

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3820	
GEF Agency project ID		4180	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening of the Protected Area Network in Mongolia (SPAN) ⁽¹⁾ _(SEP)	
Country/Countries		Mongolia	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-1: To catalyze sustainability of protected area (PA) systems SP-1: Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level SP-3: Strengthening Terrestrial PA Systems	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment, Green Development and Tourism ⁽¹⁾ _(SEP)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M) *
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	NA
	Co-financing	0.1	NA
GEF Project Grant		1.36	1.36
Co-financing	IA own	0.7	0.69
	Government	0.5	0.48
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.0	0.69
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0.72	1.20
Total GEF funding		1.36	1.36
Total Co-financing		3.02	3.05
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.39	4.42
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		September 10, 2015	
Author of TE		Crawford Prentice, Orgiltuya Dashzevge	
TER completion date		March 17, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

* Those are the amounts disbursed as of the finalization of the TE in August 2015

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Since the 1990s, Mongolia has been expanding its national network of Protected Areas (PAs). Before the start of this project (SPAN project), there existed 61 PAs in the country, representing 21,749,509 ha, or 14% of the country's surface. Unfortunately, the expansion in the PA network has not been accompanied by a simultaneous development of the management and financial capacity for the network. As a result, most of the PAs are underfunded and suffer from weak management. (PD p.1)

The project's main objective is to remediate to this situation and "enhance effective management and sustainable financing of the protected area system in Mongolia as a whole" (PD p.1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

More specifically, the development objective for this project is "to catalyze the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Mongolia's protected areas system." (PD p.1)

In order to achieve this objective, the project focuses on three outcomes:

- (1) Strengthened National policy, legal and institutional frameworks for sustainable management and financing of the national PA system;
- (2) Institutional and staff capacity and arrangements are in place to effectively manage and govern the national PA system; and
- (3) Sustainable financing mechanisms and innovative collaboration approaches demonstrated at 3 PA demonstration sites, increasing funds and effective strategies for PA management.

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

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation.

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 rates relevance as satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as satisfactory due to the project's good alignment with both Mongolian national priorities and GEF priorities under the biodiversity program.

Indeed, Mongolia has been active in creating PAs much before the beginning of the SPAN project. Already in 1778, an area was protected in the Bogd Khan Mountain – one of the oldest in the world. Prior to the project start, the Government of Mongolia committed to setting aside 30% of its territory as protected areas by 2030. This commitment stems from Mongolia's Biodiversity Action Plan (1996) and its National Programme on Protected Areas (1998). This commitment was reiterated as part of Mongolia's 2005 Millennium Development Goal resolution in 2005 (PD p.10). Finally, the country's 2007 National Development Plan also identified the need to decrease rapid decline in its biodiversity (PD p.47).

The project is also fully in line with the GEF biodiversity focal area's first strategic objective, namely 'To Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Area (PA) Systems. It is also aligned with the GEF's first strategic program, 'Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level' and the third strategic program, 'Strengthening Terrestrial PA Systems'. Indeed, all project activities focus on increasing the sustainability of Mongolia's PA system.

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

The TE rates effectiveness as somewhere between satisfactory and highly satisfactory. This high rating is due to the project having met its three main objective indicators, and a majority of its outcome indicators. This TER rates effectiveness as satisfactory due to most project targets having been met and the adequate progress that was made towards enhancing the sustainability of PAs in Mongolia. The project's performance under its three main outcomes is examined below.

Outcome 1: Strengthened National policy, legal and institutional frameworks for sustainable management and financing of the national PA system

This objective appears to have been adequately met. Indeed, “the score for the UNDP Financial Scorecard component 1 ‘Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks’ reached 50.0% by June 2015, exceeding the logframe target of 45%. In addition, the score for UNDP Capacity Scorecard components related to ‘Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies and programmes’ reached 89% by June 2015, exceeding the logframe target of 75%” (TE p.47). The two main indicators for this outcome were achieved.

