

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2751	
GEF Agency project ID		None given	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Rehabilitation and Sustainable Use of Peatland Forests in South East Asia	
Country/Countries		Regional (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, and Vietnam)	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Land Degradation (LD), Biodiversity (BD), and Climate Change (CC)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD-SP2, Biodiversity-SP4, and Climate Change-SP6	
Executing agencies involved		ASEAN and Global Environment Centre (GEC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Co-funders: Wetlands International Indonesia; Propegemus Foundation, Inc.; Conservation International- Philippines	
Private sector involvement		Co-funders: Sinar Mas Forestry, Bridgestone Tyres Malaysia, HSBC Bank, Sime Darby Plantations, ENRICH-SNV	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		8/08/2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		7/28/2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		6/30/2013	
Actual date of project completion		6/30/2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.34	.34
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.3	4.3
Co-financing	IA own	.45	.37
	Government	8.62	20.45
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.15	2.42
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		4.64	4.64
Total Co-financing		10.22	23.24
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		14.86	27.88
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		10/20/2014	
Author of TE		Not given	
TER completion date		12/04/2015	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	NR	HS	NR	HS
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	ML	NR	ML
M&E Design	NR	HS	NR	S
M&E Implementation	NR	HS	NR	HS
Quality of Implementation	NR	NR	NR	S
Quality of Execution	NR	NR	NR	HS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	NR	S

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is “to reduce the rate of degradation of peat swamp forests and support their rehabilitation to maintain biodiversity, carbon storage and climate regulation functions” (2014 PIRS pg. 2).<sup>1</sup>

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is “to reverse the loss and degradation of peatlands in Southeast Asian countries in order to avoid negative impacts on socio-economy, health and environment through capacity building and sustainable peatland management practices” (2014 PIRS pg. 2).

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

The objectives, outcomes and outputs were consistent throughout implementation.

## 4. GEF IEO 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.

<sup>1</sup> The Global Environmental Objective (GEO) and the Development Objective (DO) are not explicitly stated in the PD. The GEO and DO stated here are taken from the PIRs.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project was designed to support the implementation of the *ASEAN Peatland Management Strategy* (APMS), endorsed by the ten ASEAN governments in 2006, and the *ASEAN Peatland Management Initiative* (APMI) adopted by the Environment-Haze Technical Task Force in 2003. The project used existing ASEAN and national institutional mechanisms established for haze prevention and peatland management such as the *ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution* (AATHP) and national working groups (TE pg. 15). The project also supported the development and promotion of the *National Action Plans for Peatlands* (NAPs) for each participating country (TE pg. 17-18).

The project is also in line with GEF-4 strategic programs, including a) LD SP-2: *Supporting Sustainable Forest Management in Production Landscapes*; b) Biodiversity Strategic Program 4: *Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity*; and c) Climate Change Strategic Program 6: *Management of Land-Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF)* (2008 Request for CEO Endorsement, pg. 13).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	------------------------------------

The TE assesses the effectiveness of the project as **Highly Satisfactory**. This TER concurs, as the project met and in some cases, exceeded expected results. The project was highly complex, with regional and national components, spanning four countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Vietnam. Two additional countries, Brunei and Singapore, participated in the program and covered their own costs (they were not eligible for GEF funding) (PD pg. 22). The achievements of the project, by outcome, are summarized below. Outcome 5 (Project Management) is not assessed for effectiveness in this TER as it is not a programmatic result.

- **Outcome 1:** *Capacity and the institutional framework for sustainable peatland management in South East Asia strengthened*

Expected results under this outcome included (1) Strengthened inter-sectoral policy and planning frameworks for integrated peatland management at the regional, national, and local levels; (2) Strengthened capacity for peatland management through training and awareness programs to support the upscaling of good peatland management practices; and (3) Innovative financial mechanisms to support sustainable peatland management.

At the regional level, the APMS was revised and adopted by the Committee (COM) of the ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution (AATHP). Multi-stakeholder workshops on National Action Plan on Peatland (NAP) development and implementation were held for each country, and Training of Trainers modules and awareness materials were disseminated to participating countries and stakeholders. In addition, a regional communication strategy on raising awareness

of peatland management was developed and implemented. A report on options for sustainable resource mobilization was published and circulated to ASEAN Member States (AMS), and \$250 million was compiled from multiple donors for a new ASEAN program on Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems (2014-2020) (TE pgs. 38-39).

