

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		398	
GEF Agency project ID		UN project ID 344, RAF/92/G32	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Pollution Control and Other Measures to Protect Biodiversity in Lake Tanganyika	
Country/Countries		Burundi, Tanzania, Zambia, Democratic Republic of Congo	
Region		Regional	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 9 – Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGOs were involved, particularly through community education and conservation, but the TE does not include specific names. (TE pg. 27)	
Private sector involvement		Private sector involvement through promotion of tourism and the control of industrial pollution, but the TE does not include specific names of organizations. (TE pg. 27)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 1, 1991 (PMIS)	
Effectiveness date / project start		Expected July 1994 (Pro Doc). Actual August 1995. (TE pg. 27)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 1, 1998 (PMIS)	
Actual date of project completion		July 31, 2000 (TE pg. iii)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		10	10
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		10	10
Total Co-financing		0	0
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		10	10
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2000	
TE submission date		2000	
Author of TE		Stanislaw Manikowski, Lothar Gundling	
TER completion date		October 3, 2014	
TER prepared by		Dania M Trespalacios	
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/A	N/R	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	S
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	HS
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	S

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective is to protect the health and biodiversity of the Lake Tanganyika ecosystem. (Project Document pg. 4) lake Tanganyika possesses perhaps the highest biodiversity of any lake on Earth, and it plays an important role in the economies of the four countries that surround it: Burundi, Tanzania, Zaire and Zambia. The lake's biodiversity is threatened by pollution from sediment and nutrients, industrial pollution, and intensive fishing. (Project Document pg. 3)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document states that the ultimate objective of the project is to demonstrate an effective regional approach to control pollution and prevent the loss of biodiversity of Lake Tanganyika. The development objective would be met by creating the capacity in the four participating countries to manage the lake in a sound and sustainable manner. (Project Document pg. 26) The immediate objectives of this project include investigating the sources and nature of threats to the Lake, developing environmental education programs for stakeholders, establishing a regional framework for cooperation among the four neighboring countries, and developing conservation measures, such as protected areas.

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

There were **no changes** in the Global Environmental and Development Objectives of this project.

#### 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project outcomes are consistent with the GEF Focal Area of International Waters and Operational Program 9 for Integrated Land and Water activities. Lake Tanganyika is the largest water reservoir in Africa, with remarkable biodiversity of worldwide interest and importance, including highly diverse endemic biota, geology and sedimentology. Lake Tanganyika faces serious environmental threats. (Project Document pg. 4, 6)

The project outcomes are also consistent with country priorities. The four neighboring countries- Burundi, Congo DR, Zambia, and Tanzania- have no legal framework for the joint management of the lake or the conservation of its biodiversity (Project Document pg. 5, 6) However, all four countries depend on the lake for drinking water and fisheries, and stand to gain potential tourism benefits. (Project Document pg. 6) The Project Document lists 21 existing projects in Lake Tanganyika that share potential areas of cooperation with this project, indicating widespread interest in the activities of this project. (Project Document pg. 7-8) Other documentation of growing interest in the welfare of Lake Tanganyika: the University of Burundi has developed research capacity on ecological and pollution aspects of the lake; the University of Zambia's Biology Department is interested in working on the lake; the University of Dar-es-Salaam's Biology Department has begun research on lake fisheries. (Project Document pg. 9)

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

Project outcomes are commensurate with the expected outcomes, and adequately address the problems the project was intended to improve The TE lists all of the project objectives and expected outputs and activities, records when and whether each activity was scheduled and executed, and discusses the results and conclusions of the six major objectives explicitly. (TE

pg. 37-85) However, the TE does not provide specific ratings for the objectives, quite possibly because this practice was not standardized during the Pilot Phase of projects.

