Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	350
GEF Agency project ID	632
GEF Replenishment Phase	Pilot Phase
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP
Project name	Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal
Country/Countries	Nepal
Region	Asia
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP-4: Mountain Ecosystems
Executing agencies involved	Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation
NGOs/CBOs involvement	The Mountain Institute, Resources Nepal, and the King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation (now known as the National Trust for Nature Conservation): sub-contracted agencies
Private sector involvement	Not involved.
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	12/1/1991
Effectiveness date / project start	9/16/1993
Expected date of project completion (at start)	12/31/1999
Actual date of project completion	12/31/1999

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		3.8	3.8
Co-financing	IA own	0	UA
	Government	2.7	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	2
	Private sector	0	UA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	UA
Total GEF funding		3.8	3.8
Total Co-financing		2.7	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.5	UA

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	4/19/1999
TE submission date	
Author of TE	Jeffrey F. Griffin
TER completion date	September 2014
TER prepared by	Shanna Edberg
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Joshua Schneck

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
M&E Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
Quality of Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
Quality of Execution	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the global environmental objectives of the project are to conserve biodiversity in Nepal. Most of Nepal's biodiversity is found in its protected areas, such as the Makalu-Barun region. The Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area is "one of the most relatively undisturbed ecosystems along the southern flanks of the Himalayas" and is home to more than 3,500 native plant and animal species (PD, pg 3). Like the rest of Nepal's protected areas, the Makalu-Barun region is threatened by human population pressures such as agriculture, ranching, energy demands, and the illegal wildlife trade. The project seeks to address these threats by implementing a participatory park management approach in the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area, as well as creating a National Biodiversity Action Plan for Nepal and improving national capacity for the protection of Nepal's biodiversity.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objectives encompass the following three components, as stated in the project document:

1. To provide a systematic and strategic approach to biodiversity protection in Nepal by formulation of a National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) in accordance with the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), taking into account existing initiatives and responsibilities, and to implement selected priority activities of the NBAP which will contribute to the protection of globally significant biodiversity values.
    a. The National Biodiversity Action Plan which identifies needs and constraints for biodiversity protection and provides a specific programme of priorities and actions to conserve representative samples of Nepal's range of ecosystems and species assemblages.
    b. The protection, management, and enhancement of key biodiversity values as required to meet the objectives of the GEF.
2. To protect the biodiversity of the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area (MBNPCA) as a vanguard project within a long-term strategy for biodiversity protection in Nepal, through a

management approach which recognizes the interdependence of development and biodiversity conservation, and which provides a model for replication inside and outside of Nepal.

  a. A sustainable, innovative, and effective management system with participatory mechanisms for protecting the biodiversity of the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area.
  b. A sustainable grazing management system compatible with biodiversity conservation that halds park grazing and rehabilitates alpine and sub-alpine ecosystems in consultation with local people.
  c. An effective and sustainable ecotourism program that maximizes benefits to local people and minimizes negative environmental and cultural impacts.
  d. An effective long-term management strategy that offers alternative sources of income with low impact on biodiversity for the two small settlement enclaves within the park.
  e. An effective conservation education program developed in consultation with the local people that results in an increased awareness of the benefits of biodiversity protection, unsustainable natural resource use, and human resources development.
  f. Generation and utilization of information on critical conservation areas (including threatened habitats), key indicator species (including endemic, threatened, and endangered species), and ecosystem dynamics.
  g. Appropriate field equipment and support facilities for MBNPCA management.
  h. All national MBNPCA staff and related Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation staff trained in technical skills, management, leadership, team building, and community relations for the effective conservation of biodiversity with the involvement of local people.
  i. Published articles and information related to MBNPCA's new strategies for biodiversity conservation.

3. To enhance Nepal's national capacity to protect, manage and enhance its unique biodiversity through institutional support and the building of greater collaboration and consensus on biodiversity protection needs.

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

One minor change was reported. Output 2 of Component 3 was changed from "Greater consensus and collaboration within the traditional conservation management sector and between the private and public sectors for biodiversity conservation" to "Promote Conservation" (TE, page 31). The reasons for this change are unclear.

