

## 1. Project Data

| Summary project data                                   |                           |  |                        |
|--|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| GEF project ID   |                           | 3606   |                        |
| GEF Agency project ID                                  |                           | 3530   |                        |
| GEF Replenishment Phase                                |                           | GEF-4  |                        |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)       |                           | UNDP   |                        |
| Project name   |                           | Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas in the Philippines Project (otherwise known as New Conservation Areas in the Philippines Project – New CAPP) |                        |
| Country/Countries                                      |                           | Philippines  |                        |
| Region   |                           | Asia   |                        |
| Focal area   |                           | Biodiversity<br>Strategic Objective 1  |                        |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives |                           | GEF-4<br>Strategic Program: BD-SP3   |                        |
| Executing agencies involved                            |                           | UNDP, and Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau  |                        |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement                                  |                           | NGOs, indigenous people and local communities - Partners   |                        |
| Private sector involvement                             |                           | No Involvement   |                        |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)             |                           | July 2009  |                        |
| Effectiveness date / project start                     |                           | August 2010  |                        |
| Expected date of project completion (at start)         |                           | September 2015   |                        |
| Actual date of project completion                      |                           | December 2015  |                        |
| Project Financing                                      |                           |  |                        |
|  |                           | At Endorsement (US \$M)  | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant                              | GEF funding               | -  | -                      |
|  | Co-financing              | -  | -                      |
| GEF Project Grant                                      |                           | 3.5  | 3.451                  |
| Co-financing   | IA own                    |  |                        |
|  | Government                | 2.740787   | 3.489                  |
|  | Other multi- /bi-laterals | 1.043616   | .640                   |
|  | Private sector            |  |                        |
|  | NGOs/CSOs                 | 3.751691   | 1.498                  |
| Total GEF funding                                      |                           | 3.5  | 3.451                  |
| Total Co-financing                                     |                           | 7.536094   | 5.627                  |

|  |                  |           |
|--|------------------|-----------|
| <b>Total project funding<br/>(GEF grant(s) + co-financing)</b> | 11,036,094       | 9,078,000 |
| <b>Terminal evaluation/review information</b>                  |                  |           |
| <b>TE completion date</b>                                      | February 2016    |           |
| <b>Author of TE</b>  | Maria Onestini   |           |
| <b>TER completion date</b>                                     | 11/22/2016       |           |
| <b>TER prepared by</b>   | Spandana Battula |           |
| <b>TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)</b>                  | Molly Watts      |           |

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

- The Global Environmental Objective of the project was “conservation of biodiversity within the Philippines’ terrestrial ecosystems” (PD pg 60).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

- The Development Objective of the project was to “expand and strengthen the terrestrial protected area system in the Philippines by developing new protected area models and building capacity for effective management of the system” (PD pg 27). The project planned to achieve this objective through three outcomes (PD pgs 27-32):

Outcome 1: Expand protected areas system under new and diverse regimes to cover an additional 400,000 ha. of Key Biodiversity Areas;

Outcome 2: Improve conservation effectiveness through systemic, institutional and individual capacities; and

Outcome 3: Enhance financial sustainability of the terrestrial protected area system.

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

- According to the TE, there were no changes in the Global Environmental and Development Objectives.

## 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

- The project outcomes were consistent with GEF's focal area strategies and country priorities. The project aimed to conserve biodiversity of terrestrial ecosystems in Philippines and this is aligned to GEF's Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1 on catalyzing sustainability of protected areas (TE pg 52). It was also consistent with GEF's strategic considerations of integrating the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within national sustainable development plans and policies (GEF-OS pg 16).

The Philippines Medium Term Development Plan (2004-2010) aimed to fight poverty by strengthening the protection of vulnerable and ecologically fragile areas, especially where biodiversity is threatened (TE pg 52). The project's objective to expand and strengthen terrestrial protected area system by linking to local communities and indigenous lands was compatible with the country's priority to protect fragile areas. The project was also aligned with Philippines' National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (TE pg 52).

