

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		355	
GEF Agency project ID		60	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation of the Dana and Azraq Protected Areas	
Country/Countries		Jordan	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP1: Arid and semi-arid ecosystems OP2: Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems (incl. wetlands)	
Executing agencies involved		Government of Jordan	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		U/A	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 30, 1993	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 1999	
Actual date of project completion		U/A	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		6.3	6.25
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.459	U/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		(90,000 JD from Japanese Development Agency; 52,000 JD from USAID)
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		6.3	6.25
Total Co-financing		0.459	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.759	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 1996	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Tomas Crisman; Donald Gordon; Martyn Murray	
TER completion date		November 2014	
TER prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	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	UA
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	UA
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	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 provide for the rehabilitation and management of the Dana Wildlands and the wetlands of Azraq Oasis. PD states that both sites contain globally significant biodiversity – the former having great floral diversity, including many endemic species, and the latter containing a unique system of spring-fed marshes comprising the most extensive freshwater ecosystem in the country. Both sites are threatened from a variety of sources and “the wetlands of Azraq Oasis, in particular, are now badly degraded and likely to suffer irreparable damage unless some remedial action is taken in the near future” (PD, pg 3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the PD, the overall Development Objective of the project is “to enhance the national capability to conserve biodiversity throughout Jordan” (PD, pg 22). This broad development objective is further defined for the two areas where the project’s on-the-ground efforts are focused. For the Dana Wildlands project component, the development objective is to “address the economic needs of the local communities in the vicinity of the reserve to ensure the sustainable utilization of the area’s natural resources” (PD, pg 9). For the Azraq project component, the development objective is “to establish a sustainable basis for the utilization of water resources for the Azraq Basin for water supply and agriculture, while at the same time conserving the outstanding biodiversity values of the natural wetland ecosystems” (PD, pg 51).

Furthermore, the PD states that the project aims to strengthen the institutional capabilities of the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN), a non-governmental organization mandated by the Government of Jordan with national responsibility for nature conservation, management of protected areas, and support to the Jordanian programme for conservation education (PD, pg 2).

Immediate Objectives are also defined in the PD for the two targeted areas:

Dana Reserve Objectives:

- Immediate Objective 1 – Preparation and implementation of the Dana Conservation and Management Plan

- Immediate Objective 2 – Upgrade the institutional capability of the RSCN to facilitate implementation of the Dana and Azraq Conservation Management Plans, initiate similar endeavors in other Jordanian reserves, and increase the scope of the environmental education programme to include all sections of Jordanian society.

Azraq Oasis Objectives:

- Immediate Objective 1 – to halt further degradation of the aquatic ecosystems in the Azraq Wetland Reserve and to restore as much of the reserve as possible to a natural or near-natural condition, with a view to maintaining the biological diversity of this unique wetland ecosystem.
- Immediate Objective 2 – to establish a broadly-scoped Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) unit within the Department of Environment with a capability to evaluate, assess, and monitor environmental sites and developments in Jordan. The unit will coordinate government inputs to multi-sectoral environmental problems. One of the unit’s roles will be to service the government’s obligations under the Ramsar Convention; one of its first operational tasks will be to assess the impact of existing and ongoing development projects on the wetlands of Azraq Oasis, the nation’s only Ramsar Site.
- Immediate Objective 3 – to provide a series of guidelines for agricultural development in the Azraq Basin aimed at improving agricultural practices and providing more efficient irrigation systems within the basin.
- Immediate Objective 4 – To develop a water management plan for the Azraq Basin to ensure sustainable and environmentally sound management of water resources throughout the basin.
- Immediate Objective 5 – To seek practical and applicable measures for the conservation of groundwater resources in arid and semi-arid regions, through enhancing natural groundwater recharge and evaluating artificial recharge; and to prepare guidelines for the investigation and design of water harvesting schemes in arid and semi-arid regions. To disseminate the results of this research through publication of research reports and guidelines on water harvesting, artificial recharge of surface run-off and treated waste water, and water conservation and management practices in arid and semi-arid regions.
- Immediate Objective 6 – To strengthen the capability of the RSCN to manage the Azraq Wetland Reserve, Dana Reserve and other protected areas in Jordan, and to foster environmental education and public awareness.