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 aligns with GEF Operational Program 4: Mountain Ecosystems. The operational program promotes the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in mountain ecosystems, focusing on the Himalayan and other mountain ranges. The project aligns with these objectives by aiming to produce an effective and sustainable management strategy for the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area, as well as to build national capacity for conservation and create a National Biodiversity Action Plan.

The project is also relevant to Nepal's national priorities. Nepal's National Conservation Strategy was established in 1988. At the time of writing of the project document, a National Environment Policy and Action Plan were in the midst of being prepared. In 1988, the government prepared a Master Plan for the Forest Sector, which identified biodiversity as an important component of the forestry sector. In 1991, the national government established the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area and prepared a comprehensive management plan for it, which this project is intended to support.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE was written nine months prior to the end of project implementation, so project activities were still in progress at the time of writing. However, there is sufficient information to rate project effectiveness.

- The first component of the project was to create a National Biodiversity Action Plan in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity. In May 1998, the first draft of the Action Plan was produced on schedule. The TE states that it was "of a reasonable overall quality," but there is a "lack of a readily understandable strategic approach or framework" (TE, page 7). After the completion of the first draft, the "development process has broken down amid finger pointing and recrimination, resulting in an eight month delay in producing the second draft (January of 1999), which still hasn't even been seen by key officials in Government" (TE, page 7). In support of the Action Plan, a GIS database was developed and maps of all of Nepal's protected areas were collected.
- The second output of Component 1 was the "protection, sustainable management and enhancement of key areas of biodiversity value as required to meet GEF objectives," which the

contracted agency, Resources Nepal, interpreted as a report summarizing the flora, fauna, and socioeconomic status of western Nepal (TE, page 8). The TE expressed disappointment with the report as an insubstantial output, but "recognizes that more work is planned with the remaining US$75,000 under this output" (TE, page 8). This output reflects a problem with project design rather than with Resources Nepal; the TE states that "this output displays the illogic and weakness of the project's design," and it should not have been included in the project (TE, page 8). The TE rates the impact of Component 1 as "minimal compared to what it should be" (TE, page 10).

- The second project component was the protection of the biodiversity of the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area, which would serve as a vanguard project for Nepal's overall biodiversity strategy. The first output under this heading was to implement a participatory management system for the National Park. To this end, the project held yearly community-level planning meetings. The project divided the park into sectors to aid management, established community forest user groups, and helped groups achieve legal titling. The TE states that "a management system has been developed," but "making it sustainable and truly participatory will take more time and attention" (TE, page 13). An information baseline was established to support grassland and forest management, but "no active management of these ecosystems has begun yet" (TE, page 14). Also, there is no integrated program for data management or monitoring.

- The second output under Component 2 was to develop a sustainable grazing management system. The TE reports that "a system is in the process of being established" (TE, page 14). Livestock and grazing inventories were in the process of being conducted, a Grazing Area Management Working Plan 1997-2000 was produced, and a Grazing Area Management Orientation Training Manual was written. However, the TE points out that the project did not work to ensure biodiversity conservation in the park's grasslands, which cover 15% of the park's area.

- The third output of Component 2 was the creation of an ecotourism program. The project produced three tourism management plans for popular park destinations, improved trails, built viewing towers, rest houses, bridges, and camping sites, built a kerosene depot to minimize the use of firewood, established a porter association, created two tourist information centers, and published guides and maps in Lonely Planet. The TE "finds the project's work to date on this output to be impressive and of high quality," though lacking in a comprehensive tourism strategy (TE, page 15).

- Output 4 of Component 2 meant to produce a management strategy for two settlements inside the boundaries of the Makalu-Barun National Park. Rather than developing a strategy, the project focused on improving infrastructure such as a new bridge and water system. The TE states that "the good-will engendered by the project has certainly made anti-poaching deputies out of the villagers," but the link between improving infrastructure and protecting biodiversity is weak (TE, page 16).

- Output 5 of Component 2 was to create a conservation education program. The project developed day camps for children, a Malaku-Barun board game, a newsletter, natural history

materials, curricula for teachers, and advanced literary classes for 500 local people. 44 locals were provided with scholarships for undergraduate programs in Nepal, and 33 students received partial scholarships. But the TE reports that education efforts were "ad hoc and not guided by a strategy designed to bring maximum support to the new Park" (TE, page 17).

