

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4204	
GEF Agency project ID		P120623	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Support to the Global Tiger Summit Hosted by the Russian Federation	
Country/Countries		Russian Federation	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-1, BD-3, BD-4, BD-5	
Executing agencies involved		All Russia Institute for Nature Conservation and WWF-Russia	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		WWF-Russia (joint executing agency), Wildlife Conservation Society (NGO partner), Save the Tiger Fund (NGO partner)	
Private sector involvement		n/a	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 29, 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		November 10, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 31, 2011	
Actual date of project completion		July 31, 2011	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	n/a	n/a
	Co-financing	n/a	n/a
GEF Project Grant		560,000	481,782
Co-financing	IA/EA own	416,000	367,448
	Government	440,000	1,140,000
	Other*	50,000	50,000
Total GEF funding		560,000	481,782
Total Co-financing		906,000	1,557,448
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1,446,000	2,039,230
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		1/30/2013	
TE submission date		3/28/2013	
Author of TE		Serguei Milenin	
TER completion date		February 5, 2014	
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

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

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The ultimate goal of the project is to restore the global population of wild tigers, which are nearing extinction due to poaching of tigers and their prey as well as habitat loss from land conversion and urbanization. Because tigers are the largest top predator in Asia and require large land areas to range in, the health of the species can act as an indicator for the health of its whole ecosystem. This MSP is in support of the Global Tiger Initiative, which was launched by the World Bank, the GEF, and other partners in 2008 and has since become an alliance of all 13 tiger range countries (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Russian Federation, Thailand, and Vietnam) along with international organizations, civil society, and the private sector. The goal of the Global Tiger Initiative is to double the amount of wild tigers by 2022, the next Year of the Tiger, and in the meantime reduce habitat losses and losses from poaching. The Global Tiger Recovery Program is the vehicle to enact this goal, and it is based on National Tiger Recovery Programs based in each tiger range country. The Global Tiger Recovery Program will scale up four activity groups necessary to tiger conservation: 1) protected area management to render the sites where tigers breed inviolate from human activity, with connections from these breeding sites to green corridors and buffer zones; 2) technology for monitoring and forensic science to control poaching and reduce encroachment on tiger habitat; 3) community engagement to gain local support for conservation, compensate for losses from wild tigers, and education programs; and 4) cooperative management between countries with tiger ranges that cross borders.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The MSP objective was to prepare and run the Global Tiger Summit in St. Petersburg in November 2010, which was chaired by the Russian Prime Minister. The Global Tiger Summit brought together heads of state from tiger range countries to endorse and launch the Global Tiger Recovery Program, a multifaceted strategy to increase the tiger population in Asia. This project would therefore enable Russia, as a tiger range country, to make substantive contributions to the Global Tiger Recovery Program. To that end, the project would:

- I. Assist in the development of the Russian inputs to the Global Tiger Recovery Program, especially addressing transnational habitat management and the prevention of the illegal

- wildlife trade, as well as supporting the strategic follow-up on the implementation of the decisions made at the Global Tiger Summit.
- II. Finance some of the operations of the Global Tiger Summit and provide logistical support for its preparation.
- III. Promote the Global Tiger Summit to the media and the public. This would include several different activities to disseminate information, such as photo exhibitions and youth events, among many other events.

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

No changes were made to project activities or objectives.

## 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 MSP supports Biodiversity objectives BD-SP1 for protected area financing, BD-SP3 for protected area networks, BD-SP4 toward strengthening policy, and BD-SP5 for governance and enforcement measures. Tiger habitat conservation is relevant to Sustainable Forest Management, including SFM-SP1 for financing, SFM-SP2 for protected area networks, and SFM-SP4 for policy. By aiding the creation of the Global Tiger Recovery Program, the project promotes financial tools and resource mobilization for habitat conservation and management, policy tools for regional protected area networks, mainstreaming with economic development, and consolidating enforcement and governance measures.

