

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		365	
GEF Agency project ID		630	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening Conservation Capacity and Development and Institution of a National Biodiversity Conservation Plan	
Country/Countries		Mongolia	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF3 OP-1-4: Biodiversity: arid and semi-arid; coastal, marine, and freshwater; forest; and mountain ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		One of the beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		05/01/93	
Effectiveness date / project start		07/04/97	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		04/01/98	
Actual date of project completion		N/A	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	1.000	1.000
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant			
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.350	0.350
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1.000	1.000
Total Co-financing		0.350	1.350
Total project funding		1.350	1.350
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 1997	
TE submission date		N/A	
Author of TE		Peter-John Meynell	
TER completion date		09/07/14	
TER prepared by		Sean Nelson	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	U
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	U
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
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 objective of the project is to protect and conserve the globally significant biodiversity that resides in Mongolia. Since Mongolia is relatively large, its interior exhibits high landscape diversity: deserts, steppes, forests and mountains. Due to its relatively low population density and its low level of economic development at the time, these landscapes were largely untouched, helping to create a high level of biodiversity. According to the PD, several Mongolian species were endangered at the time: “7 mammals, 6 birds, 2 amphibians, 4 reptiles, 2 fish and 17 plants species” (PD, p. 2). At the time of project approval, these resources were threatened by natural resource extraction activities

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the PD, the overall goal of the project is “to increase the capacity of the Ministry for Nature and the Environment (MNE) to protect and promote biodiversity conservation in Mongolia” (PD, p. 1). At the time, the MNE was only 2 years old and lacked institutional capacity to carry out its biodiversity responsibilities. In addition, the project’s activities include support to parliamentarians working to draft legislation to protect biodiversity in Mongolia's evolving legal and environmental context. The project sought to make economic growth in Mongolia, which was heavily dependent on natural resource extraction, more sustainable. Because unsustainable resource exploitation in Mongolia is driven largely by lack of alternative economic opportunities, several pilot projects were to be set up in local areas to provide alternative means of income other than illegal logging and poaching. It should be noted that the project did not seek to displace natural resource extraction as a part of the Mongolian economy, only to make its practice more environmentally friendly.

The PD defines the following 17 project objectives:

- 1) To craft a 10-20 year plan, which would then immediately lead to a Biodiversity Action Plan
- 2) To put together a single document outlining MNE policies and procedures
- 3) To create and carrying out an MNE employee training program
- 4) To increase legislative members' biodiversity law writing and implementation capacity
- 5) To subsequently draft new biodiversity laws, revise existing laws and to help pass these laws
- 6) To improve the Mongolian legal community's access to the international environmental law community and its resources while also enhancing biodiversity law enforcement
- 7) To help write and implement tourism laws, policies and institution to ensure tourism helps carry out biodiversity goals
- 8) To determine how and when to best create a Mongolian Biodiversity Trust Fund (MBTF)
- 9) To help increase Mongolian biodiversity protection capacity by 1) teaching stakeholders the most recent biodiversity protection theories and methodologies and 2) improving their research and grant proposal writing skills
- 10) To enhance Mongolian protected area conservation management skills
- 11) To create methods and mechanisms through which local populations can help protect and benefit from biodiversity
- 12) To link the Small Projects Fund (SPF) to other existing socioeconomic development programs in Mongolia, while also ensuring it has access to long-term financing sources
- 13) To improve biodiversity public education and awareness in Mongolia
- 14) Other training goals: 1) To train teachers on how to educate their students on biodiversity, 2) To teach local residents near 5 Protected Areas why it is important to protect local biodiversity and how they can do so and 3) To help improve MNE employees' English communications
- 15) To contribute to the MNE's institutional memory and methodology standardization by creating the Public Awareness and Biodiversity Education parts of the MNE Policy and Procedures Manual
- 16) To create a Biodiversity Information Management System (BIMS) that will assist biodiversity management and conservation
- 17) To ensure that local users can properly use, manage and maintain the BIMS database
To train a minimum of 2 technicians and 2 managers to use, manage and maintain the BIMS database

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

The TE makes no explicit mention of changes to the GEOs or the DOs. The PD had 17 objectives, 41 outputs and 107 activities. This created an initial confusion and a lack of focus, so these were trimmed down and rationalized to become more manageable.