- Output 6 of Component 2 intended to generate and use biodiversity and ecosystem information. The project produced inventories, data on grazing and slash and burn plots, species habitat maps, reports on forest products and endangered plans, vegetation maps, a database of all community forest boundaries, and a natural history field guide and training manual. The project also trained 50 staff in monitoring techniques. However, the TE states that the monitoring program was not designed based upon management objectives, and the project failed to identify special areas of biodiversity interest to focus the work.

- Output 7 of Component 2 was to provide field equipment and facilities for park management. To this end, the project built a headquarters building and four sector offices, installed radio equipment and solar power to the offices, and delivered basic field equipment, including computers and a vehicle. The TE reports that "some purchases (the laptops) perhaps didn't support the Park directly as much as originally intended" (TE, page 19).

- Output 8 of Component 2 intended to increase the human capacity for biodiversity conservation. For local people and park staff, the project funded 11 scholarships to Nepal's Institute of Forestry, 2 scholarships for engineering training, a scholarship for a course on applied technology, and 2 scholarships for a master's program in the United States, although the latter two students violated their agreement with the project and refused to return to Nepal. 75 park staff received short-term training on a range of issues such as GPS and first aid. Other personnel were sent abroad for a culture exchange program, a north-south study tour, a talk on transboundary conservation, and other trips. Once again, the TE describes these efforts as ad-hoc and not as part of a framework or strategy for the Makalu-Barun National Park.

- The final output of Component 2 was the dissemination of new strategies on biodiversity conservation. The TE reports that the project disseminated a multitude of reports and other publications, although "very little of the information specifically covers 'new strategies for biodiversity conservation'" (TE, page 21). The reports were "produced in somewhat of a haphazard way and as a result have had far less impact than they could have had they been produced in a more targeted manner," and are not consolidated in an easy-to-use way (TE, page 21).

- Component 3's objective was to enhance Nepal's national capacity to manage its biodiversity through institutional support and collaboration. The first output of this component was to train and equip field staff in the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation. A target of 700 staff members trained was provided in the PD, which the project was on track to complete at the time of writing of the TE. However, the midterm evaluation stated that the quality of training needed improvement and the TE concurred that this was still a problem in the project's final year. The Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation wrote concept and strategy papers on capacity building, research policy, education strategy, and the establishment of a Research and Training Center for Protected Areas. Other activities were implemented under

this output: the Research and Training Center for Protected Areas was established, an international grassland workshop was conducted, a draft management plan for Langtang National Park was produced, a Warden conference was supported, 13 computers were purchased, staff attendance at international study tours and conferences was funded, and other materials were produced. However, the TE reports that "the quality of training was sub-standard" and there was more emphasis on constructing a new building than on training (TE, page 33).

- Output 2 of Component 3 was to achieve greater collaboration for biodiversity conservation, although the work plan for 1999 changed this output to "promote conservation" instead (TE, page 31). No activities were conducted for this output and no change in collaboration or consensus was recorded.
- Output 3 of Component 3 was to engender greater political support for conservation activities, but the TE states that "no specific activities have been conducted to produce this output" (TE, page 31).

Project effectiveness is rated moderately unsatisfactory. As noted above, several outputs were incomplete, especially in Component 3. For the activities that were completed, many were overly focused on development and infrastructure and were not tied to the goal of biodiversity conservation. The formation of the National Biodiversity Action Plan, on which all future GEF interventions would be predicated, was in shambles at the time of writing of the TE.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE states that project activities did not begin until two years after the project document was signed. TE does not explain why this occurred. Component 1, producing the National Biodiversity Action Plan, completed its first draft on time despite the initial delay. Since then, however, "the process [of revising the Action Plan] has been stagnant with little productive exchange" (TE, page 10).

For Component 2 on conserving the biodiversity of the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area, the TE states that "efficiency was fairly good overall," although there were two administrative problems that created bottlenecks: "uncertainty at UNDP about how to administer private sub-contractors and the fact that UNDP-HQ was revising NEX guidelines and procedures, which added some confusion to the situation in Nepal" (TE, page 24). Efficiency increased as time went on.