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

No changes in the GEOs or DOs or other activities were reported to have occurred in the TE

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 is relevant to both the GEF and the Government of Jordan. For the GEF, the project’s objectives are in-line with those of Operational Programs 1 & 2: Arid and semi-arid ecosystems; and Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems (incl. wetlands), respectively. The global significance of the Azraq wetlands biodiversity was recognized when the area was designated as a Ramsar wetland site in 1977. Moreover, the project was seen as an emergency stopgap measure that was needed to stave off total biological disaster for the wetland (TE, pg 19). Similarly, the Dana reserve area is identified in the PD as an area with globally significant biodiversity, and one that faces a multitude of threats and development pressures. For the Government of Jordan, the PD states that many of the priorities outlined in the National Environmental Strategy of 1992 are directly supported by this project, and include: strengthening of the RSCN; expansion of the protected area system; upgrading local community environments while providing economic opportunities; development of an environmental education program; and management and utilization of water and agricultural land (PD, pg 11).

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

Overall the project is assessed to have been successful in making significant progress towards the realization of both global environmental objective - the rehabilitation, sustainable management, and protection of the Dana Wildlands and the wetlands of Azraq Oasis - and development objectives. Shortcomings include failure to finalize management plans at both target sites, weaknesses in the management plans themselves, particularly with their incorporation (or lack thereof) of relevant ecological and sociological data, and the limited effectiveness of the newly established EIA unit. Moreover, it is far from certain that the wetlands of Azraq can be restored given the limited water supply available and the extensive damage already inflicted upon the ecosystem. Additional studies are required to understand how the ecosystem functions, and how it can best be managed given the competing demands on water supply. Effectiveness is therefore rated as moderately satisfactory (no rating is provided in the TE).

Progress is detailed further along each of the immediate objectives defined in the PD:

Dana Reserve Objectives:

- *Immediate Objective 1* – Preparation and implementation of the Dana Conservation and Management Plan. Under this objective, the Dana Nature Reserve was established under state law, giving the RSCN full legal authority to manage the natural resources in the reserve (TE, pg 54). A number of baseline field studies assessing the biological diversity in the Dana reserve core were done, although TE finds there was little attempt to integrate these findings into a larger understanding of the ecosystem at Dana. A draft management plan was prepared. “Overall it is strong in documenting environmental information, in planning for tourism and zonation and in practical conservation measures, but it is weak in mechanisms for community participation, law enforcement strategy, in-service staff training requirements, and financial planning...Despite these weaknesses, the Management Plan represents a considerable achievement and will play a vital role in reserve management” (TE, pg 23).
- *Immediate Objective 2* – Upgrade the institutional capability of the RSCN to facilitate implementation of the Dana and Azraq Conservation Management Plans, initiate similar endeavors in other Jordanian reserves, and increase the scope of the environmental education programme to include all sections of Jordanian society. TE states that overall the institutional strengthening components of the project were a success, resulting in an organization (RSCN) “...which operates in a very timely and effective manner, is competent in a managerial sense, and is responsive to rapid changes in external environment” (TE, pg 56).

Azraq Oasis Objectives:

- *Immediate Objective 1* – Halt further degradation of the aquatic ecosystems in the Azraq Wetland Reserve and to restore as much of the reserve as possible to a natural or near-natural condition. TE states that by mid-1994 the project director was able to secure enough water to establish a core area of wetland around the Shishan springs and Ramsar site. This was accomplished through renovation of an existing water pipeline for delivery of water to the wetland from northern well fields rather than drilling more expensive wells closer to the site, as originally envisioned (TE, pg 51). However, TE reports that there is at present very little understanding of what impact re-flooding will bring to the area, in terms of restoring the area’s biodiversity and viability as a habitat for migratory bird species, and insufficient understanding on how to determine and manage water allocations for maximum ecological benefits. A comprehensive management plan for the Azraq wetland has been produced in draft form and, according to the TE, should be finalized in the coming weeks. (TE, pg 26). TE does not provide a detailed assessment of the quality of the Azraq management plan, but does state that failure to find a subproject manager for this project component weakened the “development of a sound management plan (TE, pg 26). Other work under this objective include repair of the reserve headquarters. However, the visitor center has not yet been constructed as envisioned in the PD –presently only the planning stage has been completed.
- *Immediate Objective 2* – Establish a broadly-scoped Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) unit. According to the TE, an EIA unit has been established within the General Corporation for the Environment and EIA guidelines are becoming established. TE states that the project director has done an impressive job at building linkages both to governmental agencies and the