Immediate objective 1 was to establish a regional long-term management program for pollution control, conservation and maintenance of biodiversity of Lake Tanganyika. Outputs included an Inception Report on Lake Tanganyika's ecosystem, demography and sociopolitical situation, and a Lake Tanganyika Strategic Plan to guide a future management program. The TE reports that both the Inception Report and the Strategic Plan were completed successfully. The Inception Report compiled information about the biodiversity of Lake Tanganyika, the impact of sediment discharge and pollution, the socioeconomics of its inhabitants, and relevant legal and institutional features, and informed the Strategic Action Plan. (TE pg. 39) The Strategic Action Plan was produced in 1996 and approved by all four countries in January 1998. (TE pg. 45) The TE states: "the creation of conditions allowing national ownership of the Strategic Action Program is one of the project's greatest achievements". (TE pg. 8-9)

Out of 25 specific activities prescribed under objective 1, only 2 were not carried out, and 1 activity was begun but not completed. An initial attempt at prioritizing conservation areas in the Lake was not possible, because there was insufficient evidence to justify the designation of some Lake areas as needing more protection than others. (TE pg. 43) Community consultations by NGOs were not carried out because plans for these were "too premature", but local NGOs did participate in the project work plan and maintained close work relationships. (TE pg. 43) Finally, the review of demographic trends and dialogue with lakeshore communities was not completed as scheduled due to instability around the Lake, but it activities were begun in 1999 in Burundi and Congo. (TE pg. 39)

Immediate objective 2 was the formulation of regional framework for cooperative management of the lake environment, including a review of existing laws and regulations, and recommendations for a harmonized framework of environmental legislation. All four activities under this objective were successfully completed. After two years of workshops, the project succeeded in producing a binding Convention that would guide national legislation adjustments in all four countries. (TE pg. 50)

Immediate objective 3 was the establishment of a program of environmental education and training for Lake Tanganyika and its basin, including training for park managers and technical staff, organizing teacher groups in local schools, offering fellowships to students working on the Lake, and producing printed material for communities. The TE notes that the environmental education program was performing well, so far as it was involved in trainings, workshop organization, preparation of work programs, and awareness building in villages. (TE pg. 52) 339 personnel from 49 government institutions participated in these activities, 11 students were sponsored, and many lake stakeholders such as fishermen and farmers participated. (TE pg. 54) However, the environmental education campaigns in Congo and Burundi were begun only in 2000, towards project end. And the TE notes that the effect of the program is still

unknown. (TE pg. 52) Most importantly, the TE notes that awareness alone is insufficient for improvements in resource management:

“The current agricultural and fishing practices damaging the lake environment cannot be perceived as merely the results of ignorance or absence of environmental awareness. They should be considered as an optimum achieved by a farmer or fisherman given his situation. Change of behavior should be perceived not as an act of good will that will follow an awareness building campaign, but as a result of a decision that will leave him better off. The EE analysis should provide the authorities with managerial options and not only with advice.” (TE pg. 53)

Immediate objective 4 was the establishment of tested mechanisms for regional coordination in conservation management of Lake Tanganyika basin, including: installing an effective communication system and organizing regular meetings of the Steering and Technical Committees; and preparing a Lake management system for approval. The project established a complex structure of several operative bodies, including a Regional Steering Committee, four National Steering Committees, a Project Coordination Unit, and National Working Groups. The TE reports that the project installed an effective communication system between the Project Coordination Unit and the four national stations, and that all important technical documents and modifications to the project work plan were analyzed by the Steering Committees. (TE pg. 55) The project organized frequent workshops and common training sessions, which helped to create informal regional links among national institutions and their staff. (TE pg. 55)

Immediate objective 5 was the completion of ‘specific studies’ that would add to the understanding of the lake and provide the baseline and framework for long-term research and monitoring programs. The topics of these special studies include: the biological consequences of sediment discharge; the consequences of chemical pollution discharge; the consequences of fish exploitation; the structure of biodiversity with an emphasis on proposed protected areas; and examination of other relevant sectors that affect Lake Tanganyika. The TE reports that all of these planned studies were completed successfully, and that many of them yielded important knowledge results with immediate implications for the Strategic Action Plan. (TE pg. 66-80)

Immediate objective 6 was the implementation of the Strategic Action Program. This was one of the most ambitious objectives, and one of the least successful. The project succeeded in implementing 7 out of the 18 specific activities of this objective, including the consolidation of a pollution monitoring program, and the recommendation of new lake reserves. (TE pg. 81- 84) The project did not implement 11 out of 18 specific activities. These included the establishment and implementation of four underwater reserves, and the development of mechanisms to ensure local participation and cooperation. (TE pg. 84-86) The TE explains that these activities were purposefully not implemented by the project:

