

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID	352		
GEF Agency project ID	640		
GEF Replenishment Phase	Pilot Phase		
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP		
Project name	Development of Wildlife Conservation and Protected Area Management		
Country/Countries	Sri Lanka		
Region	Asia		
Focal area	Biodiversity		
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP2: Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems		
Executing agencies involved	FAO, World Conservation Union (IUCN)		
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Lead executing agency		
Private sector involvement	Through consultation		
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	May 1992		
Effectiveness date / project start	May 1992		
Expected date of project completion (at start)	May 1997		
Actual date of project completion	September 1999		
Project Financing			
	At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)	
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant	4.1	4.1	
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	5.2	4.3 (estimate in TE)
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding	4.1	4.1	
Total Co-financing	5.2	4.3	
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	9.3	8.4 (difference in government funding is explained in TE as a result of fluctuations in exchange rates)	
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date	August 1999		
TE submission date			
Author of TE	Virginia Ravndal (et al)		
TER completion date	September 2014		
TER prepared by	Daniel Nogueira-Budny		
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	HS	N/R	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the project's Global Environmental Objectives are to protect Sri Lanka's wet and coastal zone ecosystems by establishing at least six new protected areas, as well as raise awareness of the goals and objectives of wildlife conservation and protected area management. Furthermore, related objectives include conducting research studies on wildlife species and ecosystems in and around protected areas in order to discover new methods of dealing with a variety of problems and issues within protected areas, including compensation to farmers, removal of crop-raiding animals, and *ex situ* conservation.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

This project's Development Objectives are: to conserve the biodiversity of Sri Lanka in representative terrestrial, freshwater, and coastal marine ecosystems; manage the wildlife resources of Sri Lanka in a sustainable manner to benefit present and future generations of Sri Lanka and of the global community; and enhance the contribution of the wildlife conservation and protected area management sector to national socioeconomic development. The project has two immediate objectives:

1. Raise the scientific and technical capacity of the Department of Wildlife Conservation (DWLC) for the establishment and management of protected areas (PA) and the communication of their role in the socioeconomic development of the nation to the people
2. Develop a capacity for the systematic assessment and management of human-elephant conflict (HEC) and formulate a strategy for integrated *in-situ* and *ex-situ* efforts to conserve the Sri Lankan elephant

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

There were **no** changes in GEOs or DOs during implementation.

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 was relevant to both the GEF and National priorities at the time of approval. In terms of GEF priorities, the project’s objectives are in-line with those of GEF Operational Program 2: Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems, which seeks to protect the globally significant biodiversity present in these ecosystems. Sri Lanka’s unique geological formation has led it to house considerable biological diversity, occupying a unique regional and global niche. In terms of National priorities, certain critical wildlife habitats, as well as remnants of important ecosystems, such as mangroves and coral reefs, occur outside of Sri Lanka’s sizeable protected area network. Biodiversity conservation meshes with the Sri Lanka National Conservation Strategy, which argues that preservation of genetic diversity is required for the domestication and improvement of crop plants and farm animals, and that the sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems are of immediate and potential importance to human well-being (cf. PD, pp 3-4). This project helps Sri Lanka address the insufficient scientific and technical capacity to plan and manage its protected areas, as well as develop a systematic approach to assessing and resolving conflicts between wildlife conservation / protected area management and alternative forms of land and resource use.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
--------------------------	-----------------------------

Project effectiveness is rated as satisfactory since the project largely succeeded in achieving its stated immediate objectives. Achievements and challenges under the two immediate objectives are as follows:

1. *Raise the scientific and technical capacity of the DWLC for the establishment and management of PAs and the communication of their role in the socioeconomic development of the nation, to the people* – Project succeeded in adding 260 staff to formerly understaffed DWLC, created much needed new posts at DWLC, and trained almost 90 percent of wildlife guards, range assistants, rangers, and assistant directors (totaling 477 people). Also, project developed management plans for Sri Lanka’s most important PAs, covering 45 percent of total area under DWLC jurisdiction. Overall, this objective’s achievements exceeded project expectations.
2. *Develop a capacity for the systematic assessment and management of HEC and formulate a strategy for integrated in-situ and ex-situ efforts to conserve the Sri Lankan elephant* – An HEC

study technique was established, studies were conducted at three sites, and national-level plans for long-term conservation of elephant populations, as well as HEC mitigation, were developed.