As part of this component, the Mongolian Law on Protected Areas was revised, an Action Plan to enforce the national program on Protected Areas was developed, and several other activities took place to strengthen the institutional framework. In addition, management capacity was built among PA staff, including officers, rangers and park administrators. According to the TE, the project activities were effective in supporting the achievement of this outcome.

Outcome 2: Institutional and staff capacity and arrangements are in place to effectively manage and govern the national PA system

The project score for UNDP Capacity Scorecard components related to ‘Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programs’ achieved 65.6% by June 2015, exceeding the logframe target of 60%. As part of this component, several project activities took place including the improvement of the PA accounting program, an update on the guidelines for PA management, and better evaluation tools to assess the effectiveness of the PA system in Mongolia. Better training, mentoring and learning systems for PA staff are now in place, and the GIS PA database has been improved. Overall, these activities are reported by the TE to have generated “a marked increase in national capacity to manage the PA system effectively” (TE p.48). That being said, the TE also reports that progress on this outcome could have been better, but was slowed down by some bureaucratic delays in passing revisions to the Protected Area Law and in applying the Budget Law (TE p.48).

Outcome 3: Sustainable financing mechanisms and innovative collaboration approaches demonstrated at demonstration sites, increasing funds and effective strategies for PA management

According to the TE, “protection of the core zones at both demonstration sites remain sustainable, affording protection from overgrazing to core zones of 283.4 thousand hectare of pastureland (251.9 at INNR, 31.5 in OVNP) through effective agreements with herder communities” (TE p.49). However, the score for the GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard component ‘Tools for revenue generation’ was 29.6%, falling short of the 35% target. Sources and mechanisms for additional financing have been piloted at the demonstration sites, but little had been implanted by project end. Management effectiveness scores have improved in both demonstration sites by project. Overall, financial sustainability has not improved as much as expected during the project, but management effectiveness sustained satisfactory improvements.

Overall assessment

The TE (p.50) shows that 80.6% of the logframe targets had been achieved as of June 2015, and a further 11.1% were likely to be completed by the time of project closure in December 2015. Despite minor lags in ensuring the financial sustainability of PAs – largely due to bureaucratic lags outside the control of the implementing team, - the SPAN project was successful. For this reason, a rating of satisfactory is appropriate.

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

The TE rates efficiency as satisfactory due to the project's ability to minimize costs and exploit available synergies. For the same reasons, this TER also rates efficiency as satisfactory.

According to the TE, the project's results "have been delivered with the least costly resources possible" (TE p.54). Indeed, the project was financially very well managed, and project staff actively tried to minimize costs, for example by replacing planned international consultants by national consultants at a lower cost.

In addition, the SPAN project benefited from its combined management with another related UNDP project –Mongolia's Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas (MRPA) – which helped create implementation synergies and lower costs. It reduced the staffing and operational costs, and took advantage of existing expertise and resources (TE p.54). However, when the Project Implementation Unit also started coordinating the MRPA program in September 2013, implementation delays were incurred by the SPAN project.

Overall, despite some delays due to new project implementation arrangements, the project appears to have been efficiently managed and real efforts appear to have been made to ensure its cost-effectiveness.

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

The TE rates sustainability as moderately likely, largely due to uncertainties regarding the future of some planned measures to improve PAs' financial sustainability. This TER also rates sustainability as moderately likely and notes the project's numerous accomplishments in improving the sustainability of the Mongolian PA network.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

According to the June 2015 financial sustainability scorecard results, the project was successful in increasing the overall financial sustainability of the national PA network. This success is partially reflected in the threefold increase in state financing for the PA network between 2008 and 2014. However, as of summer 2015, some of the financial sustainability measures put forward by the project

were still pending approval by the Ministry of Finance and the proposed revisions to the Special Protected Areas Law had yet to be approved by Parliament. The formal adoption of those measures is necessary for “PAs to become financially sustainable through the use and adequate retention of funds from sources such as entry fees, tourism revenue, land use fees and so on” (TE p.55). The UNDP/GEF MRPA project, managed by the same Project Implementation Unit as the SPAN project, will continue to follow up on those issues and push for the adoption of the financial sustainability measures discussed above. Given the remaining uncertainty related to the adoption of those financial sustainability measures, a rating of moderately likely is given.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely

The project has been strongly supported by the Ministry of Environment, Green Development and Tourism (MEGDT) despite the several changes of Government that took place during the project lifetime. Increasing PA sustainability has remained a priority for the Ministry, and it appears unlikely that the upcoming changes in government would weaken the political support for PAs (TE p.56). For this reason, socio-political sustainability is rated as likely.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely

Given that the UNDP will continue to manage the MRPA project, which is very closely aligned to the SPAN project, it appears likely that the support for outcomes achieved as part of this project will continue after implementation completion. Given the continuing interest of the MEGDT and the UNDP in this topic, it appears like there is a strong institutional basis for the continuation of project outcomes.

However, the sustainability of outcomes will also depend on local government decisions in the two demonstration areas. The support of the two local governments was very strong, but this cannot be assumed to be the case everywhere where project activities might be replicated going forward. Awareness raising and capacity development will be needed to secure the local support for PA conservation. That being said, focusing solely on this project’s outcomes, institutional risks appear low, and sustainability is therefore likely.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

Climate change is likely to have an impact on the biodiversity this project aims to protect, but as a result of the project, PAs are better managed and therefore better able to deal with those risks. The TE suggests that “stronger attention to climate change adaptation by the project could have helped to mitigate this risk further.”(TE p.56) Environmental sustainability is rated as likely.

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 expected co-financing from the Government of Mongolia, the GIZ, WWF-Mongolia and the Denver Zoo came through and provided a much needed additional support to the project.

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 was extended by six months due to implementation delays. Those delays were due to changes in the management of the Project Implementation Unit, as well as frequent changes in the political landscape of Mongolia, which caused project delays. Those delays did not affect project outcomes.

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 project benefited from very strong country ownership. The project formulation involved key government stakeholders and created a strong basis for national ownership. The project was closely linked to the Protected Area Administration Department and the Ministry of Environment, Green Development and Tourism throughout, which has also facilitated country ownership. This close collaboration will have ensured successful outcomes and increased the likelihood of sustainability of the project (TE p.54).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E design as satisfactory due to its having no major shortcomings, and featuring all necessary components of a strong M&E framework.

The Project Document features a comprehensive M&E plan, including monitoring arrangements, evaluation timeline, project indicators, baseline, responsibility, budget and a plan for learning and knowledge sharing. A full set of indicators and baselines was established at the beginning of the project as part of the logical framework, which “has provided a sound basis for work planning, monitoring and evaluation. Indeed, the lack of any significant changes to the log-frame at inception stage, and the lack of major proposals to change the log-frame at MTE stage, reflects upon the quality of the simple original project design” (TE p.29).

Indeed, the logical framework developed at the beginning of the project (PD p.50) featured detailed, SMART indicators that formed a good basis for the project’s M&E. The logframe has been criticized for not putting enough importance on biodiversity objectives, and instead putting the emphasis on sustainable financing and institutional strengthening (TE p.27). It is the opinion of this TER that this should be considered a criticism of the project design, and not a criticism of the M&E design.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory. This TER also rates it as satisfactory as all planned M&E procedures were respected and the team made a serious attempt at implementing recommendations from the mid-term evaluation.

Even though it took a while for the planned M&E officer position to be filled (TE p.33), the Project Implementation Unit effectively discharged its M&E responsibilities throughout the project. Indeed, PIRs have been completed every year from 2011 to 2015, and a mid-term evaluation was conducted in 2013. According to the TE, the project team also had “a regular process of internally evaluating project activities, and compiling lessons learned that can be incorporated into future activities, summarised annually in the PIRs.” (TE p.39)

In addition, the project team took the mid-term evaluation recommendations seriously, with 13 out of 20 recommendations having been addressed and five were in progress when the TE was prepared. According to the TE, the drive to implement mid-term evaluation recommendations came from the Project Implementation Unit (TE p.36).

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 Satisfactory
--	--

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP's quality of implementation is rated as moderately satisfactory due to a lack of focus on community engagement and communications as part of the project and to some delays in project implementation that it generated. This TER agrees with this rating.