This project also coincides with national priorities. It builds on already-existing Russian conservation programs and policies, such as the National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan. It directly addresses the following priorities of the Action Plan: conservation of rare species, public outreach and awareness raising, environmental education, and informing the public about biodiversity threats. By arranging and promoting the Global Tiger Summit where the Global Tiger Recovery Program will be adopted, the project will also indirectly support many other priorities of Russia's conservation strategies, including monitoring, financing, and economic mechanisms for conservation, among others. The MSP will also support the update of the National Amur Tiger Conservation Strategy, preparation of

Russia's National Action Plan, and will help Russia to meet its international commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

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

Effectiveness is rated Highly Satisfactory. The MSP achieved all of its objectives and met its outcome indicators. Its purpose was to set up, promote, and run the Global Tiger Summit held in St. Petersburg in November 2010. The Summit was attended by top-level political figures of tiger-range countries, including the Prime Ministers of Russia, Bangladesh, China, Lao PDR, and Nepal; the President of The World Bank Group; the GEF Chairperson; and other top officials of donor and development organizations.

For the preparation and launch of the Global Tiger Summit, the MSP produced several multimedia publications on tiger conservation issues for Summit delegates as well as the public and press, supported the finalization of Russia's National Tiger Action Plan, supported the Technical Working Group and Drafting Committee, and organized a Youth Forum and Youth Presentation.

The Global Tiger Summit launched the Global Tiger Recovery Program, with the goal of doubling the wild tiger population before 2022, the next Year of the Tiger. The Recovery Program will address poaching and the illegal wildlife trade, smart green infrastructure development, and transnational habitat management by scaling up four activity groups in each tiger range country: "Critical Landscape and Protected Area Management, Technology for Wildlife Protection, Community Engagement, and Cooperative Management of International Landscapes." The Global Tiger Summit demonstrated the political will of tiger range countries to conserving the environment, provided strategic programming for tiger conservation, created a system to strengthen conservation institutions through capacity building, cooperation, and knowledge sharing, and mobilized political support and financial resources for tiger conservation. Overall, the Global Tiger Summit was a huge success and milestone for tiger conservation, and it was made possible by this MSP.

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

This project was highly cost-effective considering the returns and outcomes of the Global Tiger Summit. All objectives were met, with the GEF spending less than expected (although this was more than made up for in greater than expected co-financing.)

One source of project efficiency is the wide-ranging effect of conserving the tiger population. Because tigers are Asia's largest top predators and require a large amount of forested land for their habitat, protecting the tiger also protects other threatened species and improves the health of the ecosystem as a whole. Therefore this relatively small, targeted investment—which led to substantive commitments and engagement from top policymakers, strengthened collaboration among all of the stakeholders

involved, and suggested additional conservation financing sources—will provide an array of ecological benefits.

The MSP was less efficient in terms of time. Although the Global Tiger Summit and the events preceding it were completed on schedule, the project took several months longer than expected to close. The terminal evaluation report explains that the delay was needed to “process logistical payments after the Summit and to complete the audit,” but no other details were provided on the delay. This did not affect the completion of project activities or outcomes.

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

The terminal evaluation report cites a moderate risk to the project’s development outcomes because of their dependence on government commitment, national ownership, and the transformation of political will into on-the-ground institutional decisions. The political risk is somewhat lessened since the Global Tiger Recovery Program was based on country priorities, such as Russia’s National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan, so the Russian government and other tiger range countries were already firmly committed to tiger conservation. In addition, there is now an international architecture in place to support these government commitments and address their needs, which will enable long-term financing arrangements and the institutional framework necessary to sustain the operation of the Global Tiger Recovery Program. Moreover, the Recovery Program contains aspects to promote capacity building, cooperation, and knowledge-sharing, which will strengthen conservation institutions for the long term.

Several donors have already confirmed significant financial commitments to the Global Tiger Recovery Program, including the World Bank, European Commission, WWF, and Wildlife Conservation Society. As of September 2011, the total of confirmed financing amounts to \$67.9 million, and tentative funding commitments that were declared at the Global Tiger Summit amount to much more (about \$370 million from the World Bank, ADB, GEF, WCS, Germany, USA, GTF, and Leonardo Di Caprio). So a certain level of financial sustainability is assured toward enabling and continuing the project outcomes over the next several years.

The CEO approval document claims that the sustainability of the project is not at risk from environmental factors such as climate change, but instead that “the global climate change agenda offers new opportunities for supporting the protection of forest habitats.” However, the effects of climate change may put tiger habitats at risk of further destruction,<sup>1</sup> and neither the MSP nor the terminal evaluation report addressed this as a risk that could erode the benefits of the Global Tiger Recovery Program.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Wildlife in a Changing Climate,” Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO Forestry paper 167, <http://www.fao.org/forestry/30143-0bb7fb87ece780936a2f55130c87caf46.pdf>.