“Extension of the existing parks to the Lake by creation of underwater reserves would require that hundreds of local fishermen change their practices. The project felt that before recommending to displace people, it should better understand the need for reserve

creation. Namely it should understand better what habitats the future reserve will include, what species depend on them, and these species unique to the Lake. ... it is only now, after this long process of training and surveying that the project may more confidently recommend creation of underwater parks. The final project report will contain these recommendations.” (TE Pg. 84-85)

The TE concludes: “two months before project termination, the project realized most assigned activities and is in the process of delivering the attained outputs.” (TE pg. 3) Out of more than 80 specific activities, the project did not execute 13. 11 of these activities were purposefully not executed, because information produced in the initial stages of the project made evident that there was not sufficient information to establish and implement protected areas. The TE also mentions that delay in project implementation and insecurity in Congo and Burundi made it impossible to put in practice the programmed regional cooperation and to launch environmental education campaigns in these last two countries. (TE pg. 3)

Despite significant political constraints, difficult working environments, and many challenges, the project successfully implemented the majority of its expected objectives. It successfully established a regional long-term management program for Lake Tanganyika, it formulated a regional framework for cooperative management of the lake in the form of The Convention, and it created regional coordination structures. (TE pg. 21-22) Thus, the project is rated satisfactory.

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

The project established an efficient and complex organizational structure that accomplished most of the planned objectives by project end. The project’s budget remained steady at \$10 million USD, despite a project delay of more than a year due to difficult political and environmental challenges. There were delays in project implementation, due to a shortage of qualified national staff, initial low country ownership and engagement, and civil unrest. (TE pg. iii, 2, 43) The Strategic Action Plan was lacking an evaluation of its cost effectiveness and an assessment of acceptability by stakeholders, which was noted during the terminal evaluation as a project shortfall. (TE pg. 47) Neither the project nor the terminal evaluation include an assessment of cost-effectiveness. With the information available, it may be concluded that project efficiency had moderate shortcomings that in part caused significant project delays, and thus is rated moderately satisfactory.

4.4 <b>Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unlikely</b>
---------------------------	------------------------------------

The TE concludes that project's effort will likely be continued well after its end, because the project “did the most to assure the national and regional ownership of its products. (TE pg. 19) The project trained national staff, equipped national laboratories for lake monitoring, and aligned national technicians and decision makers to prepare the Strategic Action Program and

Convention. The achievements of the project are significant. However, the sustainability of these achievements faces significant risks.

**Environmental Risks – Moderately Unlikely** The Lake continues to be under increasing severe pressure. Overpopulation, increasing deforestation and land degradation from unsustainable agricultural practices cause increased eutrophication and sedimentation of the Lake.

**Financial Risks – Unable to Assess** The TE does not discuss financial resources that may be available to continue the activities of this project.

**Institutional Risks – Moderately Likely** There is still much work to be done to ensure the continued implementation of project results. The TE lists necessary steps that must be taken to ensure the implementation of the management plan: endorsement of the priorities by the government; incorporation of the Plan into the national development and investment programs; and preparation of specific implementation proposals and investment projects. (TE pg. 9) The cooperative activities established between government authorities, scientists, stakeholders, NGOs and the private sector are expected to continue under the framework of a regionally cooperating organization. (TE pg. 27) The TE also notes that the participating countries must preserve the vast information accumulated by the project and continue the research and implementation structures animated by the project, lest the momentum and the staff be lost. (TE pg. 56) The project's legal and institutional baseline study concluded that the existing legislation relevant to sustainable management of the Lake is obsolete or incomplete. (TE pg. 40)

**Socio-Political Risks – Moderately Unlikely** All four countries face significant challenges that might delay or deter project continuity. (TE pg. 9)) Political and military instability of the region bring thousands of refugees that depend on the Lake and the shore lands resources. (TE pg. 24) Burundi and DR Congo both suffer periodically from political and military conflicts, their Lake populations practice unsustainable agricultural practices, and there is little to no community involvement in Lake conservation. (TE pg. 40) Tanzania and Zambia are both politically stable states with some degree of community organization and development programs, and some degree of protected area management, but the local populations in both of these countries are still not actively involved in conservation (TE pg. 39-40) the populations living around the Lake frequently ignore the harm they are doing to the land and indirectly to the Lake by inappropriate agricultural practices. (TE pg. 24)

In its conclusions, the TE recounts that the project's results were achieved in very precarious security conditions, in very poor countries, in a situation of uncertainty and strong competition for extremely limited governmental resources. The TE states that “the project itself did not propose a detailed program to achieve material self-sustainability of the Lake protection programs, but it indicated the ways to achieve it”. (TE pg. 19)

There are significant risks that will affect the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after project completion, including lack of financial resources, socio-political instability, lack of institutional capacity, and severe environmental pressures. Although it is very possible that the Strategic Action Program and the Convention will guide management and legislative actions for Lake conservation in the future, there are many potential risks to this. Thus the sustainability of this project is rated as moderately unlikely.

