

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		406	
GEF Agency project ID		244	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		African NGO-Government Partnership for Sustainable Biodiversity Action	
Country/Countries		Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		STRM – Short Term Response Measures	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		secondary executing agency; one of the beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement		No involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		2/4/1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		3/20/1998	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		5/5/2003	
Actual date of project completion		5/5/2003	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.214	
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.330	
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	7.117	
Total GEF funding		4.544	4.52
Total Co-financing		7.117	7.476
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.661	11.996
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		1/31/2003	
TE submission date		4/1/2003	
Author of TE		Jonathan Timberlake and Dennis Fenton	
TER completion date		10/07/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
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	S	S	N/A	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	N/A	N/A	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/A	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project as stated in the PD (pg.31) is “to conserve all globally important biodiversity sites in Africa in the Important Bird Area process”. The International Bird Area process involves application of internationally agreed criteria to identify globally significant sites for biodiversity conservation at the national level, followed by a cycle of monitoring, action and advocacy to ensure the conservation of these sites. The project will use birds as biodiversity indicators. National teams will identify sites (IBAs), agree on priority for action, and then monitor their conservation. IBAs are identified with the objective international criteria, resulting in a comprehensive set of sites of global biodiversity significance, and encompassing all the major biomes in Africa. Since 1994, national institutions in an Africa-wide network have been collaborating in the IBA process (PD, pg.1).

The project will result in local efforts to protect critical sites for birds and other biodiversity and will also train and empower the conservation community, at national and regional levels, to advocate widely for change towards more sustainable use of natural resources (PD, pg9).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Immediate Objective of the project is “to enhance biodiversity conservation in Africa through local and national NGO-government partnerships in the Important Bird Area process” (PD, pg.31).

This project will scale-up the process continent-wide by developing existing national programmes in 10 of the 18 countries: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia and Uganda (TE, pg.3). Regional coordination and sharing of skills will be enhanced, and the institutional structures consolidated to permit the expansion and replication of the process in a further suite of African countries (TE,pg.11).

At the end of the project, there will be active partnerships in 10 African countries collaborating in the monitoring and conservation of all the most important sites for biodiversity in each country. National systems will be established for regular monitoring, advocacy and site-specific action to ensure the conservation of all sites in perpetuity. There will be cadres of trained government and NGO staff and well-established community groups and volunteers taking responsibility for monitoring of individual sites, in close liaison with the national NGO-government partnership, and staff, communities and

volunteers will have received training and experience (PD,pg.14). Public understanding and awareness of the IBA programme will also be a key component of the project’s success.

The Logical Framework (PD, Section D) describes the 7 following project outputs:

- (1) NGO-government partnerships for Important Bird Areas established and functioning in all 10 participating countries.
- (2) Collaborative national (NGO-government) programmes functioning to monitor and conserve Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in all participating countries.
- (3) Conservation of national IBAs achieved through local monitoring, site action and advocacy programmes.
- (4) Local and national NGO and government capacity built to sustain all activities in the Important Bird Area Process.
- (5) Strategy and mechanism in place to ensure sustainable long-term funding for Important Bird Area conservation in all participating countries.
- (6) Regional structures established and functioning to exchange information and expertise and to support development of IBA programmes in new countries.
- (7) Increased regional awareness of the IBA approach and expressions of interest in launching national IBA programmes in a further 10 countries.

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

The TE reports that the project has “evolved since its original formulation and moved on from the original immediate objective” (TE, pg.7). However, the TE does not mention what has evolved and what were the changes in objectives or activities. The PIR does not mention any changes in objectives and/or activities.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project’s goal is to enhance biodiversity conservation in Africa by identifying, monitoring and advocating for the protection of key habitats through NGO-government partnerships in the Important

Bird Area process. This was identified as a relevant Short-Term Response Measure (STRM) for the GEF, as the project seeks to prevent environmental degradation by encouraging and strengthening partnerships to address problems at the regional level through scientifically sound cost-effective measures. The project also constitutes to the fulfillment of the obligations of the Convention on Biological Diversity by the countries involved, especially with regard to articles 3 (preventing damage to the environment), article 6 (cross-sectoral integration of biodiversity conservation), article 7 (the identification and monitoring of critical components of biodiversity), article 8 (in situ conservation and development of protected areas network), and article 13 (promoting and encouraging understanding of biodiversity conservation) (PD, pg.13).