Overall, the project was very well designed. It benefited from a clear and concise logical framework, which helped the executing agency implement the various project components. However, the MTE and the TE report overall "weak attention to the issue of community engagement in the original project design (limited to Output 3.3) with no recognition of the crucial need to integrate livelihoods development into the project in order to secure effective collaborative management" (TE p.27). This issue was addressed through adaptive management during project implementation. Similarly, too few resources were devoted to communications, with no specific Project Implementation Unit staff tasked to focus on the issue, or no planned consultancy on this topic, despite the need for an integrated communications strategy.

During the project, the UNDP played an active role and generally provided useful and timely support to the MEGDT, the execution agency. However, started in 2014, the UNDP became very busy with the implementation of the MRPA project and the SPAN project started receiving less attention. As a result, there were delays at UNDP's end in responding to requests from the Project Implementation Unit. This ultimately created implementation delay (TE p.33, TE p.42).

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

The executing agency for this project was the Ministry of Environment, Green Development and Tourism. The TE rates the quality of their execution as between satisfactory and highly satisfactory due to their good adaptive management and the commitment of the staff. This TER rates the quality of project execution as satisfactory.

The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) showed a very good ability to adaptively manage the project, as demonstrated by the following examples. First, and as mentioned above, the PIU was able to increase the emphasis on community engagement despite the lack of focus on this in the project document. The PIU also reduced the number of international consultancies planned, making savings to be used on other aspects of the project. The PIU also took the initiative to "present the findings of the ecosystem services valuation study to different audiences before all reports were finalized, an important move in supporting the passage of the revised SPA Law at its next submission, as well as in strengthening understanding of the overall value of the PA system versus other land use options" (TE p.34).

According to the TE, the PIU staff also “demonstrated high levels of commitment, initiative, and strongly focused on their responsibilities as defined in their personal (weekly, quarterly and annual) work plans which provide the basis for their annual performance assessments. The Project Coordinator especially deserves recognition for her effective leadership of an ambitious project with limited resources. Through successful adaptive management and a high level of commitment, she and the PIU team saw the project through significant administrative changes and challenges, including the shift to a joint PIU for SPAN and MRPA, associated change from NEX to NIM modality, and several changes of government” (TE p.41). Overall, the PIU appears to have had the drive and commitment necessary to carry the SPAN project through and to find creative solutions to the problems encountered.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project met its global environmental objective to enhance effective management and sustainable financing of the protected area system in Mongolia as a whole. Scorecard numbers show tremendous improvements in both financial sustainability and management, which will certainly translate into more and better protected biodiversity in Mongolia. However, at project end, no measures of biodiversity change had been captured to support this claim. (TE pp.46-47)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No socio-economic change was reported as part of this project.

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

Building the capacity of PA staff was an explicit goal of the SPAN project. At project end, PA staff were better able to manage PAs and followed more standardized guidelines, which lead to overall enhanced management effectiveness across PAs. (TE p.48)

b) Governance

At the demonstration sites, the project very successfully engaged local communities and governments through participatory joint management committees. This has set a positive example “of good governance at the local level, bringing a wide variety of local stakeholders together to guide management and resolve land use conflicts” (TE pp.54-55). It is hoped that this example will be noted and replicated by local and national governments as part of future projects necessitating the engagement of communities.

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 were recorded as part of this project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The replication potential of this project is high, and the continuing MRPA project offers an opportunity for scaling up the outcomes of this project. By project end, it had not yet been replicated.