At the national levels, NAPs were developed and adopted by three countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines, while Vietnam's NAP was pending approval at the end of the project. In addition, peatland issues were included in policy frameworks of participating countries. 900 people from 10 countries were trained on peatland management. Lastly, incentives for local communities (green contracts, seeding buy-back schemes, etc.) were established in Vietnam, Philippines, and Malaysia (TE pgs. 34-35).

- **Outcome 2:** *Reduced rate of degradation of peatlands in South East Asia*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) status and trends of peatland degradation in South East Asia determined, (2) rate of degradation of peatlands by fire reduced, (3) conservation measures for peatland biodiversity enhanced at identified critical sites, and (4) guidelines for integrated peatland management developed and promoted for peatland areas in the region.

At the regional level, assessments, inventories, and GIS mapping data were compiled, and a report on peatlands and climate change was prepared and disseminated. In addition, integrated peatland planning guidelines were prepared.

At the national levels, incidence and impacts of fire were reduced in pilot areas due to strengthened fire management prevention approaches, despite extreme drought in 2013 and 2014. Indonesia and Malaysia also prepared Fire Risk Maps and Hotspot maps. Participating countries also designated new protected areas and prepared guidelines for integrated peatland management (TE pg. 35-36)

- **Outcome 3:** *Integrated management and rehabilitation of peatlands initiated at targeted peatlands*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) sustainable management options for peatlands showcased through demonstration projects, (2) maintenance and rehabilitation activities in identified critical peatland sites implemented, and (3) integrated management planning for identified critical sites developed and adopted.

At the regional level, a network of 13 pilot sites for sustainable use and rehabilitation of peatlands was established, resulting in more than 700 hectares of rehabilitated peatlands. At the national levels, local ordinances were developed and approved, and management guidelines were prepared (TE pg. 36).

- **Outcome 4:** *Local communities and the private sector actively contributing to sustainable peatland management*  
Expected results under this outcome included: (1) integrated sustainable peatland management implemented in partnership with the private sector through joint activities at identified critical sites, and (2) local communities empowered for sustainable peatland management through poverty alleviation, alternative livelihoods and microfinancing.

At the regional level, guidelines on Best Management Practices (BMPs) for existing oil palm cultivation on peatlands was developed by the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). In addition, community livelihood initiatives were piloted in buffer zones at all pilot sites, including forest-seeding buy back systems, green contracts, and eco-tourism efforts. At the national levels, private sector companies have funded and supported community-based fire management and community livelihood projects (Indonesia), and buffer zone protection and rehabilitation (Malaysia) (TE pg. 15).

4.3 <b>Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, and this TER concurs. The initial transfer of project funds to the national executing agencies was delayed due to slow approvals from participating governments, including the signing of grant sub-agreements, opening of bank accounts, and appointment of signatories. These administrative delays resulted in the postponement of initial activities in some countries (TE pg. 17). The TE notes however, that the project took deliberate efforts to address these shortcomings and minimize project management and overhead costs. The TE also notes that the initial delays did not impact the achievement of key outcomes. Furthermore, the project was managed and implemented using existing ASEAN and national institutional mechanisms which was cost-effective and reduced overheads (TE pg. 18). Lastly, the TE notes that GEF funds were used strategically to target priority outcomes, and that overall, the efficiency of the project compared favorably with similar GEF Trust Fund projects in the region (TE pg. 19).

4.4 <b>Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Overall, the TE assessed the sustainability of the project as **Moderately Likely**, and this TER concurs.

**Financial Resources**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for the sustainability of financial resources. This TER upgrades the rating to **Likely**. As mentioned above, the 10 ASEAN countries have approved a new \$250 million program to follow-up, replicate, and scale-up the project. In addition, the TE notes that routine operating costs, such as salaries, are already covered by the participating governments and are expected

to continue. The TE also notes that there is little likelihood of an economic or financial crisis in the near future. Overall, the TE does not provide any evidence of risks to financial sustainability (TE pg. 19).

### **Sociopolitical**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for sociopolitical sustainability. Ownership of the project by ASEAN and participating national governments is high, as is key stakeholder engagement (donors, private sector, and NGOs). The TE does note that there are moderate risks to sustainability at the local level, where the project has had to invest in awareness raising and ensuring representation of marginalized groups (pg. 19).