Moreover, the process of identifying and describing Important Bird Areas (IBA) was ongoing in many countries across the region before the project started. The BirdLife Africa Partnership of national NGOs was implementing this process with support from the BirdLife International Secretariat (TE, pg.10).

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

Overall, the project was a “well-executed, innovative and successful regional project” (TE, pg.13). It was effective in channeling international assistance on conservation down to the local level.

Most of the outputs were achieved. However, according to the TE (pg.4) “the project was perhaps too ambitious, both conceptually and in terms of expected outputs, but the individual national partners and the NGO partnership rose to the challenge”. The TE states that better results might have been achieved if fewer countries had been involved, thus enabling more focused coordination and support. The project design did not take into consideration the degree to which partners had made progress on the relevant issues. In some countries, the partners were poorly organized at project inception, and had not received prior funding from other organizations. However, all NGOs had the same activities to accomplish (TE, pg.4) and this led to differences in accomplishment among countries.

Progress is detailed further along each of the project outputs:

Regarding output 1 (*NGO-government partnership for IBA established and functioning*), the implementation varies across countries but overall the achievements are satisfactory. Most partnerships have been developed and will be sustained. The project has helped government bodies to increasingly rely on the NGOs partners for technical support related to conservation.

Regarding output 2 (*Collaborative national (NGO-government) programmes functioning to monitor and conserve IBAs*), the achievements are moderately satisfactory; the project has contributed to the improvement of the overall body of technical knowledge on birds and IBAs. However, collaborative programmes are functioning only in a few countries.

Regarding output 3 (*Conservation of national IBAs through local monitoring, site action and advocacy programmes*) the achievements are rather satisfactory given that this output was ambitious. According to the TE, innovative site actions have been initiated in all countries and will be successful models. Funds have been leveraged to ensure sustainability of these actions. However, the TE states that monitoring and advocacy is weak, and site action is very site and country-specific.

Regarding output 4 (*Local and national NGO and government capacity built to sustain all activities in the IBA process*), the achievements are highly satisfactory. All the national NGOs have developed, they have expanded their network, and their capacity.

Regarding output 5 (*Strategy and mechanism in place to ensure sustainable long-term funding for IBA conservation*), the achievements are also satisfactory. The project has established strong linkages between local and international actors, which, according to the TE, is important for NGO sustainability and for long term funding. This was due to the blending and balance between activities such as training, planning, management, partnership, field survey and implementation of conservation action (TE, pg.14). According to the TE (pg. 18) “the project is estimated to have made a high contribution to leveraging over US\$ 4.5 million in co-funding for related actions”.

Regarding output 6 (*Regional structures established and functioning to exchange information and expertise*) the achievements are satisfactory. The network across the countries is strong and productive. There is exchange of ideas and knowledge among the region. The project activities could have been carried out as 10 separate national projects. However, the TE believes that “the regional co-ordination and role of the BirdLife International Secretariat greatly enhanced both the value and impact of the project, and could only have taken place through a single, regional project” (TE, pg.23).

Regarding output 7 (*Regional awareness of the IBA approach created and expressions of interest made for the launch of national IBA programmes*), the achievements were also satisfactory. The project played an important role in regional biodiversity planning initiatives. For example, 38 African countries have now some involvement in the African Partnership and another 8 candidate partners have been directly helped by the partner NGOs.

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

According to the TE, project implementation was “generally smooth with activities being carried out in a cost-effective manner” (TE, pg.4). This was mainly due to the involvement of dynamic, committed and competent individuals at both national and regional levels, the sense of national ownership and the strong base of the BirdLife Partnership. The national partners of BirdLife International gave good mentoring and support, even though the TE states that more strategic guidance to partners could have been provided (TE, pg.4).