The real failure of the project, according to the Terminal Evaluation (TE), was its inability to convince the DWLC to engage in much-needed institutional reforms. Failure to institutionally restructure it, which would have decentralized and empowered the Department, was a critical constraint to more effective management of both the PAs and HEC. However, as institutional reform is not one of the immediate project objectives, this failure did not affect project’s effectiveness score.

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

Project’s efficiency was moderately unsatisfactory due to questionable expenditures, inappropriate use of counterpart funds, delays in funding disbursements, and unreasonable bureaucratic obstacles preventing adequate use of project funding, all suggesting that more money than necessary was spent on the project. Inappropriate institutional structure and budgetary laws hampered DWLC’s efficiency: DWLC returned 18 percent of its budget to the Treasury in 1998, while DWLC staff in beat stations (the smallest management unit of a PA) slept on the floor, were issued only three (vehicle?) batteries for the entire year, and had no field knives for clearing brush while on control, due to obstacles in budget formats. Additionally, expenditures greater than approximately US\$71 had to be approved directly by the DWLC Director himself (cf. pp i, 3-4). Furthermore, TE noted mismanagement in the use of project funds relating to the Elephant Transit Home (ETH). While the mid-term evaluation specifically recommended that no GEF funds be spent on the Home – in part due to the exceptionally high mortality rate of elephants taken there – it continued to receive substantial GEF counterpart funding (TE, p 15). TE also notes ongoing criticism of ETH in media (it was alleged that baby elephants were taken from their parents and then illegally gifted) and remarks that its elevated status within the DWLC is widely out of proportion to the insignificant role it plays in both biodiversity and elephant conservation. TE notes other cases of cases of inappropriately used counterpart funds.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	------------------------------------

- a) *Environmental sustainability (U/A)* – TE provides insufficient information to provide a rating on environmental risks to sustainability.
- b) *Financial sustainability (MU)* – Tentative interest in future, related projects has already been expressed by several donors, including the Asian Development Bank and the WB/GEF, according to the TE. However, TE readily admits that project design did not take into account financial sustainability. DWLC is completely dependent on outside resources to fund staff training and spends almost all of its funds allocated to PAs on infrastructure development.

- c) *Institutional sustainability (MU)* – DWLC remains poorly structured and in desperate need of restructuring, undermining the institutional sustainability of the project, which rests on the proper functioning of the DWLC. TE suggests that any future GEF support should be contingent upon restructuring, ensuring adequate leadership, and instituting process mechanisms that allow for proper planning, budgeting and implementation of PA management activities. However, given intransigence at highest levels of DWLC, coupled with the fact that a recent restructuring may have even worsened the situation, its ability to conserve biodiversity is called into question.
- d) *Socio-Political sustainability (MU)* – TE notes that a small number of individuals from the highest levels of the DWLC have not been in favor of the project and have even been antagonistic to it, raising serious questions about whether the DWLC will, once the project ends, continue project-initiated activities (cf. pp viii, 3).

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?

Co-financing from the Government of Sri Lanka – totaling over 50 percent of the project's budget –was essential to the achievement of GEF objectives. It should be noted, however, that disbursement of the Government's contribution was minimal until these funds were brought under project control, in 1997. Furthermore, the government audit report for 1998 points out unsatisfactory utilization of government counterpart funds; it also highlights non-compliance with government financial regulations, accounting deficiencies, and lack of proper evidence for purchases, such as vouchers (TE, p 17).

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?

Project experienced no significant extensions in implementation. Initially, significant delays occurred, in part due to the fact that first CTA recruited by FAO was not up to the job, according to the TE. Project completion was delayed two years, although TE does not explain reasons for this delay. It is plausible that the reason for the delay was the late disbursement of Government of Sri Lanka's contribution to project (see response to 5.1).

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 broader issue is high; however, ownership of the project appears to have been low. The Government of Sri Lanka had made improvements in its capacity to conserve biodiversity a key objective in the years prior to the project, as seen in the upgrading of the DWLC from a C-grade department to an A-grade one, as well as a 10-fold increase in its annual capital budgetary allocation

between 1989 and 1992 (cf. PD, p 14). However, a dearth of interest, direction and leadership at the highest levels in the DWLC has undermined the ability of the project to have a meaningful impact; furthermore, a small number of individuals in the DWLC have exerted an actively negative influence on the project’s impact (TE, p i, viii).