### **Institutional Framework and Governance**

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Moderately Likely**, which this TER upgrades to **Likely**. As the TE notes, peatland management is ingrained in the framework of the *ASEAN Peatland Management Strategy* (APMS), *National Action Plans for Peatlands* (NAPs), and other regulations and policies at the national levels. The TE also indicates that these frameworks were developed in multi-stakeholder processes that were transparent and participatory (pg. 20). There is no evidence of viable risks to governance structures provided.

### **Environmental**

The TE assesses environmental sustainability as **Moderately Likely**. The TE cites long-term climate change and unpredictable fluctuations in extreme weather events as potential environmental risks to peatlands, agricultural potential, and biodiversity stability (TE pg. 20).

## **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?

Actual co-financing was approximately 228% of the expected level. The TE credits the strong multi-stakeholder approach employed by the project for inducing additional funding (TE pg. 18). Cash co-financing was used for “project management, development, finalization and implementation of policy, development of maps, forest fire protection activities, development and maintenance of infrastructure for forest fire monitoring, planting or rehabilitation activities, restoration of *Melaleuca* forest (in Viet Nam),” and in-kind co-financing was used for “staff time, participation in various meetings, development of awareness materials, and use of facilities of the agencies supporting the project, development of demonstration sites” (TE pg. 24).

The TE also notes that in some country cases co-financing was used to supplement the project management funds, which were inadequate (only 10% of the overall budget) (TE pg. 22).

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?

The project was delayed initially due to administrative challenges, such as signing of grant sub-agreements, opening of bank accounts, and the appointment of signatories. Some activities were delayed as a result, however outputs and outcomes were not affected in the long term. A no-cost extension was approved to extend the project end date from December 31, 2013 to December 31, 2014 (TE pg. 25).

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:

Country ownership of the project was high. The TE notes that finances were disbursed by IFAD directly to the host country government agencies which strengthened country ownership over project implementation and financial accountability (TE pgs. 22-23). In addition, expanded co-financing of the project was attributed to strong country ownership (TE pg. 24). The development of the new ASEAN program is evidence of continued country-level support for the project's objectives.

## 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: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory** due to shortcomings in the budget for M&E.

The causal linkages in the project's framework are logical and supported by a detailed problem analysis (PD pgs. 2-15). The M&E plan was thoroughly designed at entry and included SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) indicators, baseline values and targets, and a detailed reporting and evaluation schedule. In addition, the PD provided a detailed M&E work plan which outlines the M&E activities, responsible parties, relevant institutions, budget, and timeframe (PD Appendix D, pg. 15). The PD also outlined plans for Inception Workshops at the regional and country levels, during which the project management teams would review the logical framework and update indicators, means of verification, and assumptions, as necessary. The project team would also be

provided with a detailed overview of the M&E requirements and assign roles and responsibilities (PD Appendix D, pgs. 10-14).

The TE also provides a separate, **Satisfactory** rating for Budgeting and Financing for M&E. The overall budget for project management was 10%, which covered M&E activities along with other project management activities. The TE notes that due to the complexity of the project and the dispersed locations of the project sites, this allocation was often inadequate. Some countries were able to supplement project management funds with greater than expected co-financing.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for M&E Plan Implementation, and this TER concurs. There do not appear to be any notable shortcomings in M&E implementation.

The TE found the M&E system to be operational throughout the project. The TE notes that M&E activities were carried out as scheduled at the regional and national levels (TE pg. 21). The project was consistent in collecting data, and progress toward achieving outcomes were reported on regularly in the PIRs. ASEAN senior officials were regularly briefed on project performance, and the TE notes that an adaptive management approach was utilized in this project (TE pg. 18). Furthermore, several project initiatives (peatland hydrology, fire prevention, and community-based biodiversity monitoring) have established systems to monitor long-term changes beyond the end of the project (TE pg. 25).

## **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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for Quality of Project Implementation. Overall, the implementing agency, IFAD, provided a **satisfactory** level of supervision and assistance throughout the project. IFAD was uniquely suited to supervise the project effectively as it has other projects and country offices in Indonesia, Vietnam, and the Philippines, and was therefore familiar with the systems in these countries.



There were some minor shortcomings in project implementation, including delays and extensions which prevented a higher rating.

The TE notes that IFAD provided support throughout the design phase and project start-up. In addition, IFAD assigned a dedicated officer to coordinate administrative and financial support. Specifically, IFAD oversaw the signing of grant agreements and monitored compliance, facilitated project implementation, reviewed annual work plans and budgets, and approved necessary procurement of goods, civil works, and service. The TE also notes that IFAD was responsive to requests from regional and national executing agencies for management, administrative, and financial guidance (TE pg. 24).

