

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3668	
GEF Agency project ID		108882	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Extension of Kasanka Management System to Lavushi Manda National Park	
Country/Countries		Zambia	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems SP-1: Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level SP-3: Strengthening terrestrial PA networks	
Executing agencies involved		Kasanka Trust	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Kasanka trust – executing agency	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2012	
Actual date of project completion		June 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.065	NA
	Co-financing	0.126	NA
GEF Project Grant		0.835	0.847
Co-financing	IA own	0	NA
	Government	0.199	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	NA
	Private sector	0	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	0.874	NA
Total GEF funding		1.000	NA
Total Co-financing		1.199	1.74
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.199	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		NA	
Author of TE		Douglas Graham	
TER completion date		March 25, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR*	IA Terminal Evaluation**	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	--	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	S	MU***	--	MU
M&E Design	NR	NR	--	S
M&E Implementation	HS	S	--	UA
Quality of Implementation	NR	NR	--	UA
Quality of Execution	S	NR	--	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	MU

* No PIRs were submitted. Instead, Grant Reporting and Monitoring Reports (GRMs) were submitted. Ratings for the final GRM are captured in this column.

** No terminal evaluation was submitted for this project. The ratings reported here are those from the Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM)

***The ICM rates the risks to sustainability as Significant

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Lavushi Manda and Kasanka National Parks of Zambia are areas of important biodiversity, but they are currently neglected and suffering from encroachment and illegal resource harvesting. At the same time, tourism is growing fast in Zambia and those National Parks could be improved and thereby receive higher revenue from tourism.

The main environmental objective of the project is “to secure the ecological integrity and socio-economic future of Lavushi Manda and Kasanka National Parks as vital functioning components of the interlinking Bangweulu ecosystem” (PIF p.1). More specifically, the project aims to “develop and implement an effective PA management system based on the existing and successful Public-Private Partnership approach (PPP) in KNP with ZAWA, the state Zambian Wildlife Authority” (ICM p.4).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The stated development objective of the project is “to improve sustainable conservation management of Lavushi Manda and Kasanka National Parks to uplift their ecological value as part of the greater Bangweulu ecosystem” (PIF p.1). In order to do so, the project focuses on three main project outcomes:

1. Conservation Systems

Under this outcome, the project aims to put in place systems and infrastructure for sustainable conservation management in KNP and to begin management restoration in LMNP.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

Under this outcome, the project will work to increase community and other stakeholder support for the conservation of the KNP and LMNP.

3. Management Capacity Building

Under this outcome, the project will try to improve the institutional and financial capacity of Kasanka Trust to manage partnerships for Kasanka and Lavushi Manda National Parks.

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

Some changes were introduced during the mid-term review that took place in June 2012. Those changes were discussed with and approved by the World Bank team.

The main change that was made was to component 1: Conservation Systems. In the original plan, the construction of an airstrip was planned. This activity was cancelled after the MTR.

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 TE does not rate relevance. This TER rates it as satisfactory due to the project's good alignment with Zambian national priorities and other existing national initiatives, as well as with GEF programming.

Zambia is already active in developing its Protected Areas and Nations Parks system. The country already has in place a National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), a Policy for National Parks and Wildlife, and a Policy for Tourism Development that are in line with this project's objectives. The public institution entrusted to the park estate in Zambia – ZAWA – also has as a key priority the recovery of depleted National Parks through public-private partnership arrangements. Indeed, this project “seeks to organize a solid 4-pillar partnership between (1) the project promoter, Kasanka Trust, (2) the public institution entrusted to the park estate (ZAWA), (3) the immediate park communities, and (4) tourism private investors and operators” (PIF p.4).

The project falls under the GEF Biodiversity focal area, supporting Strategic Objective 1 (Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems) through its alignment with SP-3 (Strengthening Terrestrial PA Networks) and SP-1 (Sustainable Financing of PA systems at the National Level). The project supported GEF objectives by consolidating and rationalizing the network of PAs in Zambia.

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

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory. This TER also rates effectiveness as satisfactory due to the project having met or almost met all of its targets.