For Component 3 on capacity building and collaboration, the TE reports that there were "significant delays caused by ineffective communication between the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation and UNDP" (TE, page 33). The TE attributes these problems to the poorly outlined implementation arrangements in the project document and the lack of an agreement between the Department and UNDP. There were also "problems with the provision of matching funds from the King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation" (TE, page 33). Finally, the TE speculates that the poor quality of training was caused by substandard funding for this component.

Project efficiency is rated moderately unsatisfactory for the breakdown in efforts to complete the National Biodiversity Action Plan and the other myriad problems in communication and contracting with the other agencies.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

Financial: **Moderately unlikely**; for Component 2 on the Makalu-Barun National Park, the TE states that the Nepali government "will be able to support enough staff to maintain the standard level of park management activity as His Majesty's Government maintains across the country," although "clearly more work remains to be done on developing long-term partnerships and funding mechanisms to assist His Majesty's Government in managing this important area" (TE, page 13). For Component 3 on capacity building, the TE states that "this component's activities are not sustainable in a self-supporting way and could not continue in the absence of project funding...the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation is hoping to be able to sustain its 2nd training center with user fees, but this evaluator saw no analysis showing this to be actually feasible" (TE, page 34).

Sociopolitical: **Moderately unlikely**; the communications breakdown and exclusion of key stakeholders in the creation of the National Biodiversity Action Plan indicates a low level of country ownership. There has been frequent staff turnover in the senior leadership positions of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation and in the management of the Makalu-Barun National Park, which is a poor sign for continuity. In the Makalu-Barun National Park, the forest user groups are functioning well, but the grazing management partnership "has not yet achieved sustainability" (TE, page 14). The TE states that sustainability in the Makalu-Barun National Park will largely depend on the management turnover from the project to the Nepali government, which had not yet taken place at the time of writing of the TE.

Institutional: **Moderately likely**; the National Biodiversity Action Plan would be a vehicle for institutional sustainability, but it was not complete at the time of writing of the TE. Moreover, the planning process appeared to have broken down and key stakeholders were no longer involved in revision the document. The GIS database and protected area maps will increase institutional capacity, but there is no indication in the TE if monitoring and updating of information will be ongoing. Regarding the Makalu-Barun National Park, the project increased staff capacity with several training sessions and providing scholarships to local people. However, at least two of the scholarship recipients violated their agreements and refused to return to work for the park. In addition, although a park management system was established, "making it sustainable and truly participatory will take more time and attention" (TE, page 13). The TE states that the work on tourism management "cannot be called sustainable" due to the lack of a comprehensive tourism strategy and revenue mechanisms (TE, page 15). Also, the project provided equipment to park management, but not a long-term "equipment plan" (TE, page 19). Overall institutional sustainability suffered from the lack of a strategic plan to guide the project outputs for maximum use by park management. That said the training and equipment provided should provide a base for improved park management and biodiversity monitoring.

Environmental: **U/A**; TE does not discuss environmental risks to sustainability of project outcomes.

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?

Unable to assess. The TE states that this project was one of the few from the GEF Pilot Phase that was able to leverage cofinancing, and $2 million came from the Dutch government "for buffer zone development-related activities around Makalu-Barun National Park" (TE, page 2). However, there is not enough financial information in the TE to know if this was the only source of cofinancing, or if the pledged $2.7 million from the Nepali government turned up. It is also unclear what activities were initiated with co-financing.

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 not extended, but there was a two-year delay in initial project activities. The TE does not explain the reason for the delay or how it affected project activities.

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 breakdown in communication and failure to involve key stakeholders in the revisions of Nepal's National Biodiversity Action Plan is a poor sign of country ownership. The latest draft "still hasn't even been seen by key officials in government" (TE, page 7). Without the adoption of the National Biodiversity Action Plan, project sustainability is unlikely. Another signal of weak country ownership is the lack of leadership by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation. The Department was designated as the executing agency, but the TE only mentions one output for which it took responsibility. The remaining components and outputs were managed by the sub-contracting agencies with little involvement from the Department, which "gradually led to each component developing itself as a separate sub-project" (TE, pages 6-7).