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 the government of Mongolia. For the GEF, the project’s goals align with GEF Operational Programs-1-4: Biodiversity: arid and semi-arid; coastal, marine, and freshwater; forest; and mountain ecosystems. Mongolia has a combination of arid and semi-arid, forest and mountain ecosystems containing globally significant biodiversity that were potentially vulnerable without intervention. For the Government of Mongolia, the project fit into national goals of increasing biodiversity protection capacity. The Mongolian government had recently proposed at the Rio de Janeiro Conference for “the world to declare its entire territory a biosphere zone to be protected as a functioning ecosystem forever and open to the world for environmentally-oriented research” (PD, p. 2). In addition, the Mongolian government had also set aside 30 percent of its land area for national parks and reserve areas. The project was directly linked with government efforts to draft legislation to protect biodiversity.

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

Overall, the project’s legislative initiatives were the most successful, followed by the training initiatives. The public education and awareness campaign appears to be moderately successful. However, there are concerns regarding the sustainability of both of these objectives (see Sustainability section below). Similarly, the BIMS system was set up and data was collected, but the data itself was often not entered into the database systematically. As a result, TE reports that this system is seldom used. Each of the 17 PD objectives were achieved in part, but few in whole. A few, such as Objective #2: Writing the MNE PPM, are not mentioned in the TE, so their status are unknown.

In addition, the project administered training to a number of MNE employees. However, due to a lack of effective M&E, the TE says little about whether or not the training courses were successful.. In addition, not all of the planned MNE training courses took place. For instance, a Mongolian Biodiversity Seminar Series was canceled because the first few seminars had low attendance.

The project’s legislative initiatives bore more quantifiable results. The initial goal was to increase parliamentarian capacity enough to pass 5 pieces of environment legislation. The project surpassed this number by helping to prepare 16 pieces of legislation. However, not all of these proposed laws were

directly about biodiversity. Mongolia also became one of the first countries to create a Biodiversity Action Plan. To help ensure that the Biodiversity Action Plan was actually carried out, a National Biodiversity Action Plan Committee was set up in October 1996. Its role is to evaluate the state of biodiversity protection implementation in Mongolia. It reports to the Ministerial Council. A conference on the Plan had not yet taken place as of the TE's writing due to the 1996 elections.

If these laws are widely enforced and respected, the project will have achieved long-term results, though it was still too early to tell if this was the case. Mongolia did ratify Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) in 1996, with a project implementation training seminar taking place in January 1997. In addition, PRIF recommendations helped convince the Mongolian government to create the National Service for Protected Areas and Ecotourism (NSPAE).

The Mongolian Biodiversity Trust Fund was not yet operational, either as a legal entity or as a fully-funded entity. The MBTF was dependent on the MBAP first being created, which happened behind schedule. In addition, the MBTF ran into funding issues that affected its viability.

Elections brought in new parliamentarians and government officials who had not been part of the biodiversity training program and were not involved in the conversation over biodiversity. It appears these new officials were never adequately engaged as of the TE's writing.

The public awareness campaign appears to have been moderately successful, but with some mixed results. The campaign consisted of 52 radio programs, 6 TV programs broadcast; one bi-annual magazine, one monthly newspaper, one quarterly newspaper, 3 books and the quarterly MNE newsletter published [and] 4 Information brochures developed and distributed (TE, p. 17). Over 200 contestants applied to the National Biodiversity Contest. However, it is unclear how much this affected the overall discourse among Mongolians. In addition, the "Nature and Child" book failed to reach many of the teachers who had planned to use it in their classes. These teachers had received training on using the book and other biodiversity materials in their classroom, but government distribution networks proved inadequate for ensuring materials reached their destination.

Project leaders hoped to create a NGO that would connect local activists to international environment legal experts to help promote proper environmental law enforcement. However, the NGO was disbanded "due to staffing and funding problems" (TE, p. 15). Protected Area Management Plans were supposed to be made for a number of strategic sites, but only one was written (for Khovsgol Lake National Park). According to the TE author, the "plan itself lacks logic and attention to ecosystem principles" (TE, p. 16).

The BIMS was successfully launched, and field data had been collected. However, much of the data had yet to be entered, which meant that the database was of limited use to end users. As a result, it was seldom used as of the TE's writing. The project was depending on US Peace Corps volunteers to help improve BIMS performance.

The socioeconomic initiatives also had limited success. Two SPF initiatives – a local *bag* (community) kindergarten and a nomadic hospital – ended up being popular with local communities. The third

initiative – a small boot factory – had been less successful. Several factors have undermined this project: a manager's ongoing illness, a lack of reliable electricity access and consumer payments in kind instead of in cash. This final factor has hurt the factory manager's ability to purchase raw materials to keep the factory financially sustainable.