Indeed, 95% of the planned worked plan activities were delivered by time of the project end (ICM p.20). The management effectiveness tracking tools score increased from 61 to 69, exceeding the target value of 64. “In LMNP on most of the questions a higher scores was received compared to the baseline in 2009, among others for the controlling of illegal land use activities and law enforcement, for protected area objectives and design, for resource management, for availability of staff and equipment and for stakeholder communication and involvement. For KNP progress was made especially on stakeholder communication and involvement” (ICM p.14). Large mammal sightings also increased by 12% in the Kasanka National Park, and 778% in the Lavushi Manda National Park.

The first project outcome (Conservation Systems) was achieved at 93%. As a result of the project, greater areas of the parks were within 10km of a road, and they were more frequently covered by patrols. The second project outcome (Stakeholder Involvement) was achieved at 92%. The project successfully reduced the surface of encroached land by at least 3,000 hectares, and more staff were permanently employed by the two national parks. The third project outcome (Management Capacity Building) was 100% achieved, with a reduction in the time required to prepare financial and annual statements, an increase in the annual funds raised, and in increase in paid tourist days spent in the park.

Overall, all project objectives appear to have been met in both National Parks.

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

The TE rates the project’s financial management as satisfactory. This TER also rates efficiency as satisfactory due to the smooth financial management of the project and the ability of the team to leverage more co-financing than anticipated at the beginning of the project.

According to the TE, the project team has well accomplished its financial obligations. In 2013, there were issues with the late submission of financial statements. However, these issues were quickly solved and at project end, the project was up to date with its reporting obligations. Annual procurement plans were prepared, and post-procurement reviews have been positive. (ICM p.19)

The project team managed to leverage additional funds for the project. Indeed, by project end, \$1,735,787 instead of \$837,000 worth of co-financing had come through. Funders such as the Civil Society Environmental Fund only became interested in funding the project after the GEF funds were approved. Regardless, the team was able to leverage the project's achievements to productively attract additional funds.

Finally, project disbursement ran smoothly. "No major delays or problems with disbursement were encountered. The project was implemented according to budget and workplan" (ICM p.23).

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

The TE rates the risks to sustainability as significant. We rate project sustainability as moderately unlikely due to the important financial risks that remain.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Unlikely

Operations in the two national parks have expanded during this project, and sustaining those new activities will require the two parks to maintain higher revenues after project end. However, by project end, the two national parks had not managed to secure enough follow up funding to sustain the expanded operation. The national park administrations are trying to find additional funding, but nothing had been secured by project end. (ICM p.24)

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

As part of the project, the national parks' governance and administrative capacity has been enhanced to improve the park's performance. Granted sufficient funding for park management, those improvements in management should be maintained over time. Sustainability is moderately likely, but contingent on future funding.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely

The project had a strong community participation strategy. As a local employer, the national parks are supported by the local communities, and the TE did not present any other social risk.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

No environmental risks to the project were recorded.

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?

As mentioned above, the project leveraged about twice as much co-financing as initially expected. This contributed to successful project outcomes, although project documents do not reveal in which way the surplus funds added value to the project. (ICM p.20)

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's end date was extended from March 2012 to June 2014. This was necessary "to ensure that the project outcomes and activities would be duly completed. Even though the project at MTR rated satisfactory, there was a delay in achieving these outcomes as result of a 6 month delay in effectiveness and initially slow procurement as in most projects." (ICM p.12)

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 this project is unfortunately not discussed in the TE. The Government of Zambia was not directly involved in this project, nor did the project require government collaboration.

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: Satisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not rate M&E design at entry, nor does the project document describe the M&E framework for this project. The TE (p.16) describes the indicators used for the project. The project and outcome indicators presented respect the SMART criteria, and are accompanied by baseline data and clear targets. The logical framework for the project appears to have been strong. ~~Although the evidence on this topic is thin~~For those reasons, a rating of satisfactory is assigned.