## 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?

This project is fully funded by the GEF, and does not involve any co-financing.

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 were significant delays in project implementation and completion. Execution of the whole program was disturbed by civil unrest in Burundi and DR Congo and, in consequence, by limited access to the lakeshore areas. (TE pg. iv) The TE also mentions a lack of specifics in the Project Document in the criteria for staff choice and evaluation. (TE pg. 38) As a result, the project end date was extended from October 1998 to July 2000. Although the project was significantly delayed, it seems most were eventually completed by project end.

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 TE reports that there was little country ownership at the start of the project, because the participating country governments were not fully aware of the project's objectives and working program. (TE pg. 6) In response, the Project Management began to build awareness among the host governments about the Lake's environmental problems and the role of the project. (TE pg. 6) Country ownership increased during project implementation, particularly when the project launched national discussions about the Strategic Action Plan and the Convention.

As country ownership increased, governments supported the project by sending their administrative staff to participate in project meetings, technical personnel for realization of the project work plan, and providing laboratory facilities and offices. (TE pg. 5) The government's project perception considerably improved after an Inception Workshop in March 1996. The workshop's quality and the sense of ownership developed by the member countries created a momentum that helped launch and execute most of the project's program. (TE pg. iii) The project's National Steering Committee and National Working Groups also promoted national participation, although both had a lack of continuity in their working programs. (TE pg. 4)

The TE reports that, in spite of the prevailing insecurity conditions and conflicts between the riparian states, representatives of all four countries worked well together in a spirit of collaboration and harmonization to achieve project objectives. Technicians, resource managers and policy makers from all four countries participated in technical workshops and worked together in regional TDA, SAP and Convention meetings. (TE pg. iv, 5)

The TE concludes that governments' involvement in the project was characterized by "a steady increase in sharing the project's goals, and contributing to realization of the project's objectives." (TE pg. 5) As a result, the four riparian countries designed new and unprecedented



regional working programs and common legislative instruments designated to the Lake protection. (TE pg. 6)

Thus, sustained country ownership significantly affected project outcomes, by mobilizing resources and enabling the conditions for the project's success.

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The Project Document prescribes a very thorough and exhaustive monitoring and evaluation process. (Project Document pg. 39) Monitoring and evaluation activities include:

- an annual Tripartite review, conducted jointly by representatives of the governments, executive agency, and UNDP;
- a Project Performance Evaluation Report, prepared and submitted by the Project Coordinator during the Tripartite Reviews;
- the project's Technical Committee would review the project's technical progress with the National Working Group 3 times during the first year, every 6 months thereafter;
- an independent GEF/UNDP Supervision Mission that would review overall management progress and the achievement of targets 3 times during the first year, every 6 months thereafter;
- a major review of the project every 12 months;
- a project evaluation every 26 months, and four months prior to scheduled termination; and
- a project terminal report.

The Project Document includes a detailed budget that allocates \$70,000 during the life of the project to monitoring and evaluation activities. (Project Document pg. 42) The Project Document prescribes a monitoring and evaluation process that includes specific targets. However, specific indicators for each of the expected outcomes are not prescribed.

Monitoring and evaluation design at project entry is rated satisfactory.

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

From the documents consulted by the TE in Annex III, it may be observed that the project completed *at least* the following monitoring and evaluation activities:

- 13 progress reports (TE pg. 33)
- 2 Tripartite Reviews (TE pg. 33)

- Midterm Evaluation Report (1998) (TE pg. 27)
- 2 Project Implementation Reviews (PIR, 1998, 1999) (TE pg. 29)
- 3 Project Performance Evaluation Report (1996, 1997) (TE pg. 35)