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
---	------------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for the Quality of Project Execution. The executing agencies, ASEAN and GEC, were effective in performing their roles and responsibilities. It should be noted that this project was complex, involving regional and national institutions from different countries. The project utilized existing ASEAN and national institutions to execute the project. Project execution was carried out by the Regional Project Executing Agency (RPEA), or the GEC, working in partnership with National Executing Agencies. These agencies reported to a Project Steering Committee, and ultimately, the ASEAN Committee under the Conference of Parties to the *ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution* (AATHP). The TE notes that this approach minimized overhead costs and strengthened existing structures, contributing to potential sustainability (pg. 15).

A Project Procedure Manual (PPM) was developed at the onset which clearly outlined each institution's roles and responsibilities. The TE credits the PPM with contributing to good coordination and effective project execution (TE pg. 16). In addition, ASEAN and GEC officials conducted field visits on an annual basis and addressed issues that arose and provided guidance as needed (TE pg. 21). Overall, the TE notes that in most cases, the national and local coordination mechanisms will remain in place after the project ends (pg. 17).

## **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.

As a result of the introduction of a Fire Danger Warning System (FDRS), fire risk mapping, hotspot monitoring, re-wetting peatlands, and community-based fire management systems, there has been reduced fires in pilot and demonstration communities, particularly in Dumai and Rokan Hilir in Indonesia (TE pg. 10). In addition, there has been an increase in the protection of peatland areas. In Indonesia, 1.85 million hectares have been conserved, as well as 196,000 hectares in Malaysia; 19,197 hectares in the Philippines; and 8,053 hectares in Vietnam (TE pg. 11).

In addition, pilot sites in degraded peatlands were rehabilitated using a variety of methods, including the construction of canal blocks and shallow wells, enrichment planting with fast-growing indigenous tree species, and planting rubber trees with pineapples. In Vietnam for example, improvements in hydrology management at a pilot site resulted in a more durable forest ecosystem and the restoration of grasslands which had largely disappeared. This restored the habitat of water birds, whose population is now increasing (TE pg. 13).

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.

In Vietnam, a Green Contract was established between U Minh Thuong National Park and buffer zone communities, where 51 households were given a temporary lease of a 5 hectare plot of land and a \$750 grant. 3 hectares of the plot could be used for agricultural activity, and 2 hectares were set aside for fast-growing indigenous trees. The Green contract resulted in an increase in income for 85% of the 51 households (TE pg. 9). The TE also cites additional livelihood initiatives (“Buying Living Tree Scheme” in the Philippines; “Seedling Buy-Back Schemes” in Malaysia, and a pineapple plantation for fire team members in Indonesia) but doesn’t provide any quantitative or qualitative evidence of socio-economic change (TE pg. 9).

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

Regional workshops, in-country training sessions, and cross-study visits strengthened the capacity of government agencies and rural communities to manage peatlands. In Indonesia, 500 people were trained in integrated peatland management. In Malaysia, 275 representatives of 40

government agencies, public sector, research institutions, and NGOs were trained on peatland assessment and management and FDRS interpretation. In the Philippines, 14 national and local peatland managers participated in a study tour in Malaysia. In addition, 40 representatives from local government were trained in peatland assessment and management. In Vietnam, 856 representatives from national parks, buffer zone communities, and government agencies were trained on peatland management (TE pgs. 7-8)

#### b) Governance

The most notable changes in governance included the adoption of high-quality *National Action Plans for Peatlands* (NAPs) by the Indonesian, Malaysian, and Philippine governments (Vietnam pending) (TE pg.6); and the strengthening of the ASEAN governance structure which supports peatland management (TE pg. 15).

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.

The TE does not note any unintended impacts.

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.

This project had contributed significantly to the adoption of peatland management initiatives at scale. Notably, \$250 million was compiled from multiple donors for a new ASEAN program on Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems (2014-2020) (TE pgs. 38-39). In addition, smaller initiatives are being replicated or scaled-up at the national level. For example, in the Philippines, the President is launching a “Buying Living Tree System” which was piloted in Indonesia (TE pg. 9). In addition, the “community-based peatland protection” model piloted by Friends of the North Selangor Peat Forest is being scaled-up in Malaysia, as is the “Green Contract System” in Vietnam and floating gardens and raised-bed farming systems in Indonesia (pg. 29-30).

