

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 3691 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | P112108 | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF-4 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | World Bank | |
| Project name | | Tiger Futures: Mainstreaming Conservation in Large Landscapes | |
| Country/Countries | | Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Nepal, Russian Federation, Thailand, Vietnam | |
| Region | | Asia | |
| Focal area | | Biodiversity | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | BD SP4, BD SP3, SFM | |
| Executing agencies involved | | Wildlife Conservation Society | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | Wildlife Conservation Society (executing agency), WWF-US (NGO Partner), TRAFFIC (NGO Partner) | |
| Private sector involvement | | n/a | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | 12/11/2008 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | 2/11/2009 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | 6/30/2011 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | 6/30/2011 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | n/a | n/a |
| | Co-financing | n/a | n/a |
| GEF Project Grant | | 950,000 | 950,000 |
| Co-financing | IA/EA own | 1,550,000 | 1,550,000 |
| | Government | 0 | 0 |
| | Other* | 300,000 | 377,148 |
| Total GEF funding | | 950,000 | 950,000 |
| Total Co-financing | | 1,850,000 | 1,927,148 |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 2,800,000 | 2,877,148 |
| Terminal evaluation/review information | | | |
| TE completion date | | 1/30/2012 | |
| TE submission date | | | |
| Author of TE | | Serguei Milenin | |
| TER completion date | | February 5, 2014 | |
| TER prepared by | | Shanna Edberg | |
| TER peer review by (if GEF EO review) | | Joshua Schneck | |

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF EO Review |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Project Outcomes | n/a | S | n/a | S |
| Sustainability of Outcomes | n/a | L | n/a | ML |
| M&E Design | n/a | S | n/a | S |
| M&E Implementation | n/a | S | n/a | MS |
| Quality of Implementation | n/a | S | n/a | S |
| Quality of Execution | n/a | S | n/a | S |
| Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report | n/a | n/a | n/a | MS |

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project intended to mainstream the conservation of large landscapes by protecting tiger habitats in the countries that tigers range in (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Nepal, Russian Federation, Thailand, and Vietnam). According to the project appraisal document for CEO approval, efforts to protect tigers – a critically important and endangered species – in Asia will concurrently help other species and improve the entire ecosystem, due to the tiger’s status as Asia’s largest top predator and its need for large habitats. Many other important and threatened species that share the same habitat range will be protected along with the tigers, hence improving overall biodiversity in the large tiger ranges of Asia. Threats to the tiger include loss of habitat due to exploitation or conversion of land, depletion of prey from hunting, and poaching of tigers for their body parts. To address these issues and increase the wild tiger population in the long term, the project aimed to build regional commitment, capacity, and cooperation for tiger conservation and curbing the trade in wildlife, as well as identifying financing needs for further tiger conservation.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project is part of a wider collective effort called the Global Tiger Initiative, which is an alliance of tiger-range and partnering governments, civil society, the scientific community, the private sector, and several international organizations including the World Bank. The Global Tiger Initiative is an overarching global plan to double the wild tiger population by the year 2022. The MSP will support the Global Tiger Initiative and build national and regional commitment for tiger conservation by initiating country-dialogue workshops and strategic technical workshops to identify priorities and increase knowledge on conservation and enforcement, aid the Year of the Tiger Summit to promote regional cooperation, increase enforcement capacity to address the illegal wildlife trade, enhance regional consistency in monitoring frameworks, and mobilize new financing and budgetary support for tiger conservation.

The specific components of these goals are as follows:

- i. Component I: Building national and regional commitment for tiger conservation:

- a. A series of country dialogues involving sector agencies, NGOs, and other national stakeholders to enhance policies and actions that address the threats facing tigers and prey.
 - b. A technical strategic workshop for government officials to address transnational issues and agree on strategies for tiger conservation.
 - c. Support to the 2010 Global Tiger Summit.
- ii. Component II: Gap analysis of the funds and resources currently used for tiger conservation:
 - a. Analysis of the funds already in use for tiger conservation.
 - b. Investigate new financing mechanisms.
- iii. Component III: Building regional capacity and transnational cooperation to address the wildlife trade:
 - a. China capacity building program.
 - b. Vietnam capacity building program.
 - c. Transnational program to promote inter-governmental cooperation.
 - d. Developing guidance for approaches to controlling the illegal wildlife trade.