According to the TE, the project program monitoring was assured by UNOPS. The UNOPS was strongly supportive of the project, helping to overcome activities implementation difficulties, and clarify national involvement. It kept the project informed about progress in administrative arrangements. (TE pg. 3-4) After of the two Tripartite reviews introduced new and constructive elements into the project's program execution. (TE pg.4) The first Tripartite Review recommended the creation in each country of a National Steering Committee, which was subsequently implemented, in addition to the Regional Steering Committee. Each of the six meetings of the Regional Steering Committee played an important role in evaluation of the project results, proposals, and validation of the work programs. (TE pg. 4)

The TE concludes that the management, monitoring and backstopping were helpful, supportive and important in implementation of project activities. (TE pg. 4) Therefore, the implementation of monitoring and evaluation is rated highly satisfactory.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

This project was implemented by the UNDP, together with the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). The TE reports that the UNDP/GEF helped the project in solving technical and organizational issues, and that the UNDP Offices of Burundi, Tanzania and Zambia attentively followed the project's progress, advised the project staff, and contributed to the Regional Steering Committee and Tripartite Review decisions. (TE pg. iii, 5-6)

However, the TE generally reports a less than satisfactory performance in project implementation. The project's implementation was delayed due to: a slow process of identification of key national institutions to be involved in the project's execution; a shortage of qualified national technical staff in the Lake shore stations; a low awareness of the project activities and the importance of the conservation of Lake Tanganyika; and civil unrest, particularly in Burundi and DR Congo. (TE pg. iii, 2, 43) The TE also mentions that a lack of specifics in the Project Document about the criteria of staff choice and evaluation caused project implementation delays. (TE pg. 38)

The project implementation responded to the lack of knowledge and awareness on the part of national entities regarding the importance of lake conservation. By mid-project, country ownership had increased, and as a result project implementation improved. However, the implementing agency could have foreseen the importance of local support, and could have begun an awareness campaign from the start of activities. As a result of project delays, the project ended two years after its expected completion date. Thus the quality of project implementation is rated as moderately satisfactory.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---	-----------------------------

The project was executed by a consortium of consulting firms led by the Natural Resources Institute. (TE pg. 27) The NRI implemented a complex project structure, composed of financing and implementation bodies, a Regional Steering Committee, a Project Coordination Unit, a National Steering Committees, and National Working Groups. (TE pg. 56) NGOs were involved in community education and conservation, and the private sector was involved in the promotion of tourism and the control of industrial pollution (TE pg. 27) In addition, the following groups were part of the NRI consortium: the Pollution Studies Centre in Burundi, the Limnological Centre in Tanzania, the Education and Training Centre in Zaire, and the Biodiversity Studies Centre in Zambia. (TE pg. iv)

The TE reports that the NRI provided experienced and dedicated staff and competent consultants to project execution. (TE pg. iv) The financial management of the project was localized in the NRI Consortium, and was separate from the Project Management unit, which alleviated the Project Coordination Unit from everyday administrative tasks and allowed staff to focus on technical issues. (TE pg. 3) It is notable that, despite the delay in project completion, there were no additional funds required to achieve most of the original objectives.

It seems that the project structure implemented by the project was useful beyond the completion of the project, since the main organizational bodies became permanent institutions. The Regional Steering Committee became the Conference of the Parties, and the Project Coordination Unit and the four field stations became the Lake Tanganyika Authority with its Management Committee and Secretariat. (TE pg. 62)

The TE states that the success of the project is largely related to the involvement of national institutions in planning of outputs and realization of activities. The project encouraged this involvement by creating national partner structures such as the National Steering Committees and the National Working Groups. (TE pg. 62) Thus the project was able to secure country ownership and stakeholder participation, increasing the likelihood of the project’s success and sustainability over time.

The TE notes that the project management successfully responded to a changing and difficult environment. After identifying low government and stakeholder involvement, the project succeeded in building awareness about Lake’s environmental problems, and increasing local participation and government buy in. By project the end, the four riparian countries joined the project in designing new and unprecedented regional working programs and common legislative instruments designated to the Lake protection. (TE pg. 6) Political instability in the region and lack of access to almost half of the project sites required “many ad hoc arrangements

and endurance in pursuit of objectives”. (TE pg. 6) The civil unrest in Burundi and DR Congo considerably delayed execution of planned field activities. (TE pg. 2)

The TE concludes that, despite “remarkable obstacles” and “adverse conditions”, the project succeeded in achieving many of its objectives, including the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, the Strategic Action Program, and drafted the Convention on the sustainable management of the Lake. (TE pg. iv, 6)

Project execution succeeded in achieving most of the project objectives, progressively adapted to changing conditions, successfully adhered to the monitoring and evaluation plan, and demonstrated minor shortcomings despite significant political and environmental challenges, and thus is rated satisfactory.