The project may have been too ambitious to achieve its objective in 5 years, especially given the known very low starting points for some national partners (e.g. Cameroon, Sierra Leone, Ethiopia) and organizational/legal problems (e.g. Tunisia, Ethiopia).

However, overall the project finished its activities on time, and most expected activities were completed. The use of NGOs proved cost-effective and time-efficient. The national NGOs had a good credibility thanks to the direct contractual relationship with the UN. In many cases, this project exposed them for the first time to international planning, management and reporting standards, thereby increasing their capacity (TE, pg.15).

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

The overall sustainability of the project is rated Moderately Likely for the following reasons: Support for the continuation of project outcomes is not assured in most areas. It appears, from the TE information, that in many cases the stakeholders are willing for the project to continue, but they do not know who will take the initiative, if the project should be expanded to include other countries, or who will fund it. This greatly depends on the country; in some countries, sustainability of project outcomes is not assured, and in other cases, such as Kenya and Burkina Faso, the project is likely to be transformed into a national mechanism to get NGO input into national policy debate (TE, pg.19).

Environmental Sustainability: (Unable to assess)

According to the TE, there are concerns on the sustainability of conservation impacts (pg.13). However, there is no other information provided on environmental sustainability.

Financial Sustainability: Likely

In this project national partners had to leverage additional funding in order to achieve one of the main project outputs - conservation action on the ground. According to the TE (pg.3), “most did this well, leading to greater organizational confidence and sustainability”. The project was small in financial terms at a national level; therefore it forced NGOs to secure other funding for conservation activities. This increased their capacity for fund raising and hence sustainability.

Socio-political sustainability: Moderately Likely

Potential success of site support groups and local communities’ involvement depends on national political and site circumstances, as well as on their own composition, structure and aspirations. Many of those groups still require input of time and funding to maintain. Therefore, a strategy is required to make them independent of significant external support and to ensure conservation objectives continue to be met (TE, pg.5).

Institutional sustainability: Moderately Likely

Many national partners were transformed in their approach to conservation and strengthened; however, some of the smaller ones remain fragile because they depend on a few committed individuals and an unreliable stream of donor funding (TE, pg.4). Both national and international NGO partners functioned well, however there are concerns on the fragility of national NGOs and sustainability of conservation impacts (TE, pg.21). The TE states that the project provided institutional support to 10 indigenous NGOs, covering in part operational and start-up costs. In most countries, this was done with a clear exit mechanism to ensure the NGO did not become dependent on GEF support (TE, pg.19).

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 GEF contribution to the project was US\$ 4.52 million (including PDF A and PDF B activities). According to the approved GEF Project Brief and UNDP Project Document, project co-financing was US\$ 7.117 million. The main sources of this co-financing are the BirdLife International Partnership, RSPB, European Union, UK/Darwin Initiative and the UK Overseas Development Administration (TE, pg.10).

The project was small in financial terms at a national level and high in targets, therefore, NGOs had to secure other funding for conservation activities (TE, pg.14). A further US\$ 571,365 was leveraged by the implementing NGOs in the period Jul 2001 to June 2002 bringing the total amount leveraged by the NGOs since the project started to US\$ 4,971,634. In addition, contributions from the main co-financing agents, mainly RSPB and Sida and fund-raising efforts at secretariat reached US\$ 2,504,680 bringing the total co-funding and leverage funding to US\$ 7,476 million (PIR, pg.12).

According to the TE (pg.15), a factor in the project's success was the co-financing provided by the RSPB; "Not only did this support significant organisational development in the concerned partner NGOs, it also very flexibly financed activities (e.g. training) that GEF was unable to finance".

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?

Project activities started in 8 of the 10 countries in the second half of 1998. Tunisia and Sierra Leone could not start project implementation in 1998 and started approximately 15 months later. In Sierra Leone there were in-country security problems and in Tunisia there was internal organizational problem. Sierra Leone was able to catch up while Tunisia was unable to catch up in terms of delivering all the outputs in the available time. Therefore, a six months extension was requested by the relevant NGO with no budget increase (PIR, pg.10). By January 2003, all the other partner countries had completed their planned activities (TE, pg.10).

