trained on how to collect and use necessary monitoring data and met regularly to review targets and check progress. But the TE describes that there were delays in providing adequate financial and administrative reports.	
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?	Rating: S
The project M&E plan, as designed, was properly funded.	
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?	
The TE does not provide enough information on the M&E system of the project to make this assessment.	

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

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?
The TE author identifies important lessons for project implementation in general: - It is useful to keep the project running, even through a time of civil conflict and poor security, to maintain some profile, as it has convinced local stakeholders of FFI's long-term commitment and laid ground for improved outreach and constituency building. - The importance of adequate and committed support from parent NGO (FFI HQ and Regional Office), including adequate resources for technical input and capacity building during the project

period and commitment to maintain support beyond project period.
 - International NGOs expanding their global programs, such as FFI's situation, need to put in place adequate resources and support mechanisms to service an expanded network, especially when there is a need to strengthen national capacity as part of their new programs.

4.6 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.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
No additional information was available to the reviewer.

4.6.2 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? The TE mainly gives a description of the project outputs and doesn't provide a comprehensive analysis of outcomes and impacts.	4
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Although the TE presents complete information on the project implementation and results, it fails to rate the project sustainability and M&E system.	4
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE only gives a description of the project strategic approaches developed at the initial project design that were geared at ensuring the project sustainability but gives no assessment of their effectiveness or of possible risks.	3
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The TE author provides several lessons related to each of the five project outcomes but many of them are very general.	4
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes.	5
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? The TE only makes a basic description of the M&E system; it doesn't provide enough information on its implementation or use.	4

4.7 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 project had no real "on the ground" impact, and the deteriorating security situation in Aceh makes a technical assessment unadvisable.

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)
 PIR 2001, PIR 2005