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

The project experienced two main periods of delay. The first involved a 9-month delay in hiring the CTA. The other was to establish the MBTF. The project was able to get back on track despite the first delay. However, the MBTF was still behind schedule due to the second delay. Some activities were delayed because they could not start until other objectives had been achieved. For instance, the first task mentioned in the PRIF – “Draft a national biodiversity action plan and describe a strategy for its implementation, including identification of funding sources”(quoted in TE, p. 8) – was originally scheduled for 1 year. However, the BAP had to actually be written before its implementation strategy and funding could be complete. In total, this one activity took roughly 3 years. The MBTF was also behind schedule in part because it depended on the BAP to be completed first. The low rating given above in part is a reflection of the early unrealistic timelines that the project was unable to meet.

There does not appear to be any apparent misuse of GEF funds, and total project expenditures at the project closing were in-line with expectations at CEO Endorsement.

The TE author makes several claims that the project was efficient, but do not give any metrics for measuring efficiency. No financial information with budget line items is given. However, the authors note that M&E was inadequate throughout the project, which means there are few metrics they can provide (see sections 6.1 and 6.2). The authors also claim that the project was efficient at generating legislation, but no input numbers are provided (labor hours, expert salaries', etc.) that allows the reader to evaluate the writing of legislation in terms of efficiency. The amount of information collected for the biodiversity database appears to be extensive, but much of the information had not yet been entered, so few people used the database. Peace Corps volunteers appear to helping to strengthen the BIMS system and its use.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Due largely due to legislative successes and widespread MNE training, Sustainability of Project Outcomes are is rated as moderately likely, with some moderate risks to sustainability. Sustainability is dependent the relatively new environmental laws actually being enforced and respected, the success of ongoing training, new public officials and parliamentarians to be properly engaged, and future funding for the MBTF and the National Centre for Biodiversity Conservation to maintain a training program. The project had not yet achieved major physical environmental benefits.

Project sustainability is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

Environmental Sustainability: Unable to Assess

This project was not created with its main focus on immediate environmental benefits. While illegal resource extraction and poaching continued on protected lands, the TE was unable to assess if this would be an ongoing problem or if the new legal environment would help to ameliorate these issues. The new legal environment was simply too young to properly assess the project's environmental sustainability.

Financial Sustainability: Moderately likely

The MBTF provides a potential funding source once it is operational. However, the MBTF had been delayed and had to be merged with the Desertification Trust Fund to remain viable. According to the TE, the Dutch government had expressed interest in supporting the MBTF, but this was not yet for certain.

Sociopolitical Sustainability: Moderately Likely

The project resulted in 16 pieces of legislation – over three times the original target – which is a positive sign that project outcomes enjoy a strong base of political support. The creation of a Biodiversity Action Plan is also a positive step. The 1996 elections brought in new government officials and parliamentarians whom had not made biodiversity one of their priorities. However, as of the TE's writing, they had not yet been systematically engaged. Another sphere where the project's sustainability comes into question is over local opinion. Since the popular nomadic hospital was explicitly linked to promoting sustainability and biodiversity measures, the project was able to help create a local discourse over these issues, however it is not clear how much of a lasting effect this will have. In addition, the small boot factory's poor performance also undermines the idea that sustainability is locally economically viable. Such failures help undermine sustainability in the eyes of people new to the concept.

Institutional Sustainability: Moderately Likely

There was widespread training of MNE staff. There is some evidence that the training program may be sustainable without expatriate project staff involvement. When MNE courses were repeated for new students, Mongolian instructors took over teaching in place of foreign instructors. The TE author believes that a National Centre for Biodiversity Conservation is needed to ensure training sustainability, but one has not yet been created.

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 is unclear as to the actual level of co-financing or the effects of co-financing on project outcomes or sustainability.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced both intentional and unintentional delays. An example of an intentional delay is postponing a conference over the Biodiversity Action Plan until after the June 1996 elections. The conference had not yet taken place as of the TE's writing, but was still being planned. Since a lack of engagement of new officials was a problem, the conference represents a good opportunity to engage new officials over biodiversity issues. There is controversy over whether or not it took project staff too long to create the MBTF, but advocates say they needed a better understanding of the local situation and to actually have plans in place. The MBAP also had to be complete before work could start on setting up the MBTF. The Biodiversity Trust Fund also experienced delays due to funding problems, which led to further successful negotiations with the international consultancy the project was working with to set up the Fund. They agreed upon a joint framework with the Desertification Trust Fund in order to be viable, but with both Funds remaining separate.