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 project document specifies regular monitoring and evaluation reports, regular review meetings, and ongoing monitoring of biophysical and socioeconomic indicators in the Makalu-Barun National Park. However, the TE reports that Components 2 and 3 of the project had "no success criteria" or quality indicators (TE, page 12). The objectives and outputs were not worded clearly and did not have meaningful indicators. Therefore these objectives were "difficult to evaluate based on the original intentions" (TE, page 12). M&E is not included in the project design budget. M&E design is rated moderately unsatisfactory for the lack of indicators in two out of the three project components and lack of dedicated budget for M&E..

| 6.2 **M&E Implementation** | Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |

The TE contains very little information on M&E implementation. It states that the sub-contracted agencies reported systematically. In the final three years of the project, UNDP visited the project site in Makalu Barun once every eight months, which the TE believes was too infrequent. It is unknown how often visits were made in the project's first three years. TE does provide a list of 55 recommendations from the midterm evaluation and whether those recommendations were adopted or not. Around 35 of these suggestions were attempted to varying degrees.

M&E implementation is rated moderately unsatisfactory; although there is little information to go on, there is little evidence that the project overcame the flaws in M&E design and implemented a system that could be used to evaluate the project's successes and steer the project's implementation.

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: **Moderately Unsatisfactory** |

The TE is critical of project design on several accounts. For one, "there is lack of consistency among Immediate Objectives, Outputs, and Activities. Outputs don't always contribute to the immediate

objective; and activities are not always designed to produce the outputs; and success criteria do not enable an easy evaluation of success" (TE, page 6). The implementation arrangements were also inadequate. The design assumed that the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, "with its weak capacity, would be able to bring together the different components, own them and manage them, through one or several Committees. This was very wrong" (TE, page 6). This led to the project components becoming independent of each other. According to the TE, "the poor design of the project document, in the opinion of this evaluator, has hampered the effective, efficient, and timely implementation of the project and reduced its overall impact from what it could otherwise have been" (TE, page 7). In the opinion of the TE, the project had too many sideline activities and should have focused on the creation of the National Biodiversity Action Plan. Finally, the TE states several times that sustainability was not adequately figured into project design and "there was no effective stakeholder buy-in mechanism" (TE, page 11).

UNDP's performance on supervision was more marginally effective than on project design. UNDP attempted to fix the problem of cleavages between project components by holding meetings with all of the project's subcontractors in order to create linkages between components. However, the desired linkages did not form. The TE also reports that "there was some uncertainty within UNDP about how to manage sub-contractors under UNDP rules and this was aggravated by the fact that UNDP was also at the time revising its NEX guidelines… This was settled in due course, but it appears that communication was less then effective about these matters during the transition period" (TE, page 9). On the other hand, UNDP staff "provided constructive and helpful input…in re-orienting activities to be more sustainable and more oriented towards biodiversity conservation" for Component 2 (TE, page 23). The TE also compliments UNDP's supervision team for the last three years of the project.

Project implementation is rated moderately unsatisfactory for the poor project design and mixed experience in supervision.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

One of the problems with project execution was a result of poor project design planning. For example, UNDP adopted a National Execution modality to increase country ownership. However, this conflicted with the fact that nearly all of the project's resources were given to the sub-contractors rather than the executing agency. As a result, "the components became sub-projects with no real owner; and UNDP had to step in where it should not have had to step-in" (TE, page 49). The executing agency was only responsible for a part of one component, while the rest of the project outputs were assigned to sub-contractors.

The TE attributes part of the problem with completing the National Biodiversity Action Plan with "poor communication between Government and Resources Nepal" (TE, page 9). Other problems with project execution were not explained by the TE. For example, there is no explanation for the incomplete activities under Component 3. It is also unknown why the activities under Component 2 had such a heavy focus on development and infrastructure rather than biodiversity conservation. However, the TE

states that The Mountain Institute, which was sub-contracted for Component 2, conducted daily management "in a competent, professional manner" (TE, page 24).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

No environmental baseline was established prior to the project, and the impacts mentioned in the TE are not quantitative or well-supported. The TE states that the effectiveness of park patrols increased, the creation of designated campsites has allowed old sites to regenerate, and training on forest cutting has led to a healthier forest understory.