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The TE does not document any changes in environmental stress or environmental status as a result of this project. The project produced necessary information regarding the ecological and socio-economic conditions of Lake Tanganyika, and built the capacity for regional sustainable management of the Lake. But management plans have yet to be implemented.

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 increased local environmental knowledge regarding the Lake’s resources and threats, and trained many technicians on lake ecological reconnaissance. But the TE does not provide any evidence of changes in human well-being as a result of this project. It is possible that the capacity building results of the project may result in human well-being in the future, but there is no evidence of this occurring by project end.

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) Changes in capacities:

- Compilation of information about the biodiversity of Lake Tanganyika; the impact of sediment discharge; pollution and its effects on biodiversity; social and economics aspects of the basin inhabitants; and legal and institutional features. These documents are exhaustive, extremely well presented and very instructive. (TE pg. 39)
- The project assessed capabilities of the host countries' institutions and the staff that may be important for the work program and interested in the project. (TE pg. 38)
- Inception Workshop held in Dar es Salaam in March 25 to 28, 1996, attended by about 50 delegates from the region, UNDP, GEF, UNOPS, PCU and NGOs. The workshop contributed to: the creation of a common understanding of the Lake Problem by the participants; liaisons among the stakeholders, attendees and the project management; design of an indicative work plan for special studies; and creation of a sense of ownership of the program on the part of country delegates. The Inception Workshop resulted in the Inception Report that was assessed and adopted by the Regional Steering Committee. (TE pg. 41)
- Various workshops identified main biodiversity problems, their causes, and potential management actions and priorities. The national workshops respected a common analytical approach that helped develop a coherent regional program. (TE pg. 46)
- The first detailed sedimentation study of Lake Tanganyika was conducted, which proved that sedimentation is the primary risk to Lake biodiversity. (TE pg. 67)
- The project developed a pollution database that will be finalized in June and contribute to the Strategic Action Program. (TE pg. 68-69)
- Twenty-four technicians and researchers from universities, fisheries departments, national parks and other institutions were trained to dive and identify fish and mollusk species. (TE pg. 85)

b) Governance- laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes

- The Strategic Action Plan for Lake Tanganyika management was approved by all four countries in January 1998, in a Regional Steering Committee meeting. (TE pg. 45) The management objectives situated within the overall biodiversity conservation goal were defined in a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA). The TDA was used to set priorities for actions to address in the SAP. The four countries developed a common analytical approach helping bring together national conclusions into a regional framework. (TE pg. 46)
- Series of workshops held between February 1998 and May 2000 produced a binding Convention that will serve as a framework for national legislation adjustments. (TE pg. 49-50)
- Permanent governance institutions were created and remained after project completion. The Regional Steering Committee became the Conference of the Parties, and the Project

Coordination Unit and the four field stations became the Lake Tanganyika Authority with its Management Committee and Secretariat. (TE pg. 62)

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.

The TE does not record any unintended impacts in 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 following are project activities that have been mainstreamed throughout all four project member countries. Broader adoption has been established.

- The Strategic Action Plan for Lake Tanganyika management was approved by all four countries in January 1998, in a Regional Steering Committee meeting. (TE pg. 45) The management objectives situated within the overall biodiversity conservation goal were defined in a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA). The TDA was used to set priorities for actions to address in the SAP. The four countries developed a common analytical approach helping bring together national conclusions into a regional framework. (TE pg. 46)
- Series of workshops held between February 1998 and May 2000 produced a binding Convention that will serve as a framework for national legislation adjustments. (TE pg. 49-50)
- Permanent governance institutions were created and remained after project completion. The Regional Steering Committee became the Conference of the Parties, and the Project Coordination Unit and the four field stations became the Lake Tanganyika Authority with its Management Committee and Secretariat. (TE pg. 62)

## 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 lists the following lessons that may be applicable to other GEF projects:

- Increasing the visibility of the project and increasing country ownership of the project was very important to the project's success. It mobilized the ministries to collaborate in regional priority setting and drafting of regionally binding laws. (TE pg. 8)
- The Inception Report notes the importance of involving local people at the start and through the duration of environmental education programs, since this will promote the long-term sustainability of the project. (TE pg. 42)