However, the TE does state that delays due to poor planning affected employee morale and project outcomes. When the project finished the Pre-Investment Feasibility (PRIF) phase and entered into the Pilot Phase Biodiversity Project (PPP), the project lacked an approved guiding project document and a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA). This delay caused work to be pushed back, some project goals to become less ambitious, the CTA's contract to be cut short and staff turnover due to low morale, especially among translators. One of the long-time project employees, A. Enkhbat, took over managing the project, which seems to have improved project effectiveness and ensured institutional memory. Contradictory instructions and information from the GEF also appear to have caused delays.

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 Mongolian government originally showed a high degree of country ownership. First of all, the training program was created explicitly to help improve MNE employees' skills and understanding related to biodiversity. The Mongolian government showed a high degree of ownership and initiative by creating 16 pieces of legislation and a Biodiversity Action Plan. The fact that incoming officials were not adequately engaged and did not show the same level of enthusiasm for biodiversity does decrease

country ownership and throws project sustainability into question. However, this lack of engagement appears to be due to project employee inaction instead of Mongolian government inaction.

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

The PD states that the Mongolian government, UNDP and OPS would review the project annually. The Senior Adviser, the National Project Coordinator and MNE staff would create a Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) two months before each review. A qualified evaluator was planned to evaluate the project in April 1996. However, the metrics under which M&E would be carried out were not yet defined in the PD. The TE states “none of the project documents mention indicators which might show whether the objectives had been achieved, nor the sources of information on such indicators. As a result, the evaluator is left with the task of thinking up what indicators might be appropriate to such outputs and objectives.” The TE goes on to read “a consequence of this omission has been that there has been little if any emphasis on the project upon monitoring the effects and impacts of project activities, so that there is little indication of the effectiveness for instance of the public awareness campaign, or the training programmes” (TE, p. 8). While no indicators were defined in the PD, the PD did define targets for most of the activities listed. Project budget did not provide any dedicated funding for M&E.

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

As stated in the TE, virtually no M&E occurred. While a Mid-Term Review was conducted in May 1996, the TE states that none of the documents consulted had indicators measuring success or failure.

For instance, there was no systematic approach to make sure trainees understood the material or that their classes were effective. The TE author provides anecdotal evidence that classes and training materials often provided a one-size-fits-all approach. For instance, the Manual for Park Ranger training “should be [called] a Park Managers Manual” because it was full of information that was irrelevant to carrying out a park ranger's job. The park ranger training course included a biological statistics component that trainees saw as “unnecessary and barely understandable” (TE, p. 12).

Another example of a lack of M&E provided in the TE concerns distribution of the book “Nature and the Child” to teach schoolchildren about biodiversity. While the book appears to be well-written and the teachers who did receive the book found it helpful, many teachers never actually received a copy despite being trained on how to use the book. Follow-up monitoring could have checked to see if the books reached their intended recipients, but this never occurred.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--	--

Quality of project implementation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory, largely due to weaknesses in the project design that are noted in the TE. The PRIF and the PD provided a large number of objectives and activities that were often loosely connected. The timelines were often unrealistic, causing delays of roughly 2 years in activities dependent on the MBAP’s completion. In addition, activity linkages were not clear in the planning documents, no indicators of success or failure were provided, and M&E arrangements were not robust (see M&E section above). In addition, delays over approving guiding documents and fielding a CTA also held the project in a state of limbo for about 9 months, which hurt project staff morale in the field.

On the positive side, UNDP appears to have been moderately successful at adapting to change once it became apparent that initial plans were unrealistic. In addition, UNDP also appears to have maintained good communication with the project members in the field.

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

Despite running into initial problems due to poor initial planning, quality of project execution by the UNOPS team in the field experienced only moderate shortcomings. Most project activities were performed, though the overall number of activities had to be trimmed back from initial plans. The initial number of expected activities were cut down to a more manageable and realistic number. Some

adaptations were made in activity execution, such as changing the SPF from a compensatory mechanism to a mechanism to promote small-scale sustainable development.

However, not all adaptations that should have been done were performed. For instance, when it became apparent a number of biodiversity books failed to reach teachers who hoped to use these books in their classrooms, no adjustments were made to the distribution system. While it makes sense that the Mongolian Biodiversity Action Plan Conference was delayed until after the 1996 elections in order to include new officials and parliamentarians, these new stakeholders had not yet been engaged as of the TE's writing. Many important actions depended on other actions to first be completed. For instance, the MBTF's planning depending on the MBAP first being completed. Since the MBAP was completed behind schedule, the MBTF was also behind schedule.