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 in this project was very strong. All countries played an equal role in project implementation, and benefited equally from project inputs (TE, pg.15). The partnership and contractual framework created a strong national and regional ownership of activities. According to the TE, the team identified in each country and each agency was very competent, dynamic and committed, which was one of the main factors in project success.

Generally, national governments do not trust NGOs, their motivation, their source of funding and sometimes of their members. However, this project was successful in breaking down that distrust to a significant extent in a number of countries (e.g. Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Cameroon); *“Conservation NGOs are now seen more as partners than as competitors for funds”* (TE, pg.20).

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The M&E design at entry is rated as moderately unsatisfactory. A detailed logical framework is given in the PD, and all the steps of the M&E system are given with an attributed budget (PD, pg.50). Two technical advisors were appointed by UNOPS to provide independent perspectives on project management and implementation. They would provide inputs for the Tripartite reviews and the annual work plan (PD, pg.60). Two project evaluations were also planned at entry, one evaluation at the end of year 2, and one at the end of year 5.

However, according to the TE, the relationship between outputs and activities was not clear. For example, it was unclear if the project aimed at individual capacity building, or at improving NGO-government relations, or at achieving conservation impact. The indicators in the logframe were not always useful, for example the indicator “conservation status maintained”; it is not clear if this refers to legal status or species/habitat status (TE, pg.14). Moreover, the indicators in the logframe were not sufficient for monitoring project progress or impact. According to the TE, the project monitoring mechanisms were extremely complex; each country had to prepare bi-annual progress reports (for UNOPS), annual Tripartite Review reports and annual financial audits

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

The M&E implementation is rated Moderately unsatisfactory.

At the end of each operational year of the project, APRs were completed and national tripartite reviews (TPRs) held in each of the 10 project countries. All APRs and TPRs were filled (PIR, pg.16). Decisions at the national level were taken through national tripartite review meetings and meetings of NLC. According to the TE, these mechanisms were effective and efficient. Annual Internal Reviews were also held in each country (TE, pg.15).

However, as mentioned previously, the indicators in the logframe were not sufficient for monitoring project progress or impact. Based on these, BLIS prepared annual progress reports (for UNOPS) and annual Project Implementation Reviews (for UNDP/GEF). In addition, annual internal reviews were also done, though not by national project staff. Reports on APRM and PLG meetings were also available. Therefore, this complex monitoring system resulted in a vast volume of documentation (TE, pg.15).

Each report had many recommendations, but there was no direct follow-on to many of these recommendations. All those documents were not precise and were repetitive, and the preparation of these represented a significant amount of time and resources (TE, pg.16).

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
--	--

UNDP was the implementing agency. UNDP played an important role in project development, appraisal and approval. Once the project began, UNDP’s role was principally to provide technical backstopping, overall guidance, and trouble-shooting. UNDP also had the responsibility in disseminating project lessons and ensuring their uptake in the global conservation community (TE, pg.11).

Overall, the TE found that project implementation was satisfactory but there was a poor communications strategy for project results and achievements. Although the project management

recognized this weakness early on, and requested direction from the Mid-Term review on this issue, no remedial measures were taken (TE, pg.14).

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

The project was executed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). All project activities were implemented through sub-contracts; to BLIS and to the BirdLife partners in the 10 countries. The regional coordination activities were realized by BLIS. According to the TE, this approach to execution lowered the number of project inputs and facilitated project administration (TE, pg.14).

Overall execution was very smooth; the project finished its activities on time, and most expected activities were completed. The TE believes that the use of NGOs proved cost-effective and time-efficient. Each national NGOs had a direct contractual relationship with the UN, therefore their credibility increased. Moreover, the BirdLife Secretariat was very good, spent funds well, and was very supportive of the project and activities (TE, pg.14).