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

- The TE rates effectiveness of the project as Satisfactory. According to the TE, the project did have significant achievements and minor shortcomings. The project was able achieve the majority of its targets and managed to partially achieve rest of the targets for its three planned outcomes. Considering the project was a pilot initiative in sites in Philippines, the TER also gives a Satisfactory rating to the effectiveness component. Achievements along with expected outcomes are listed below:

Outcome 1: To expand protected areas "under new and diverse management regimes (ancestral domain, local government and community managed areas) to cover an additional 400,000 hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs)" (PD pg 52):

Under this outcome there were three expected results and while two were successfully achieved, one was only partially achieved. One of the expected results was to establish nine new-types of protected areas covering 400,000 ha within the Key Biodiversity Areas. The project successfully added 46 new types of protected areas (TE pg 41). It worked on 14 sites

in 10 Key Biodiversity Areas that covered 439,485 hectares (TE pg 39). The project also set a target to modify protected area regulations and laws to recognize new conservation areas. Through local ordinances, the project managed to establish local conservation areas in three sites. This indicates that the project was able to diversify management regimes within the key Biodiversity Areas as intended in the outcome. Additionally, the project also drafted a Bill on Indigenous Communities Conservation Area, which was approved at the Committee levels at House and Senate (TE pg 39). The TE notes that the “government (executive) at the national level is adapting to these new management regimes and incorporating [them] in future management plans” (TE pg 43). However, the Bill for Indigenous Community Conservation Areas hasn’t received approval for enactment. Due to this, the government is trying to adopt temporary mechanisms to incorporate indigenous community conservation governance (TE pg 43). These results have been helpful in achieving the target of expanding the national protected area system by increasing the coverage area and establishing new protected areas through the modalities of local and indigenous community’s conservation areas.

Outcome 2: To improve and enhance systemic, institutional and individual capacities for conservation effectiveness:

The project delivered on five outputs and partially achieved one output. A salient target under this outcome was to provide technical assistance to relevant stakeholders in managing existing and new conservation areas. The project managed to accomplish the targets such as identified weaknesses in protected area management through studies, formulated policies based on the studies, engaged with NGOs and indigenous people’s organizations for consensus building, and generated and mobilized tools for setting up of new protected area modalities (TE pg 44). The project also achieved targets of generating knowledge products such as operational manual for local management bodies, M&E protocol, resource management plans and habitat management plans (TE pg 45). It also garnered support from stakeholders especially at the local government level and received additional funding from UNDP and GEF due to project achievements (TE pg 46). However, there has been underperformance in adoption and implementation of plans, and support from certain divisions of the government has not been strong (TE pg 44).

Outcome 3: To enhance financial sustainability of the terrestrial protected area system:

Under this outcome, the project achieved four targets, whereas one was partially achieved. The outputs were to undertake economic valuation at three selected sites, improve sustainable financing capacities, develop tools for business planning, resource mobilization, and replicate financial tools (PD pg 33). The project generated studies on financial sustainability and exceeded its target by setting business plans for 18 selected protected areas. It also provided technical assistance and training on sustainable financing. In terms of capacity building, the project was able to provide technical assistance and carry out trainings to improve capacity of Biodiversity Management Bureau to use tools for financing the management of protected areas in the Philippines (TE pg 46). However, in regard to

replication of sustainable financing tools, there is a gap in upscaling the output at substantial levels (TE pg 46).

Due to significant achievements of the intended targets, this TER gives a Satisfactory rating to the effectiveness of the project.

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

- The project TE rates efficiency as Satisfactory and the TER finds the rating to be appropriate. (Endorsement pg 5, TE pg 6). Although, the 2011 Annual Performance Review reports that there were delays in project approvals (APR pg 15), the TE does not report of any delays in implementation of the project, and the project was effectively completed within the timeframe of five years (TE pg 9).

In regard to the budget, the TE notes that the devaluation of the US Dollar vis-à-vis the Philippine Peso “affected the net amount of funds available for implementing the Project, which the NewCAPP Project efficiently handled although it was not a risk identified *a priori*” (TE pg 53). The mid-term evaluation reports that some of the activities went beyond budget, such as preparing for indigenous communities conservation areas’ conference and developing the State of Protected Areas Management Report. But as these activities were required to achieve the relevant targets of diversifying management regimes and capacity building, the mid-term report states the budget to be justifiable (MTE pgs 22 and 26). Therefore, the TER finds that the project was efficiently implemented.