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.

Since this was largely a capacity-building project to allow for future environmental benefits, the project achieved few discernible environmental benefits as of the TE's writing. The TE author notes that "precise data on the status of species and the protected areas is not available." (TE, p. 21) Between this issue and a lack of quality M&E, there is no real way to say that the project had had a positive or negative environmental impact at that point. Poaching and illegal woodcutting still continued, though the laws prohibiting such activities were relatively young.

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.

Socioeconomic considerations were secondary to the MNE capacity-building and legislation objectives. The SPF, the nomadic hospital and the kindergartens appear to be popular, "but the direct links between these and biodiversity conservation are tenuous" (TE, p. 22). Inhabitants in the project areas have a greater sense of biodiversity's importance that can potentially lead to greater adoption of sustainable practices. However, the failure of the small boot factory undermined this message.

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 high number of training programs and events (TE, pp. 15-19) appears to have had a positive effect on the MNE's institutional capacity. The fact that MNE trainees took over as trainers when courses were repeated in particular is a good sign. However, illegal natural resource extraction (poaching, etc.) continued in protected lands. Few cases were pursued against those individuals involved. In addition, the lack of engagement with new government officials following the 1997 election is also cause for concern.

b) Governance:

The passage of 16 pieces of environmental legislation, the creation of the Biodiversity Action Plan and ratifying CITES are all positive steps. Over the long-term, a comprehensive legal environment is necessary for ensuring biodiversity protection in Mongolia. This project clearly helped to achieve the first steps of that goal. The creation of the National Biodiversity Action Plan Committee to make sure that the Biodiversity Action Plan was actually being followed also shows a commitment on the Mongolian government's behalf. However, since these laws were young, they were not yet widely enforced or respected. The lack of engagement with new officials elected in 1996 also is concerning.

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.

As stated previously, the failure of the small boots factory undermines the idea that environmentally sustainable practices are financially sustainable among the local population. It is unclear how much this resonated among local communities.

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.

The TE does not explicitly state which GEF initiatives it undertook.

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 does not include a separate lessons learned section. Important lessons can be inferred from the TE text's body and the "Recommendations" section discussed in section 9.2.

- Projects need a well-designed M&E system with clear, quantifiable metrics for evaluation from the outset. Without such a system, evaluating project success or failure becomes nearly impossible. If failures are not detected, this makes it hard to adjust project strategies.
- Once project fieldwork is already underway and a staff is already in place in the field, they need to have clear directions based on commonly agreed upon written documents. In addition, they need all essential staff to be hired and working as soon as possible. Without these two components, project inertia can lead to delays, poor implementation, low morale and staff turnover.
- Engaging key stakeholders and decision-makers, including government officials and elected representatives, is important for drafting legislation and national plans. However, this engagement needs to be ongoing and to include new officials as elections and government turnover occur.
- Socioeconomic development initiatives need to make sure they match the local residents' needs and capacities. For instance, setting up a factory that will need to have a steady inward cash flow to make sure it can continue operating and buying raw materials requires that their target consumers can pay in cash. If local consumers can only pay in kind or barter, the development project needs to be altered so that it can receive such payments and remain economically viable.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE includes 8 main recommendations to build off of this project's achievements so far:

1. Implement a well-defined and effective M&E process. This needs to evaluate whether or not training, public education campaigns, environmental initiatives and socioeconomic development initiatives are effective and meeting their goals. These goals have to be clear and quantifiable. The results of the M&E process should help to guide future project actions.
2. There will need to be greater community engagement to get them actively invested in and involved in protecting national park lands. National park services are too understaffed to do this by themselves.

3. Biodiversity initiatives will need to be scaled up, especially on the socioeconomic side. Mongolian poverty is simply too large an issue for small-scale projects to truly address it adequately. The TE author writes, “since poverty is considered a major threat to biodiversity in Mongolia, future biodiversity initiatives should collaborate with other development initiatives which are focusing on poverty issues.” This “cross-fertilisation of ideas between biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and poverty alleviation” can help both causes (TE, p. 36).
4. Both the National Environmental Trust Fund and the National Centre for Biodiversity Conservation need to be fast-tracked to become operational as soon as possible. The former is needed to provide “funding [for] biodiversity conservation activities in other parts of the country not covered under the new project” (TE, p. 36).
5. Each facet of the public education and communications strategy needs to be tailored to its target audience in order to be effective. In addition, printed public education materials need to actually reach their target audience instead of being lost in poor distribution systems.
6. The project needs to have an ongoing conversation and relationship with public officials and key decision makers at both the national and local level.
7. NSPAE employees will need continual training across all protected areas to ensure that capacity-building truly takes place.
8. All collected project and studies data needs to be inputted into the Biodiversity Information Management System (BIMS) to make sure it is actually useful to the database's users.