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

Yes. There were some changes to the project objectives. The GEF Focal Point in China chose not to do the national capacity building program that was included in the original project design. Also, in March 2009 additional Tiger Range Countries (Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand) were added to the capacity building program in the place of China, in order to increase the benefits and geographic range of the capacity building component.

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 MSP is consistent with the GEF Strategy for Biodiversity by contributing to the sustainability of protected area networks (SP 3) and mainstreaming biodiversity in large landscapes (SP 4) by strengthening regulatory frameworks. The project also supports Sustainable Forest Management by promoting the conservation of forest habitats where tigers range. Overall, the aim of building

commitment and capacity for tiger conservation and addressing the wildlife trade will strengthen biodiversity and curb the trade in endangered species, thus promoting the health of the entire ecosystem where tigers range.

The project is also consistent with national priorities. All of the states located in tiger ranges have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity and have national legislation that supports the conservation of large natural habitats as well as legislation that protects tigers and tiger reserves. In addition, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Russia, and Thailand all have National Tiger Action Plans. Despite these political commitments, in practice national and donor efforts to protect tigers are undermined by the rampant illegal trade in wildlife. The MSP addresses some of the common needs of the national tiger conservation plans by increasing capacity development and providing guidance on the most efficient targets for conservation and enforcement resources.

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

The project outcomes were highly effective overall; all outcome indicators were met or exceeded. Toward Component I (building national and regional commitment for tiger conservation), the project provided assistance for tiger range countries to create their National Tiger Recovery Plans that formed the basis of the collective Global Tiger Recovery Program, which was launched at the Global Tiger Summit in 2010 in St. Petersburg with the goal of doubling the wild tiger population by 2022, the next Year of the Tiger. The MSP also provided inputs toward several Global Tiger Initiative meetings and created a Strategic Technical Workshop to help NGOs support tiger conservation efforts. Overall, the project advanced national and international programming and coordination for tiger conservation.

For Component II, the gap analysis of financing needs, a report was written that included information on standards of practice as well as the costs of monitoring and law enforcement, with inputs derived from field work. This report informed the Tiger Summit deliberations.

On Component III, building capacity and transnational cooperation to address the wildlife trade, several activities were completed. TRAFFIC, the NGO partner, arranged five workshops to build capacity and cooperation on international trade and law enforcement between Vietnam, Indonesia, Cambodia, and Laos. Delegations were provided with best practices and case studies. Bilateral and provincial meetings were also carried out to support cross-border investigations, patrols, and monitoring. This component spurred agreements between sub-national provinces in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos on the wildlife trade and new mechanisms for information exchange between customs offices in Indonesia and Vietnam. The project also catalyzed greater resource mobilization to tiger conservation and overall protected area management. For example, Thailand increased the number of park rangers in one of its forest complexes by 40 people.

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

The project was implemented efficiently in terms of time. The project was completed on time, despite a delay in the contracting of TRAFFIC as a project partner and the delay in the implementation of Component III, building capacity against the illegal wildlife trade. There were also changes made to Component III, which was originally planned for only two countries (China and Vietnam), but the project was changed to omit China and add Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand, thus addressing five countries rather than the original two. Also, the project's activities were aptly coordinated with the overall Global Tiger Initiative to assure that the events were of high quality and would lead to substantive political commitments. Finally, the project did not only address threats to tigers. In order to protect the tiger population, the necessary interventions in habitat conservation and against the wildlife trade also protect other species, such as tiger prey, and ensure that the entire ecosystem becomes healthier.

The lack of financial information makes it difficult to render an assessment on financial efficiency, but no problems or cost overruns were reported.

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

In September 2011, shortly after this project was completed, \$67.9 million in confirmed financing had been pledged for follow-up actions under the Global Tiger Recovery Program, coming from the World Bank, European Commission, WWF, and Wildlife Conservation Society. Therefore financing is already assured for future work on the goals of this project.