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 Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

PD stipulates that a tripartite review by representative of the government, implementing agencies, and UNDP will take place at least once every 12 months. Furthermore, the national project director is charged with preparing and submitting to each review meeting a Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER); additional PPERs may be requested, if necessary, during the project. Furthermore, the project was to be evaluated 24 months after the start of full implementation. While such activities were put into place, no impact-oriented indicators for gauging the project’s success were stipulated. The detailed list of outputs and activities (PD, pp 15-23), however, includes achievement indicators and detailed targets with which one could use to gauge whether or not the project was on track to achieve its intended objectives.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
------------------------	--

According to the PIR, the Annual Project Report, six Tripartite Reviews, Mid-Term Evaluation, and Final Evaluation took place. Impact-oriented indicators were not provided to employ monitoring and evaluation of project and project staff made no effort to engage in good record keeping to see, for example, whether the number of reported conflicts between humans and elephants was decreasing, or whether the number of DWLC staff able to recognize and eradicate exotic plants was increasing.

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 Satisfactory
--	--

The quality of project implementation is rated moderately satisfactory, for, while the quality of project design is unsatisfactory, the quality of supervision and assistance provided by the UNDP was satisfactory.. According to the TE, sustainability was not taken into account in the project design: not enough emphasis was placed on mechanisms to promote the sustainability of project-initiated and -supported activities following project completion. Second, design should have 1) stipulated clear benchmarks throughout the project life, and identified clear consequences for not achieving these benchmarks, and 2) identified tangible indicators of success related to on-the-ground PA management, and closely monitored these indicators (TE, pp vii-viii). The TE rates UNDP's support as excellent (cf. p 18). The UNDP-hired Program Assistant was deemed very competent and crucial to the success of the project, and the UNDP stepped in to rectify at least one major failure of the implementing agency: recruiting a CTA in time for his essential participation in the final project evaluation (p 18).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---	--

Quality of project execution was deemed moderately unsatisfactory. While FAO successfully staffed the project, it did not fulfil its role of providing technical backstopping for the project. It successfully recruited 14 international consultants, most of whom were well qualified for their duties; however, there were delays with at least four of them and several experienced unreasonable delays in payment. The original CTA was not up to the job and, partly because of him, significant delays were experienced (to be fair, the replacement CTA, who was recruited by FAO, was excellent and demonstrated rare talent and expertise in overseeing the project, according to the TE). In terms of ensuring project execution, "Very little or no feedback has been received from FAO on technical reports, progress reports or management plans, even though FAO itself has insisted that they review all such reports. In fact, only two comments on technical reports were made by FAO, both from FAO/Rome, and there were time delays associated with these. Nine PA plans and numerous technical reports submitted long ago remain to be reviewed by FAO" (TE, p 18). It should be noted that DWLC staff frequently complained about the

existing Administrative Rules and Financial Rules, which constrained their ability to spend funds allocated to them, leading to poor project implementation; however, TE notes that Forest Department, working under the same rules, readily and easily found mechanisms for working effectively with these rules. TE does not explain why it could not help DWLC overcome these hurdles, given negative effect they on project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Given the long-term time frame of biodiversity conservation, the project was never intended to produce immediate results and, as such, no changes in environmental stress or status occurred by the time of TE writing (four months prior to termination of project).

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.

ICR did not mention any socioeconomic changes that had occurred by the time of TE writing (four months prior to termination of project).

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* – The capacity of the DWLC to manage protected areas has been enhanced as a direct result of the project. Project has created a critical mass of technically qualified staff and has

provided other important inputs that should enable to DWLC to transition from a highly centralized institution that has largely concentrated only on the infrastructure development of PAs, to a decentralized one that effectively protects biodiversity while considering the needs of people living in close proximity to PAs. Furthermore, all new recruits to the DWLC now have a science education background and, in the higher levels, professional training (PIR, p 6). However, management of the PAs has not significantly improved: many of the most important problems pertaining to PA management that existed at the beginning of the project still existed near the project's end (TE, pp vii-viii). This is despite the fact that good quality ten-year management plans were produced for six clusters of PAs (cf. TE, p 9).

b) *Governance* – Project prepared the background for Sri Lanka's revised policy on Wildlife Management. Studies were initiated to understand existing legal provisions, their gaps, and the comprehensive legal provisions for better management of wildlife resources (PIR, p 13). Furthermore, a national elephant conservation and HEC mitigation strategy was produced, leading to the preparation and adoption of a national policy, as well as the creation of a Task Force to implement the policy, although the Force is not now functional (TE, p 15). Failure of project to help effect institutional change at DWLC has been mentioned earlier.