## 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 states the following lessons learned (TE pgs. iv-v):

- *Mainstreaming and improved governance:*
  - An integrated and coordinated multi-disciplinary approach to governance of peatland areas in South East Asia is critical to reduce further degradation and increase rehabilitation and protection.
  - Peatland management is a complex undertaking involving the interest and inputs of many different stakeholders; as such, an appropriate and effective framework for cooperation and coordination among stakeholders was critical to optimize the use of resources and efforts.
- *Strengthened capacity:* Capacity building for peatland management in the region has stimulated forward thinking in peatland management among peatland stakeholders.
- *Increased awareness:*
  - The combination of the APMS and NAPs and working through the ASEAN and national government mechanisms helped to enhance the awareness and understanding of peatlands and mainstream peatland issues into government planning processes.
  - Establishing clear guidelines for conservation and sustainable use of peatlands has provided key stakeholder groups in each country component and within the wider ASEAN Member States (AMS), a better understanding of the unique values of peatlands and the critical importance of integrated approaches to their rehabilitation and sustainable management.
- *Enhanced multi-stakeholder partnerships:* Only when social, environmental and economic dimensions are balanced can peatlands be managed on a sustainable basis. The best management practices, pilots and demonstration areas show that when the private sector and/or communities work with local authorities towards adopting responsible practices in peatland and fire management, that beneficial results can be achieved. However, both the private sector and the communities need to perceive and achieve benefits to their own businesses and livelihoods.
- *Innovative approaches to peatland maintenance and rehabilitation:* Timely and reliable data from survey and research, maintenance of a fire danger rating system and fire risk and hotspot mapping, peatland drainage control, community-based fire management and designation of conservation or protected area status for unique peatland ecosystems need to go hand in hand in a comprehensive manner.
- With regard to *Project management*, dedicated and intensive coordination was necessary among participating countries, ASEC, RPEA and IFAD to account for the complex national and local procedures and regulations relating to project administration, financial management and procurement, and to avoid unnecessary implementation delays.

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE states the following recommendations (TE pg. v):

- For designing a follow-up phase, strengthening governance, capacity and institutional frameworks to sustainably manage peatlands will require further scaling-up to enhance capacity and activities related to ASEAN mechanisms for peatlands management including the APMS and NAPs and the ASEAN Task Force on Peatlands. In this regard, APSMPE must be further developed and supported to enable multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable peatland management.
- The scale of resources allocated by governments, private sector and the international community to support sustainable management of peatlands in the ASEAN Region should be significantly enhanced to support measures to meet the targets set under the APSMPE.
- Further partnerships and collaboration should be pursued with The World Bank, FAO, IUCN and Wetlands International, among others, to ensure complementarity with their programs in rehabilitation and sustainable management of peatlands in South East Asia.
- Any future initiatives in peatland management need to build upon the goodwill and the multi-stakeholder, participatory approaches established by the project in engaging the private sector and local communities. Collaboration with local communities in diversifying their livelihood options in peatland protected area buffer zones has been an appropriate approach in all country components.
- Future support to reducing peatland degradation in South East Asia must build upon the vertical (ASEAN-National-Provincial-District-Community) and horizontal (environment, forestry, rural development, agriculture, private sector, NGOs) integration approaches shown by this project.
- Sustainable peatland management will need to be further mainstreamed into economic and institutional sectors. New sustainable-use options for peatlands will need to be developed especially for un-drained or re-wetted peatland areas. The project developed a number of innovations that can be scaled-up, including (i.) supporting development of best management practice guidelines for cultivation of oil palm on peatlands and maintenance of natural vegetation associated with oil palm on peat; (ii.) expanding the model of community based peatland protection; (iii.) expanding the “Buy a Living Tree Scheme”; (iv.) adapting the Green Contract system to other communities associated with protected peatlands; and (v.) applying best management practices to appropriate and sustainable agriculture/agroforestry on peat.

## 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 IEO 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 report extensively documents project outcomes, however there is not a dedicated section for impacts of the project. Impacts had to be teased out from the narrative.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and evidence is provided to substantiate the ratings.	<b>HS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses sustainability in all relevant areas. However, the TER adjusted ratings for financial resource and institutional and governance sustainability based on the evidence provided.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the evidence provided.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs and actual co-financing, including a detailed breakdown by component, funder, and year.	<b>HS</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report satisfactorily assess both the M&E design and implementation.	<b>S</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

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

2008 Request for CEO Endorsement