- The sustainability of environmental projects depends on how much the public, the business community, and decision makers have learned about the project achievements and to what extent they are ready to change their attitude toward the environment. The success in the message transmission and its adoption by the population depends on many factors, including local cultures, traditions and taboos. (TE pg. 23)

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE lists the following recommendations applicable to other GEF projects:

### [On Stakeholder Participation]

- Future research or applied research efforts aiming at Lake biodiversity protection should involve stakeholders. The results of applied research should contribute to solving specific practical problems. (TE pg. 8) Future UNDP/GEF projects should incorporate into their working programs activities that will help them follow the project's perception by the key stakeholders. (TE pg. 8)
- Future projects should actively involve the communities in conservation. This should be achieved by developing a participatory diagnostic process that provides local communities with sufficient incentives to be involved in the project's programmed activities. (TE pg. 40)
- The national authorities should evaluate the level of awareness of the concerned stakeholders, as this will indicate the effort needed for awareness-raising, the stakeholders to address, and inform the authorities about the most appropriate tools. (TE pg. 16)

### [On Effectiveness]

- Incorporating applied research that will be immediately helpful to users. One potential mechanism for this may be a periodic check between research and managerial staff to generate constructive and practical approaches. (TE pg. 23)
- The government and donors should incorporate recommendations and lessons from the project's launched environmental education program into other development activities in the Lake Tanganyika region. The expected benefits to Lake protection of the planned projects should be one of the criteria for their funding priority. (TE pg. vi)
- The Project Management and National Coordinators should facilitate the creation of national structures charged with implementing the Authority's decisions on the national level. These structures can act as a counterpart to the regional initiatives launched by the Authority, and transmit national preoccupations to the Authority. (TE pg. vii)

### [On Ensuring Sustainability]

- Future projects sponsored by GEF should compare the expected costs and benefits from financed research. (TE pg. 8)
- Future projects that wish to continue project activities after project end should include a mechanism to incorporate these activities into government programs, and should provide for an evaluation of their cost effectiveness and assessment of their acceptability by citizens. (TE pg. 47)
- The project should have clear visibility, particularly the results that may have short and medium term impact both on the countries' citizens' welfare and the environment. (TE pg. 17)
- The project should identify donors that may support the next phase of the Lake Tanganyika biodiversity protection project. (TE pg. 20)

- The project should systematically monitor the results of their actions, potentially by maintaining a database of information transmission techniques and their success. (TE pg. 23)
- Projects may wish to trace trained staff after project termination and evaluate the use of the acquired knowledge after the project termination. (TE pg. 23)
- In order to increase the project's impact, and sustainability of the results, each country should design one institution that will become the custodian of the documents, databases and other valuables materials produced by the project. These documents and information should be easily available to all interested persons and institutions. The designated institutions should be charged to translate the pertinent documents into local languages and produce extension material. (TE pg. 24)
- Social studies aiming at reducing impact of human activity on the Lake's biodiversity should be attached to any project dealing with sustainable management of the Lake and its catchment. The present project should identify the most appropriate institutions within the region that may continue to collect and analyze the information from all social and socio-economic studies. (TE pg. viii)



## 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 lists all of these specific objectives, outputs and activities, records when and whether each activity was scheduled and executed, and discusses the results and conclusions of the six major objectives explicitly. (TE pg. 37-85)	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE does not provide ratings, perhaps because none were demanded during the Pilot Phase of the GEF. But it does evaluate the performance of the project adequately. The report is internally consistent and convincing.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE adequately addresses project sustainability throughout the document. However, the TE does not address project exit strategy.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence of project experiences, and they are comprehensive.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not include the actual project costs by activity, and does not discuss co-financing. The TE only includes the total project costs.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does discuss the project's M&E activities, but does not do so in a deliberate and organized manner. The Project Document prescribed a thorough and complex M&E system which is not discussed in the TE. Evidence of M&E activities are gathered from the Annex III of consulted documents.	U
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

$$0.3 \times (6 + 5) + 0.1 \times (5 + 6 + 2 + 2) = 3.3 + 1.5 = 4.8$$

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

The only documents available to the TER writer were the Project Document and the Terminal Evaluation.