One of the issues however, is that too much time and attention was spent on project management, the allocation of project resources could have been more strategic and focused on the weaker partners that could not readily obtain support elsewhere. Although regional activities were good (workshops, networking), technical support to individual partners was weaker (TE, pg.16).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The IBA process has contributed to biodiversity planning and action in all countries, including influencing the NBSAP development . IBAs have been identified in the 10 countries, 77 of them prioritised as Critical. Bird conservation is now on the national agenda of a number of countries (TE, pg.17).

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.

A number of people in SSGs have increased their capacity to organize themselves for activities such as income generation (TE, pg.18). No further details is given in the TE on socio economic changes.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project has made contribution to the overall body of technical knowledge of birds and IBAs in the 10 countries (TE, pg.17).

The project provided institutional support to 10 indigenous NGOs, covering in part operational and start-up costs. These national NGOs have developed, increased in credibility and influence. They also have increased technical, managerial and administrative capacity (TE, pg.18). Some NGOs have become the national focal points for bird-related issues (e.g. Kenya, Ethiopia, Ghana); in some countries they have become a focal point for biodiversity conservation issues, and through the GEF project they have credibility in the eyes of the biodiversity community (TE, pg.25).

The project prepared many guidelines and toolkits for national conservation actors. These are generally of high quality, but it is not clear how applicable they are in every case or whether they are in fact being used (TE,pg.18). 17 regional workshops held (TE, pg.25).

b) Governance

No governance impact are reported in the TE and in the PIR.

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 impact are reported in the TE and in the PIR.

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 project allocated only very limited seed funding to this, and Partners were expected to leverage funds from other sources. Innovative site action has been initiated in all countries, and looks to be a successful model in many of them. Much funding has been leveraged. BirdLife South Africa used the project to help leverage a further 12 site-action projects (TE, pg.18).

Many of the countries have used the capacity and resources developed through the project to develop firm relations with funders. A large number of mainly small projects have already secured funding, many of them at IBAs identified through the project. The project is estimated to have made a high contribution to leveraging over US\$ 4.5 million in co-funding for related actions (TE, pg.18).

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 following lessons are given in the TE (pg.28):

- (1) It is possible for GEF and others to think globally but act locally in international co-operation projects. If the right partners are carefully selected, it is possible to construct a network stretching from the global to the local level. However, in such a complex network, the involvement of a range of partners will inevitably lead to some trade-offs and confusion.
- (2) Channelling international assistance for biodiversity conservation through national non-governmental organisations can be very effective and efficient. A large number of well-designed activities can be implemented well at relatively little cost.
- (3) Ultimately, a cadre of committed, dynamic individuals, focused on a particular topic, is the key to ensuring the success of projects and initiatives. Flexible, dynamic, focused non-governmental structures provide an incentive framework for developing such individuals.
- (4) For a project to be truly regional, it has to develop regional products and a regional view. It should not be a collection of totally national activities.
- (5) Experimental projects with a range of innovative activities can be useful in helping develop successful new approaches to conservation.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following major recommendations are given in the TE (pg.5):

- (1) GEF should continue to work through NGOs for conservation
- (2) further evaluation needs to be done on the success of SSGs and the sustainable role of NGOs in conservation
- (3) monitoring of conservation impact at sites needs to be improved

- (4) a communications strategy needs to be developed to promulgate the IBA approach and activities to the broader conservation community
- (5) core funding is still required for many NGOs
- (6) the good liaison that NGOs have developed with government in each country is built upon; and that conservation targets need to be clearly articulated for each site and kept sight of by management.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains an assessment of outcomes and impacts, however, details are not provided. The achievements for each output are given in a very short way. Therefore more details, and justification for the ratings would have been useful.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is very consistent, and has strong evidences. However, there is no rating provided for any of the category, as these were not a requirement of the GEF at the time.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses project sustainability at a regional level, as well as at the national level. It also gives the exit strategy when one was provided.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are very detailed and supported by the evidences given in the report. The recommendations are also very comprehensive are supported by the evidences.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The actual project costs is given in the TE, however there is not enough details on costs per activity and the breakdown per funding sources.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is well assessed in the report. Details are given on the logframe issues and their consequences, as well as the actions taken to balance those difficulties.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

$$0.3*7+0.1*19= 2.1+1.9=4.0$$

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