One source of institutional sustainability of outcomes for tiger conservation on the ground is likely to continue in efficacy: activities to reduce the illegal wildlife trade. The personnel that were trained as part of the MSP, including law enforcement, customs, and the media, remain in positions of influence. Due to their project-provided training they will continue to increase enforcement against the wildlife trade.

The terminal evaluation report cites a moderate risk to the project's development outcomes because of their dependence on government commitment, national ownership, the transformation of political will into on-the-ground institutional decisions, and mobilization of financing to tiger range countries. The political risk is ameliorated since the Global Tiger Recovery Program was based on country priorities, in particular the National Tiger Recovery Plans, so governments were already firmly committed to tiger conservation. In addition, there is now an international architecture in place to support these government commitments.

The report lacks an analysis of environmental sustainability. Although the international conferences agreed that Tiger Source Sites (also known as critical breeding habitats) should be as free as possible from human activities, there should be a threat assessment of the likelihood of development and

increased human intrusion in tiger range areas, as well as a consideration of the potential of climate change to alter or harm these sites.

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?

Unable to assess. No explanations were given for the increase in co-financing from the World Wildlife Fund. There was no accounting for any project costs or what the co-financing was used for. Therefore it is impossible to assess the contributions of co-financing to the outcomes of the MSP.

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?

There was a delay in beginning the implementation of Component III of the project (building regional capacity and transnational cooperation to address the wildlife trade) because one of the NGO partners, TRAFFIC, was not subcontracted until March 2010, more than a year after the project started. However, this delay was offset by the steady progress made on all fronts, and the project was completed on schedule.

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 was built into the project design by providing for the needs of each country's already-existing National Tiger Action Plan and building regional and global infrastructure to support government commitments to protect tigers and curb the wildlife trade. However, governments in tiger range states must remain committed to stemming the wildlife trade in order to attain the goals of tiger conservation, because governments take the lead in protected area management and are exclusively in charge of law enforcement to catch and punish poachers and traders.

Fortunately, tiger-range country governments made strong political commitments at the Global Tiger Summit in November 2010 and throughout the course of the project. For example, Indonesia, Malaysia, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Vietnam, and Thailand created National Tiger Recovery Plans with the aid of WWF and the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). These National Tiger Recovery Plans built the foundation of the Global Tiger Recovery Program, the vehicle for reaching the goal of doubling the number of wild tigers by the year 2022, which was launched by the heads of government at the Global Tiger Summit.

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 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

Monitoring and evaluation was managed by the Wildlife Conservation Society. Adequate indicators were provided in the CEO approval document with baselines, targets, and instruments for data collection, including intermediate outcome indicators and how the intermediate indicators would be used to further the goals of the project. Most indicators were assessed with annual reports, and the agencies responsible for data collection were specified for each indicator. M&E design was practicable and sufficient overall, although M&E was not specified anywhere in the project budget.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 6.2 M&E Implementation | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|

The terminal evaluation report does not discuss M&E, except to give it a cursory Satisfactory rating. The rating is not explained and M&E is not mentioned anywhere else in the report. The PIRs, if any, were not available on PMIS or on the World Bank intranet. TRAFFIC, however, submitted reports on each of the Tiger Futures workshops. The WCS also submitted a progress report in December 2009. These reports from the NGO partners indicate that at least part of the monitoring schedule was implemented. This component receives a Moderately Satisfactory rating due to the apparent lack of most M&E documentation.

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: Satisfactory |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

The World Bank supported the Wildlife Conservation Society in creating and coordinating a well-designed project that successfully met its objectives. The Bank had to supervise the project closely due to the multiple components and high political profile of the Global Tiger Initiative. The change in project scope (from capacity building in China to capacity building in Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand) was handled smoothly. This change in project activities also speaks to the quality and flexibility of project execution.