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 two main socioeconomic changes wrought by the project were the creation of community forest user groups and grazing user groups. Unfortunately, the TE does not provide detail on the effects of these programs. The tourism management plans and improved tourist infrastructure may yield income gains, but there was no data on this in the TE. The project also improved infrastructure in forest communities, such as adding a new bridge and a water system.

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

 Many capacity impacts were achieved. A baseline was established for environmental monitoring, including livestock and grazing inventories, data on grazing and slash and burn plots, species habitat maps, reports on forest products and endangered plans, vegetation maps, and a database of all community forest boundaries. A grazing area management orientation training manual and a natural history field guide and training manual were written. Fifty park personnel were trained in monitoring

techniques, and 75 park staff received short-term training on a range of issues such as GPS and first aid. More than a dozen scholarships were funded for local people and park staff. Park management also received a headquarters building and four sector offices, radio equipment and solar power for the offices, and basic field equipment, including computers and a vehicle. On a national scale, 700 staff members of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation were trained by the project, a Research and Training Center for Protected Areas was established, an international grassland workshop was conducted, a Warden conference was supported, 13 computers were purchased, staff attendance at international study tours and conferences was funded, and other materials were produced. However, the TE reports that "the quality of training was sub-standard" and there was more emphasis on constructing a new building than on training

b) Governance

If it had been completed, the main governance impact of the project would be the adoption of the National Biodiversity Action Plan. However, the process of writing the plan was at a halt at the time of writing of the TE. Other governance improvements include the development of a management system for the Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area, a management plan for grazing areas, and tourism plans for the National Park were established. The project also developed a GIS database with maps of all of Nepal's protected areas and produced a draft management plan for Langtang National 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 were reported.

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.

No adoption was reported or planned.

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.

Since this project was one of the few GEF Pilot Phase projects that received co-financing, it should be used as an example for future projects in Nepal.

Poorly written project documents cause decreased effectiveness during implementation. This project document should be used as a case study for how not to write one. The outputs and objectives should have been written more clearly with specific success indicators, and the project should not have tried to do so much in so little time. Project design should be simple, focused, and specific about the biodiversity impact it is promising. Sustainability needed to have been addressed in project design.

Park management should take different approaches in the high and low elevation zones. Makalu-Barun National Park can provide an opportunity to test localized management approaches, develop partnerships for buffer zone management, increase cultural diversity of park staff, and build capacity of local staff.

The project became overly focused on providing hard outputs such as buildings and trails, but effective conservation also requires softer outputs such as information, programs, baselines, and target impacts.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The agencies involved in the project should assess the impact of the project on biodiversity, forest health, and attitude changes in local communities. There should also be a gender impact assessment for the project.

The National Biodiversity Action Plan must be completed by June 1999, having solicitated comments and conducted a roundtable discussion on its remaining issues.

Efforts should be made to retain the personnel that were trained by the project.

The work on community forest user groups and grazing user groups should be officially incorporated into the management plan of the Makalu-Barun National Park.

There should be a second phase to focus on demonstrating sustainable park and buffer zone management, including a component on maintaining biological corridors for area-sensitive and migrant species.

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?	For the most part, the TE is detailed in its explanations of outputs and outcomes. It would have been more useful if it had been written after project completion, however. More information on the forest and grazing user groups would also have been helpful. The TE does not give explanations for the incomplete activities.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, but it was sometimes unclear whether the outputs listed were new or were repetitions from other components. This was partly the fault of poor and overlapping project design, but the TE should have done a better job of distinguishing the outputs.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE assesses sustainability on a component-by-component basis rather than for the project as a whole. The sections on sustainability are not very detailed, perhaps because the TE was written before project completion. But enough information is contained in the TE to make an assessment.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Yes, they are comprehensive and supported by the project's experiences.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No. This may have been because the project was not yet completed, but the information on project financing and co-financing was incomplete.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	There is very little information on project M&E. The TE does not assess M&E design or implementation.	MU
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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