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?	The TE shows that most objectives were at least partly met. Only a few objectives had been given benchmarks for success or failure (passing at least 5 environmental laws, etc.), so the TE author states they had to come up with their own benchmarks. The TE is clear on the results of the project helping to write and pass legislation, as well as draft national action plans. The TE lacks local flora and fauna population numbers for measuring biodiversity because no one had actually collected those numbers. The socioeconomic goals were also vague, so they were not quantifiable.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent on key issues: that the training was extensive but poorly monitored, that the project helped craft and pass numerous pieces of legislation that were still unenforced, that some socioeconomic development projects were popular while others failed. The fact that they evaluated each smaller initiative that went into the overall project on a numerical scale is also appreciated.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	While the project achieved its near-term legislative goals, further work needed to be done to ensure that those laws were respected and enforced. The TE author mentions his doubts about the training program's effectiveness and sustainability. They also note that key socioeconomic development initiatives were not sustainable. However, they present no project exit strategy.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are not directly mentioned, but the 8 recommendations the TE author makes cover multiple facets of the project moving forward and appear supported by the evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report lacks budget line items and budget totals for most project initiatives and the project as a whole.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report notes that the M&E system was virtually non-existent, which the author notes is a major failure. However, they fail to mention why this was allowed to occur.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating: $(0.3 * (4+5)) + (0.1 * (4+5+1+5)) = 2.7 + 1.5 = 4.2 = \text{Moderately Satisfactory}$

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

The following documents are mentioned in Appendix 3.

- EDG. 1996. Fundraising for the Mongolia National Environment Trust Fund.
- Enkhbat, A. March 1997. Progress report. Mongolia Biodiversity Project, July - December 1996.
- Finch, C. (ed). 1996. Mongolia's Wild Heritage. Mongolia Ministry for Nature and the Environment, UNDP/GEF, WWF.
- Garratt, K. & Tschmid-Otschir, B. May 1996. Mongolia Biodiversity Project Independent (mid-term) Evaluation.
- GEF. 1993. Activity Information Brief. Pre-Investment Facility Project for Mongolia Biodiversity Project.
- GEF. February 1996. Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities: Biodiversity
- GEF. February 1996. Operational Strategy.
- GEF. October 1996. Draft Operational Programs. Biodiversity Arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems.
- Griffin, J. October 1994. Final report. Mongolia Biodiversity PRIF.
- Gruys, R. 1996. TOR for Associate expert Wildlife Biology/Computers. Trip reports to Khovsgol, Dornod, Great Gobi and training courses for NSPAE staff in computers, workshop on finding information on the World Wide Web.
- Johnstad, M. December 1994. Interim consultancy report. Mongolia Biodiversity PRIF.
- Laurie, W. A. & Enkhbat, A. Sept 1996. Draft Terminal Report. Mongolia Biodiversity Project Implementation Phase One.
- Mongolia Biodiversity Project. List of equipment distributed to NSPAE offices.
- Mongolia Biodiversity Project. Prospectus Mongolia Biodiversity Trust Fund.
- Mongolia Biodiversity Project. April 1996. Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan.
- Mongolia Biodiversity Project. February 1997. Small Projects Fund Program Description.
- Nash, S.V. CITES Training, Consultants report to Mongolia Biodiversity Project.
- Rudran, R. Sept. 1996. Report on Staff Development and training needs assessment. Mongolia Biodiversity Project.
- UNDP/GEF. 1995. Project Document for Mongolia Biodiversity Project.
- UNDP. 1996. Project revision for Mongolia Biodiversity Project - Impl. Phase 1.
- UNDP. December 1996. Budget Revision for Environmental Programming for the UNDP sixth cycle programme.
- UNDP/GEF. 1997. Project document for Biodiversity Conservation and sustainable livelihood options in the grasslands of Eastern Mongolia.
- Wingard, J. April 1996. Report on Mongolia's Environmental laws. Mongolia Biodiversity Project.