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 project had no unintended impacts, according to the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Training of DWLC staff is now commonplace, and new recruits now have a scientific and/or professional training background. The National Wildlife Training Centre (NWTTC), in Giritale, which was built with USAID funds but had never been operationalized, has been turned into a high-quality training facility by the project. It is now staffed with competent trainers, many of whom received training abroad, mainly at the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) in Dehra Dun, thanks to the project. Furthermore, a GIS unit was established, complete with all necessary equipment, materials, and capable staff.

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.

1. Project objectives should be impact-oriented rather than task-oriented to ensure that project works towards having an impact, not merely undertaking project activities
2. To promote sustainability and to encourage a broadening of scope of work to more innovative and less conventional activities, government counterpart funds should be allocated proportionately across all project-supported activities that are to continue after project ends
3. Attempts should be made to have no physical separation between project staff and institutional staff (i.e., no “ project office” should exist)
4. Sharing results of the project with donors and other interested parties is useful for follow-up assistance
5. There are no shortcuts for participatory project development; if a participatory approach is desired, adequate time must be allocated for it
6. Once a development plan is formulated with the full participation of people, immediate follow-up action must be taken to retain the confidence of the people
7. Project funds flow should be designed to ensure the sustainability of the funding so that the activities that need to be continued will not collapse after the conclusion of the external funding
8. To enhance integration of projects into the institutions they assist, the National Project Coordinator (NPC) should be a staff of the institution and should be paid in part by the institution and in part by the project funds
9. Reserve a small amount to promote media coverage on the project so as to facilitate sharing lessons learned, keeping project on track, and finally providing an additional incentive for people to strive for impact, not just achievement of project activities
10. Unless specialized agencies provide technical assistance, and do so in a timely fashion, there is no comparative advantage to using them
11. Having a CTA from the region is helpful as the experience and the culture of the person is more conducive to successful implementation of project activities

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. Discard the institutional structure adopted by DWLC on 15 July 1999; adopt instead the institutional structure described by the CTA
2. Adopt mechanisms used by Forest Department to overcome obstacles presented by administrative and financial rules
3. Create new budget lines in DWLC budget request forms (completed by Park Directors) to correspond to PA management plan budget lines

4. Assist DWLC to prepare its budget request for next year
5. Immediately re-assign GEF project vehicle currently assigned to DWLC Director to a PA, immediately re-assign two of the three vehicles currently being used by GEF project office in Colombo to PAs; ensure that all project vehicles are used exclusively for project-related purposes
6. Immediately recruit into DWLC the two qualified and trained individuals who currently operate the GIS; place the GIS unit within the Planning Division
7. Request FAO to provide within three weeks its technical comments on any project outputs it has indicated it wishes to review; if said comments cannot be made available within next few weeks, FAO should desist from insisting on reviewing outputs before they are considered final products
8. Summarize the Executive Summary and the operational sections of each PA plan; translate these into Sinhala and distribute copies to all PAs
9. Establish a budget line for training in the government budget
10. Immediately provide donor assistance to allow for full implementation of the eco-development plan for Udawalawe
11. Immediately attend to the water supply problem at the NWTC
12. Construct electric fences where most needed using materials provided by the project

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?	TE adequately assesses relevant outcomes and impacts of project, as well as achievement of objectives	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE is internally consistent, evidence is compelling, and ratings – when provided (many were not provided) – are well substantiated	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE does not adequately assess project sustainability or exit strategy	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE includes project costs per activity. However, does not include total project costs and does not always mention amount of co-financing per activity, although total actual co-financing is stated.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not adequately discuss or report on project's M&E systems	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating: $0.3 * (5+4) + 0.1 * (2+5+4+3) = 4.1$

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