university and to the general public, in the area immediately surrounding the Azraq wetland (TE, pg 27). However, TE states that overall, “currently, the EIA appears to remain weak both in ecological understanding and the ability to affect compliance with ecologically sustainable developmental practices” (TE, pg 2).

- *Immediate Objective 3 – to provide a series of guidelines for agricultural development in the Azraq Basin aimed at improving agricultural practices and providing more efficient irrigation systems within the basin.* TE states that activities associated with this objective appear to be progressing well and “will lead to a significant product” (TE, pg 52). Completed work includes surveying of groundwater quantity and quality, and information has been shared with local farmers. TE states that “...this has helped greatly to make them (local farmers) feel that the Azraq project is a cooperator rather than a threat to their existence” (TE pg 52).
- *Immediate Objective 4 – Development of a water management plan for the Azraq Basin.* Under this objective, a monitoring program for groundwater has been established, and models are being developed with which to formulate a water management plan. However, it does not appear from the TE that this plan is complete as of the TE – PD states that the water management plan is to be completed by the end of the project.
- *Immediate Objective 5 –* Under this objective, several demonstration sties have been developed, and data compiled on the geology, hydrology, meteorology and topography for field sites for assessing the impact of water harvesting and artificial recharge of surface runoff and treated waste water.
- *Immediate Objective 6 –* TE finds major shortcomings on this component, particularly with regard to the poor coordination with RSCN and strengthening RSCN’s capacity to manage the Azraq Wetland Reserve (TE, pg 28).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

Overall, the TE finds project efficiency to be good (no rating provided), and cites several examples of cost-saving measures. These include scrapping construction of two water wells adjacent to the Azraq wetland to provide water to the system, as originally proposed. This idea was rejected in favor of renovating an older pipeline to deliver water from a well field north of the wetland. TE finds the cost savings to the project from this action alone to be “substantial” (TE, pg 20). In addition, TE finds that considerable efforts were put in by the project’s director to keep the costs of the visitor center low. Finally, while the project was able to produce most outputs on time, without delay, construction of the Dana Centre was delayed after initial work revealed a stronger foundation would be needed due to the soft substrate. This translated into additional costs, which was provided by a grant from the Japanese government (TE, pg 22). Based on the evidence provided in the TE narrative, project efficiency is assessed as satisfactory in this TER.

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

Of the three project components – protection and restoration of Azraq wetlands, establishment of Dana Reserve, and RSCN institutional strengthening – the sustainability of the Azraq wetlands faces the most risk going forward. TE notes that there is very little understanding of how the ecosystem of the Azraq wetlands functions, including the minimum amount of water necessary to sustain and restore the area’s biodiversity, how to manage flows, and whether restoration is possible at all given the extent of damage already inflicted upon the wetlands. Moreover, the long term commitment of the government of Jordan to provide sufficient water to the Azraq wetland is “by no means assured,” given the competing demands for water use and rapidly expanding human populations (TE, pg 40). For other project components, TE finds that adequate plans and progress has been made in establishing a viable foundation and workplan to ensure sustainability of project outcomes. Sustainability of project outcomes is therefore rated as moderately unlikely in this TER.

Sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following four risk dimensions:

- *Environmental risks: (MU)* – As noted above, TE identifies several environmental risks to the existing biodiversity and ecosystem of the Azraq wetlands. These include lack of long-term commitment of the government of Jordan to provide sufficient water to maintain the Azraq wetland, and the expected future rise in demand for alternative uses of available water. In addition, there is to date insufficient understanding of how best to manage the wetland so as to protect biodiversity.
- *Financial risks: (ML)* – While TE notes that sustainable financing is not assured for the management of Azraq or Dana reserves, TE finds that there has been good progress in advancing sustainable financing plans for RSCN – the organization charged with managing these reserves, as well as commitments on the part of the Jordanian government and other international funders, as well as local revenue-generating operations that are beginning to scale up, such that financial risks to sustainability appear manageable.
- *Socio-Political risks: (MU)* – TE notes that much work remains to be done in terms of managing competing demands for development and conservation in the two project areas, and that local support for sustainable conservation in these two areas is not assured. Both management plans are in draft form and have yet to be implemented. Moreover, while there are some positive signs, with the emergence of the Friends of Azraq CSO and the availability of a forum whereby various interest groups can have their voices heard, there remains the real possibility that support for conservation will erode as development pressures increase.
- *Institutional risks: (ML)* – While funding for continued operation of RSCN is not assured, TE finds much progress was made in terms of embedding and solidifying positive gains in RSCN’s capacity and work culture (TE, pg 43-44).

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?

TE does not report on the degree to which promised co-financing of some \$0.5M from the GoJ materialized. TE does state that additional funding for construction of the Dana Center was secured from the Japanese Development agency and USAID, and that these were important in facilitating construction of this facility after it was determined that additional work was needed to provide a more stable foundation, given the soft substrate in the area.

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?

Most outputs, with the exception of finalized management plans, were completed on time. TE reports a delay in the construction of the Dana Center owing to the need to secure additional funding (see above), however, this does not appear to have affected outcomes or sustainability.

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 for the project appears to have been strong, as evidenced by the legal establishment of the Dana Reserve, and support for RSCN that is noted in the TE. Without government support, it is unlikely that much progress would have been made in either location. Local support for the project remains an ongoing concern and an area where, TE notes, additional efforts are needed to secure long-term sustainability of the conservation of the Dana and Azraq areas.

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 design included a detailed logframe with immediate objectives, outputs and activities, and a detailed workplan. Indicators are provided, however they lack targets and it is not clear from the PD how

indicators are to be measured. For example, the indicator for Immediate Objective 1 under the Azraq Wetland Reserve component is the following statement: “A core area of the formerly extensive spring-fed wetlands at Azraq Oasis will have been restored to a near-natural condition, and the biodiversity of the wetland ecosystems will have been maintained almost intact” (PD, pg 52). However, it is not clear in practice what a “near-natural condition” is, nor how to measure its progress. Other indicators are similarly vague, lacking clear targets, and in many cases, targets are not provided at all. In other respects, M&E design appears to have been adequate, with a dedicated budget and stipulations for several kinds of monitoring reports, including annual reports and a mid-term evaluation.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

TE does not provide sufficient information on the quality of M&E implementation to assess a rating here. No PIRs were found on PMIS, although this does not mean they were not produced. While the Terminal Evaluation itself was carried out, there is little information on whether M&E processes called for in the PD were implemented and carried out.

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: Unable to Assess
----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating on the quality of project implementation, nor does it provide sufficient information with which to assess quality of project implementation and provide a rating in this TER. The project design has weaknesses in the design of the M&E system, which lacks appropriate indicators and clear targets (in some cases, no targets are provided). In addition, the overall global environmental objective at the Dana reserve “to ensure conservation of the biological diversity of all ecosystems occurring in the Dana reserve area,” (TE, pg 9) is overambitious for a project of this scope. In other respects, the PD appears stronger. However, there is no information provided in the PD on the degree to which UNPD provided effective oversight and assistance during project implementation to provide a rating here.

The TE does not provide a rating on the quality of project execution, nor does it provide sufficient information with which to assess quality of project execution and provide a rating in this TER.

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 below that this is indeed the case. 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.

TE states that the project was successful in providing a small amount of pumped water to a core area within the Azraq wetlands. However, no assessment is provided on the effect this will have on the area's ecosystem and biodiversity. Similarly, draft management plans have been developed for both the Azraq wetland and Dana reserve, but these have yet to go into effect and the TE does not assess how they may impact the local environment and threats to.

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.

No changes in human well-being are reported in the TE to have occurred by project's end.