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

The Wildlife Conservation Society as well as its NGO partners, the World Wildlife Fund US and TRAFFIC, executed the project and reached its goals. TRAFFIC carried out several capacity-building workshops for tiger range government officials based on its experience in international trade, while WCS and WWF undertook a strategic technical workshop for NGOs on conservation. WWF and WCS also aided the development of each country's National Tiger Recovery Plan. The Wildlife Conservation Society had developed successful models for addressing the wildlife trade in Vietnam, and brought those lessons to the other tiger-range countries for training purposes. In short, each executing agency and NGO partner successfully performed their portions of the project, although the terminal evaluation report notes that WCS found execution demanding due to the project's large geographic scope.

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The report states that the most successful strategy for tiger conservation “focuses on ensuring inviolability and connectivity of Tiger Source Sites” (or breeding habitats) within conservation landscapes (ICM, 14). These areas must be kept free from human activity, protected by law enforcement, monitored regularly for tiger and prey populations, and their buffer zones and connectivity corridors must be managed effectively.

Secondly, tiger conservation has a better chance of success when the judiciary, police, and press are involved, instead of the environment ministries alone. Involving every stakeholder in the effort against poaching—from the process of detection to evidence collection to the arrest, prosecution, punishment, and finally the media coverage of arrests—ensures that more poachers are caught and future poachers are deterred. The realization of the need for wider stakeholder involvement leads to the suggestion of specific training curricula and capacity building for law enforcement, customs officials, the judiciary, and the media.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report recommends that stakeholders and project managers align their tiger conservation activities with the St. Petersburg Declaration on Tiger Conservation, the Thimphu Affirmative Nine-Point Action Agenda on Tiger Conservation, and the recommendations of the Global Tiger Recovery Program in order to secure the sustainability of this MSP as well as the overall Global Tiger Initiative outcomes. In addition, national governments must take ownership of their own tiger populations and hence fund a greater portion of conservation costs. The international community should channel resources to the most critical interventions needed to restore tiger populations, and the science community must monitor tiger and prey populations as efficiently as possible so as to conserve resources and direct them where they are most needed. Lastly, a critical recommendation for stakeholders is to become deeply familiar with the specific issues and threats facing each conservation area on the ground. Because there are so few zones that can support large tiger populations, it is important that every effort on protection and monitoring be tailored to that zone.

The report also contains recommendations for other wildlife conservation projects. For one, the idea of focusing on Source Sites or critical breeding grounds can apply to other large mammals, such as Asian elephants, and will help to direct conservation resources to their most effective use. Also, the approach of focusing on all aspects of enforcement against poaching applies to the illegal trade in wildlife anywhere in the world. Lastly, prioritizing on-the-ground work rather than GIS or remote sensing analyses “has meant that a far greater proportion of time and effort has been expended developing methodologies and approaches between landscapes,” which are more easily adaptable between species and protected areas (ICM, 12).

9. 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 outcomes and impacts of the projects were reported comprehensively and in detail. However, the report would be much stronger if it included more financial information and descriptions of M&E. It would also be easier to assess the outcomes of the project if the indicators were placed in a table. | Satisfactory |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | The report is consistent, detailed, and substantive, again with the exception of financing and M&E. | Satisfactory |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The report had an appropriate assessment of risks as well as positive signs for the sustainability of the MSP, providing information about financial, political, and institutional sustainability. However, there was no information on environmental sustainability; for example, an assessment of whether climate change and habitat loss could roll back the progress made in the wildlife trade. | Moderately Satisfactory |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | The terminal evaluation report lists several lessons and recommendations, all derived from experiences in the project. The report also has several suggestions that could apply to projects dedicated to the conservation of other animals and in other landscapes. | Highly Satisfactory |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The total original and actual project costs were included in the report, but there was no accounting or explanation of per-activity costs. No explanation was given for the increase in co-financing from what was listed at CEO approval, nor what the extra co-financing was used for. | Unsatisfactory |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | The Grant Reporting and Monitoring report gave M&E a Satisfactory rating, but with no explanation or evidence. Other than the rating, there was no evaluation of M&E. | Unsatisfactory |
| Overall TE Rating | | Moderately Satisfactory |

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

The project documents used in this report were: the Grant Reporting and Monitoring Report, Implementation Completion Memorandum, and the CEO Approval document.