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

- The TE gives a Moderately Likely rating to sustainability. The TE notes that there were moderate risks in socio-political and governance components, but there was also likelihood of benefits to continue even after the end of the project. This TER also rates the overall sustainability as Moderately Likely especially due to achievements in financial resources, such as the piloting of financial mechanism and moderate achievements in local-level policy implementation, such as getting approval for local ordinances.

Financial Resources: The TE gives a Moderately Likely rating to financial resources sustainability as it finds that the project design itself embedded a financial sustainability outcome and actions had been taken to achieve it. For example, a pilot initiative of Payment for Environmental Services mechanism had been implemented and seemed likely to continue at the time the TE was written (TE pg 56). On the other hand, work is needed to be done for livelihood promotion associated to protected areas especially amongst indigenous population (TE pg 51). Considering the achievements and challenges, this TER also gives a Moderately Likely rating.

Socio-political: In regard to socio-economic risks, the TE reports that due to low support by private sector and some divisions of the government, there are threats to sustainable management of protected areas (TE pg 44 and 57). In particular, there are threats of mining and illegal logging which could have adverse effects on the conservation efforts, and local and indigenous people's habitats/rights. In relation to political risks, the TE states that the "whole political setting in The Philippines as it affects natural resource management (including protected areas) is fragmented, with high rotation of officials, persistent leadership changes, and fragile" (TE pg 58). However, the TE notes that there was high stakeholder ownership at national and local levels. The ownership was manifested by participation of local institutions, NGOs and indigenous people in the project activities (TE pg 54). Due to the project, there has been increased awareness about indigenous rights and biodiversity conservation, which has positively affected while revising management plans for conservation areas. The TE gives a Moderately Likely rating to this component and the TER finds the rating to be appropriate.

Institutional Framework and Governance: As stated earlier, there exist political uncertainties which are likely to affect governance structures. More importantly, the approval of policies needed to establish local and indigenous communities' conservation management have not been fully achieved on the national scale. The Indigenous Communities Conservational Areas Bill, which forms the institutional framework, has been drafted by the project stakeholders, but needs to be approved by the decision makers. There are transient mechanisms for implementation in place but lack of approval on national-level is a key risk to sustainability. Hence, the TER gives a Moderately Unlikely rating, same as the TE.

Environmental: The TE does not report any environmental risks that could be undermined by the project activities and gives a Likely rating to environmental sustainability. Although the TE lacks an environmental risk assessment, the TER finds that due to satisfactory achievements of project outcomes in expanding protected areas of Key Biodiversity Areas there could be long-term beneficial impacts on the environment. Thus, this TER gives a Moderately Likely rating.

## **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?

- The TE notes that there was a 25.4% difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing. The planned co-financing was \$7,536,094 while the actual co-financing was \$5,627,000 (TE pg 6). Although the mid-term evaluation reports that some of the

activities went beyond budget, the terminal evaluation reports that the actual project cost was much less than what was anticipated (MTE pg 22). The TE does not provide any information on the effect of difference in co-financing on project implementation and thus, this TER is unable to assess the impact of the shortfall in co-financing on project's outcomes.

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 annual performance review (APR) conducted in 2011 reports that there were substantial delays in the approval of the work and financial plan and execution of memorandum of agreements with local partners (APR pg 15-16). The APR states that even with delays the project was able to meet most of its targets for the year (APR pg 24), however, the mid-term evaluation and TE do not include any information on delays to the project implementation and hence, any effect on project outcomes cannot be assessed in this TER.

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 country ownership was high at local level during the implementation of project. At the local level, indigenous peoples and NGOs took ownership of the processes, products and results by the institutions. But the TE states that even though the project aided in generating and adopting policy, ownership has not been fully adopted on national level (TE pg 54).

## 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 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|

- The TE gives a Satisfactory rating to the M&E design at entry, however, the TER finds M&E design to be Moderately Satisfactory as although most elements of a M&E plan were present, some elements were missing, such as quantifiable indicators, and risk assessment.

The M&E design included a baseline analysis and provided indicators for the outcomes. It also listed outputs necessary to deliver outcomes in the plan and gave specific indicators.