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 – According to the TE, the project's institutional strengthening component was successful at improving the capacity of RSCN to manage Jordanian protected areas. "This has

resulted in an organization which operates in a very timely and effective manner, is competent in a managerial sense, and is responsive to rapid changes in external environment” (TE, pg 56). In addition, the project helped establish an Environmental Impact Assessment unit within the General Corporation for the Environment, and EIA guidelines are becoming established. However, TE states that overall, “currently, the EIA appears to remain weak both in ecological understanding and the ability to affect compliance with ecologically sustainable developmental practices” (TE, pg 2).

b) Governance – Draft management plans for the Azraq wetlands and the Dana reserve were produced under this project. Under this objective, the Dana Nature Reserve was established under state law, giving the RSCN full legal authority to manage the natural resources in the reserve (TE, pg 54). A number of baseline field studies assessing the biological diversity in the Dana reserve core are were done, although TE finds that there has been little attempt to integrate these finding into a larger understanding of the ecosystem at Dana. A draft management plan was prepared. “Overall it is strong in documenting environmental information, in planning for tourism and zonation and in practical conservation measures, but it is weak in mechanisms for community participation, law enforcement strategy, in-service staff training requirements, and financial planning...Despite these weaknesses, the Management Plan represents a considerable achievement and will play a vital role in reserve management” (TE, pg 23). Similarly, a comprehensive management plan for the Azraq wetland has been produced in draft form and, according to the TE, should be finalized in the coming weeks (TE, pg 26). TE does not provide a detailed assessment of the quality of the Azraq management plan, but does state that failure to find a subproject manager for this project component weakened the “development of a sound management plan (TE, pg 26).

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 are reported in the TE to have occurred as a result of the project.

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 of GEF initiatives at scale are reported to have occurred as a result of this project.

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 provides the following key lessons:

- Involving Jordanian graduates in surveys has led to successful staff recruitment by RSCN.
- Success of the socio-economic team owes much to the dynamic leadership of the section head who has extensive experience with community development and poverty alleviation, working with NGOs.
- The shuttle bus system is proving to be an effective means of controlling visitor pressure.
- An early start to participatory rural appraisals with Bedouin groups is essential to project success.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations:

- For maximum benefit and transfer of lessons learned, additional research dimensions are needed in order to develop a reproducible model for wetland restoration.
- It is essential the funding for this project be continued.
- There is still a critical need to collect additional unforeseen ecological data on key species and ecological processes in order to provide the best long-term management plan for the Azraq wetland. Data is needed on the relationship between both water level in the wetland and its intra- and inter-annual fluctuations and biological response. It is recommended that ecological data be collected on such relationships for key species including dominant aquatic plants.
- It is recommended that a long-term monitoring program be established for the Azraq wetland for the purpose of determining successional trends and management needs following reflooding.
- It is recommended that the Azraq project develop closer coordination with RSCN especially in the areas of training, public awareness and ecology. RSCN should immediately develop permanent professional capacity in both aquatic ecology and wetland management and hydrology.
- It is recommended that more effort be given to the impact of exotic species, especially fish, on the Azraq wetland.

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 includes a detailed assessment of the relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of project objectives.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Report is internally consistent, however evidence provided to support assessment of the draft management plans and institutional strengthening is lacking. Moreover, very little information is provided on the quality of project implementation and execution.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE does a reasonable job at assessing risks to the sustainability of project outcomes. However, more information should have been provided on the progress of draft management plans for the Azraq wetlands and Dana reserves, and whether there is sufficient support and institutional backing for their implementation. Such information would facilitate a clearer picture of this dimension (sustainable management plans) of project sustainability.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons are in general not applicable beyond the project's experiences, or to general to be of much use. For example, the TE states that "the Friends of Azraq is an excellent example of how to organize and empower local communities..." but does not provide any account of how this example of successful community organization took place.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE does not provide an assessment of actual project costs and the section on co-financing describes some additional project funding secured during implementation, but does not state whether the original co-financing pledged by the GoJ was realized.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE provides very little assessment of project's M&E design or functioning. Outputs are recorded using the project's logframe, but there is no assessment of whether the logframe indicators and targets proved adequate. Moreover, TE notes that some recommendations of the MTR were not taken up, but does not provide any explanation for why.	U
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating = $(0.3 * (5+4)) + (0.1 * (4+3+2+2)) = 2.7 + 1.1 = 3.8 = MS$

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