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

The TE rates the performance of monitoring and evaluation as satisfactory, but does not provide any rationale or evidence supporting this claim. Other project documents do not mention M&E implementation; this TER is therefore unable to assess the quality of the M&E for this project.

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 rate the quality of project implementation, but mentions that “the World Bank’s task team was effective in guiding the implementation team throughout implementation. Feedback on implementation was provided in a timely and constructive way. Annual missions to the project were carried out. Procurement and financial management specialists handled requests in a timely fashion and approvals were granted without undue delays” (ICM p.26). Based on that account, project implementation does sound satisfactory. However, given that the ICM report was written by World Bank staff, and considering the lack of external, more independent evidence on this topic, this TER chooses not to assign a score for the quality of project implementation.

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

The TE does not rate the quality of project execution. This TER rates it as satisfactory due to the evidence that the project execution team was highly committed and displayed good adaptive management during implementation.

According to the TE, the project team implemented its project “professionally, in a consultative manner and to a high standard according to the project document and legal agreement” (ICM p.26). The team was “fully committed” (ICM p.26) and made very wise project decisions that strengthened the project. For example, “the changes made by the recipient such as refocus on the GMA creation helped to strengthen the project’s impact” (ICM p.26). The team was also able to leverage additional co-financing.

Overall, the project team appears to have played its role very well, with no issue related to its performance.

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.

National parks are now more effective and better at conserving wildlife. Over the lifetime of the project, large mammal sightings increased by 12% in the Kasanka National Park, and 778% in the Lavushi Manda National Park. (ICM p.14)

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 project created additional permanent jobs in the national parks, and contributed to increasing the revenue from tourism in the two national park areas. The impact on local communities' socio-economic lives has not been measured. [\(ICM p.17\)](#)

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 administrative and management capacity of the two national parks has been increased, as evidence by the improved management effectiveness tracking tool score obtained by the two

national parks at project end. In KNP, the score increased from 61 to 69; in LMNP, the score increased from 9 to 55 (ICM p.16).

b) Governance

Not relevant.

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 have been identified.

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.

Not relevant.

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 presents the following lessons:

1. The key positive lesson was that improved management inputs, coupled with relatively limited funding, can have a profound impact on turning around depleted and marginalized protected areas. ^[1]_[SEP]
2. The key negative lesson was that implementation successes and subsequent sustainability of the Project could have been enhanced by formal inclusion of KTL in the Bangweulu wetlands management structures; clearer definition of the specific roles and responsibilities of the implementing parties (KTL and ZAWA) and of the neighboring stakeholders (BWMB and APN). Additional benefits realized may have included improved efficiency and effectiveness of management input applied; wider constructive participation from neighboring communities; and improved law enforcement results. ^[1]_[SEP]
3. Others lessons include the following:

- Administrative costs of such a project are quite high and need to be phased in and out to avoid problems at project end. This would need more attention in the future, including working on follow up funding. [SEP]
- The fact that the funds were made available to one implementing partner and that [SEP] the funds could be implemented without third parties was crucial for speed and [SEP] effect of the project. [SEP]
- The approach taken to focus on planning and implementing systems instead of [SEP] concentrating on investments proved worthwhile and effective. On the other hand, we maybe should have prioritized some more investments for sustainability halfway the project. [SEP]
- The GMP process for LMNP was delayed by recentralisation of planning activities resulting in unnecessary duplications and time loss. Future operations would benefit of decentralization of responsibilities from ZAWA HQ to the local offices. [SEP]
- There are mechanisms to market a park with few wildlife sightings (outdoor activities). [SEP]

(ICM p.27)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

No recommendations were made in the TE submitted.

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 report adequately assesses relevant outcomes and objectives. However, the discussion of impact is limited.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. However, a lot of evidence mentioned in the report is missing. Ratings are often missing, and usually not well substantiated.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit	The report presents key risks to the project and provides a short narrative on how those negatively influence project sustainability.	MS

strategy?		
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned section is very short, and not very well supported by evidence	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs per activity. Complete co-financing figures are not available.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does not evaluate the project's M&E	HU
Overall TE Rating		MU

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.