But the TE finds that “some of the baseline indicators were not quantified, therefore making it difficult to establish measurable progress in attaining results or effects” (TE pg 27). In terms of assumptions, the logical framework fails to include assumptions and even risks anticipated per output. For instance, there is no mention of risks associated with policy outcome, which the TER finds it to be a major limitation (TE pg 29). The socio-political sustainability has become weak due to lack of this risk assessment. However, the project document included in its M&E plan the development of inception report, Project Implementation Reports, periodic site visits for monitoring, mid-term evaluation, and final evaluation (TE pg 37).

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

- The TE rates Moderately Satisfactory to M&E implementation of the project. The TE and the mid-term review find that the monitoring reports were submitted on time, except for some progress reports that came late from sites (TE pg 38, MTE pg 13). The TE also states “the midterm review was carried out later than planned due to operational issues. Recommendations arising out of midterm review were tacitly incorporated in the management of the concluding implementation period, yet no formal change to log frame or indicators was established” (TE pg 38). M&E was conducted in accordance with existing UNDP and GEF procedures. As there no major problems with the implementation, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

- The main implementing agency of the project was UNDP and the TE found the project implementation as Satisfactory. The TE states that UNDP has a comparative advantage in terms of “capital of information, knowledge management capabilities as well as its regional and global positioning and development of similar projects” (TE pg 32). The UNDP office in the Philippines has a long association with key stakeholders of NewCAPP project especially with Department of Environment and Natural Resources and the project was able to build

upon this. The TE reports that although UNDP did not have a direct operational and coordination role at local and regional levels, implementation worked overall (TE pg 38). Hence, the TER also gives a Satisfactory rating to project implementation.

|                                  |                                 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 7.2 Quality of Project Execution | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|

- The main executing agency was Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB). The TE gives a Satisfactory rating to project execution but doesn't provide an evaluation of the work done by PAWB. There is no mention of how PAWB coordinated with partner agencies and executed project activities, and thus, this is a significant shortcoming when assessing the quality of execution. However, the TER gathers that one of the tasks of PAWB was to provide support to stakeholders involved. It successfully provided technical assistance to Protected Areas Management Board and other stakeholders in managing protected areas and new conservation areas (TE pg 8). Due to lack of additional data on PAWB, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to execution of the project.

## 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.

- The TE does not provide any information whether there were any changes in environmental stress by the end of the 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.

- The TE notes that one of the significant effect of NewCAPP project was the work carried out by the indigenous people's organizations. It states "the engagement with IPs has gone beyond achieving land coverage, it has also resulted in pertinent strengthened relation with these actors which are key to management of natural resources in the country" (TE pg 60).

The project also helped highlight indigenous people's rights over their ancestral lands and human rights regarding natural resources (TE pg 60).

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 project involved indigenous people's organizations, which created awareness about indigenous rights. Technical assistance was provided to stakeholders and training were conducted to enhance capacity in order to implement the tools for financing the management of national terrestrial protected areas in the Philippines (TE pg 46).

b) Governance: Draft policies were produced relating to local and indigenous communities conservation areas. Studies were conducted and reports were drafted that identified weaknesses in Protected Areas Management, and the project prepared plans to fill the gaps. The project generated tools and instruments for demarcation and management, and mobilized information at different levels (TE pg 44).

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 affecting ecological or social aspects.

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.

- In regard to mainstreaming, at the local level the local governments have adopted management plans proposed by the project but the adoption is still lacking at the national level. The TE notes "the project has converged mainly with UNDP priorities regarding governance as well as the support of human rights" (TE pgs 54-55).

In regard to replication, the TE reports that a newly approved GEF financed project builds upon the success of NewCAPP. Although the new project will work on different sites than the NewCAPP, it will help build on replicating and mainstreaming the model (TE pg 55).