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 report presents the following lessons learned:

- Capacity building training for communities and local government at demonstration sites was highly effective. It was notable that these stakeholders immediately identified their enhanced ability to collaborate as a major benefit of the project, rather than any material gains.
- The training provided overall was wide-ranging and strong, but a need remains for further training on fund- raising / income generation / management of trust funds. This would strengthen financial sustainability at the site level and facilitate reaching out to new opportunities (eg mining company CSR and biodiversity offsets, etc).
- The legal review process may have benefited from stronger consideration of international experience from countries facing similar conservation / sustainable land management practices in order to inform the proposals. The national legal/policy consultancy team could have strengthened the process through more capacity building for the working groups, and facilitated round table discussions on key issues to help inform policy development.
- The ecosystem services valuation study was an important contribution towards underpinning political support for development of the PA system, which should have continued impact if the results are well used.
- Frequent changes and lack of continuity in the Project Board impacted guidance for the project. While this was largely related to changes in government, it was a problem for project implementation.
- The innovative establishment of a joint PIU and Project Board for the SPAN and MRPA projects was well intended to maximize synergies between these two well-sequenced projects on Mongolia's PA system, as well as to achieve cost efficiencies and to take advantage of the experienced PIU staff and achieve continuity.
- Some key factors enabling successful outcomes for the SPAN project that should be considered in the design and implementation of other PA system projects include:
 - Strong project design during PPG stage;
 - Strong support from UNDP CO at project start;
 - Innovative and highly effective outreach change; ^[L]_[SEP]
 - Engagement of national experts from different government agencies, parliamentary committees and NGOs in legal / policy working groups;
 - Combined approach of demonstrating alternative modes for PA management at site level coupled with national policy / fiscal development, and exposing national policy-makers to real changes on the ground;
 - Substantial large scale effort in capacity building for the PA system; and ^[L]_[SEP]

- Collaborative engagement of local government, communities and other key stakeholders. ^[L]_{SEP}

(TE pp.xi-xiii)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report makes the following recommendations:

Recommendations to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

- Additional support for securing the sustainability of related key SPAN outcomes should be considered by the joint Project Board and planned for after the close of SPAN. Continued dialogue and closer collaboration with Ministry of Finance is critical to progress these issues.
- GIS / GPS training for PAAs has been effective and progressive. A system for continuing professional development of PAA staff should be emplaced by MEGDT to maintain this capacity across the system.
- Systematic M&E for the PA network (“Mong METT”) is being transferred to an online system – this needs to be completed by end of project. UNDP/GEF should document and make available the tailored Mong METT system to inform other countries with similar ambitions (for example, Indonesia).
- Community engagement at the demonstration sites has been effective, and demand is increasing as a result, so MEGDT and UNDP should give serious attention as to how further resources can be made available to maintain community engagement and motivation. Ultimately, this may be most sustainable through making Soum conservation funds available through applying appropriate criteria

Recommendations for future directions underlining main objectives

- A key awareness raising and capacity development need is continued awareness raising through national PA forums and other measures, and reaching out to Aimag and Soum governments to increase understanding of the values of PAs, the successful joint management councils and community co-management at the demonstration sites, and the financing needs and options for PAs. Full use should be made of SPAN experience through study tours to the demonstration sites for lawmakers on PA management and sustainable financing issues.
- While discussed during SPAN, limited progress was made in engaging the mining industry in supporting PA management through options such as CSR scheme contributions and biodiversity offsets. These issues deserve focused attention through a separate project through MEGDT / UNDP as they have potential to release significant financial resources in support of conservation goals. The experience and expertise of NGOs such as TNC should be considered (see for example, Heiner et al. 20131).
- One important proposal made by the MTE and endorsed here, is to establish a mechanism to coordinate inputs from the wide range of players strongly engaged in supporting improvements

to the effectiveness of Mongolia's PA system. These include UNDP and GEF, bi-lateral agencies, NGOs and increasingly, local government.

(TE pp.x-xi)

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?	All project indicators are reported against, and a good assessment of project outcomes and impact is provided in the report.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidence provided is complete. Ratings are clearly justified and well substantiated.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project very clearly assesses the various sustainability risks facing the project, and provides a good assessment of the project's sustainability.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned section very comprehensive, even summarizing the lessons learned sections of the 2013 and 2014 PIR. The lessons learned appear supported by evidence presented elsewhere in the report.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes total actual projects costs, but not project costs per activity. Actual co-financing figures are also provided.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides an adequate assessment of M&E implementation, but the assessment of M&E design is limited.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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.