## 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 key lessons are (TE pg 61):
  - a) To involve all stakeholders in a clear way with delineated roles for projects with multiple issues;
  - b) To have concrete terms for stakeholders in joint implementation of different stages of a project so as to true partnerships;
  - c) To work in a systematic way with significant partners and promote the process throughout the whole life span of a project;
  - d) To concentrate on intensive targets (rather than extensive) is a good strategy for projects seeking innovative and new models of natural resource management;
  - e) To set realistic and accurate expectations when dealing with policy work and have clear strategies to foster policy, such as working with parliaments, civil society groups etc.; and
  - f) To anticipate that when expectations are not fulfilled, it can create disengagement with the communities.
- The best practices are (TE pg 62):
  - a) the TE states that “the work with indigenous communities that the Project carried out can be deemed as a best practice given that its results went beyond the demarcation of new models of protected areas to be managed by these communities”. The work also helped in recognizing indigenous people’s rights to ancestral lands and their management practices were acknowledged as viable and environmentally sustainable.
  - b) In relation to conflict resolution, the TE notes a resolution “of a long standing conflict over natural resources between the Balatoc and Banao tribes in the Baguio region. The long standing conflict between the tribes obstructed obtaining ancestral domain titles. In the course of activities facilitated through the Project the conflict was resolved and this has led to implementing the establishment of ICCA and prepare, accordingly, a community conservation plan for the communal conservation area, together with ceasing hostilities between the tribes”.
  - c) Finally, the TE states that working with the local governments “has also been a best practice, in particular regarding capacity building and the impulse for the creation of policy tools, acknowledging that these tools are a necessary condition for enhanced management of protected areas”.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

- Recommendations given in the TE are at design level, implementation level and follow-up level. They are:

- Recommendations at the Design Level (TE pg 12) -
  - a) Designs and indicators of such projects should be more realistic and feasible, and acknowledge limitations in implementation;
  - b) Monitoring should be linked to design and have regular reviews to comprise changes and relevant adaptations;
  - c) Design formulation should include flexible factors and prevailing national and local socio-political circumstances;
  - d) Clear strategies should be embedded in the project to promote policy adoption for projects that policy related outcomes;
  - e) For projects that promote innovation, there should be a balance between novelty and expected results;
  - f) Participation and responsibilities of key stakeholders should be stated at the design and formulation levels; and
  - g) Exit strategy and sustainability of the project with realistic framework for results should be part of the design. This should also include sustainable financial structures and arrangements for adopting policy to sustain achievements.
  
- Recommendations at the Implementation Level (TE pgs 12-13)-
  - a) Implementation managers should work closely with partners and respect partner's capacities;
  - b) Implementation should work jointly and build partners with regional and local authorities especially where there is very strong site component;
  - c) There should be emphasis on livelihood component in development projects with natural resource management so as to create incentives for communities to incorporate sustainable management practices;
  - d) Regularly review project logic to account for changes in socio-political circumstances;
  - e) Promote knowledge management inputs and outputs throughout project stage and acknowledge that just creating products is a necessary but not sufficient for capacity building; and
  - f) Clear strategy should be designed for projects with policy outcome and increase policy adoption advocacy.
  
- Recommendations at the Follow-up Level (TE pg 13) -
  - a) Explore other models that were not sufficiently recognized for the near future;
  - b) Publish and disseminate all material produced in a user friendly manner and are made available in all formats;
  - c) Develop and implement comprehensive communication plan taking into account different target audiences;
  - d) Implement gaps and unmet products and needs, if it is possible to do so;
  - e) Follow-up policy work to secure workable institutional and governance sustainability to achievements attained; and

- f) Follow-up on financial issues, and upscale and institutionalize successful pilots and also ascertain that financial support allocated for new management models is indeed affected.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

| Criteria  | GEF IEO comments  | Rating    |
|---|---|-----------|
| To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? | The TE presents a thorough and critical analysis of relevant and effective outcomes, impacts and achievements of the objectives.  | <b>S</b>  |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?         | The TE's rating and explanation of the evaluation component are sometimes inconsistent. For instance, the TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the quality of execution, however, it did not provide any explanation as to why such a rating has been given. Some cases did have an inflated rating but mostly the TE ratings contained evidence. | <b>MS</b> |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?   | The TE assesses the project sustainability very well but does not include any information on project exit strategy. This could be for the reason that the project is intended to be replicated.   | <b>MS</b> |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?                                      | Lessons learned are presented well but lack evidence for support.   | <b>MU</b> |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?                                     | The TE report does not include the projects per activity but provides total project cost.   | <b>MS</b> |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:   | The TE's assessment of M&E design and implementation is brief and needs more elaboration.   | <b>MU</b> |
| <b>Overall TE Rating</b>  |   | <b>MS</b> |

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

- The TER used mid-term review, CEO Endorsement Request, and Annual Project Review to gather information.