## **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?

According to the list of key outputs in the terminal evaluation report, co-financing went toward the following purposes: co-financing made up the majority of the money spent to run a Youth Forum in Vladivostok as well as a Youth Presentation at the Global Tiger Summit; part of the money spent to organize a special National Geographic photo exhibition on tigers; part of the support to the Technical Working Group of the organizing committee; most of the support to the Drafting Committee to prepare documents for the Global Tiger Summit; and most of the money spent on media promotion for the Global Tiger Summit and its goals. Therefore, co-financing was an integral part of the MSP because of its support in public promotion of the Global Tiger Summit, in integrating youth, and doing part of the technical work for organization and document drafting for the Summit.

The co-financing total was greater than expected because some of the GEF-budgeted activities were covered by the Russian government instead, which allowed the GEF grant to be reduced. But this did not affect the project outcomes, as the same activities were covered as planned.

**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 ended a few months later than expected. Despite that, project activities for the preparation and completion of the Global Tiger Summit were completed on schedule. The need for the delay in project closure was due to the time needed to "process logistical payments after the Summit and to complete the audit." The delay does not appear to have affected project deliverables or 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:

Project sustainability is largely dependent on country ownership. Although this MSP brought about transnational commitments that were built on national priorities for tiger conservation, the political will demonstrated by Russia and the other tiger range countries at the Global Tiger Summit must be turned into on-the-ground decisions regarding protected area management, conservation financing, and law enforcement against the wildlife trade in order to implement the goal of doubling Asia's wild tiger population. The Global Tiger Recovery Plan launched at the Summit was designed with country ownership in mind, as it was based off of the tiger range countries' already-existing National Tiger Action Plans. With the advent of the Global Tiger Summit, the regional and global infrastructure needed to support these plans was created, but country governments must continue to take the lead in reversing the decline of tigers.

## 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: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

The MSP was not monitored by project proponents, but instead by the interagency National Organizing Committee, which monitored all of the government and GEF activities for the Global Tiger Summit. The CEO approval document explained that the National Organizing Committee contained World Bank representatives and that monitoring and evaluation would follow standard World Bank requirements for medium size projects. Perhaps because of this, the CEO approval document did not have a budget, timeline, baseline, or a description of the logistics. It did have output indicators and sources of verification.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Unable to assess</b>
------------------------	---------------------------------

The terminal evaluation report does not discuss M&E, except to give it a Satisfactory rating without any description. The rating is not explained and M&E is not mentioned anywhere else in the report.

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

Project design was highly satisfactory in creating a project that helped raise global awareness for tiger conservation while strengthening coordination among tiger-range countries and assisting Russia in its technical plans for tiger conservation.

The World Bank supported the All Russia Institute for Nature Conservation and WWF-Russia in designing this MSP and facilitating communications related to the Global Tiger Summit. The terminal evaluation reports that supervision was close due to “the high political profile of the event and its strategic significance.” The only flaw in implementation was the delayed project closure due to payment processing and the audit, but it is not clear where the fault lies for this.

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

Both the All Russia Institute for Nature Conservation and WWF-Russia completed the project activities at a satisfactory level to meet project objectives on schedule. The only problem mentioned was that the All Russia Institute’s Director changed twice during the course of the project, which caused occasional gaps in decision-making authority but did not significantly harm project objectives. The terminal evaluation report mentions that that project execution was “demanding on Recipients as it involved extensive coordination at the highest level of the government.”

## **8. Lessons and recommendations**

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

The terminal evaluation report states that "valuable experience in organizing the Summit on technical, staffing, communications, financing, and other issues will be used by the GTI in establishing procedures and activities for the following high level implementation reviews of the Global Tiger Recovery Program." The report does not describe the specific lessons learned.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

As noted above, the terminal evaluation report states briefly that its experiences will be valuable and useful for other Global Tiger Initiative and Global Tiger Recovery Program activities, but does not describe any specific recommendations. The Grant Reporting and Monitoring Report suggests that the tiger range countries and any international partner organizations should align all current and new activities with the St. Petersburg Declaration and the Global Tiger Recovery Program.



## 9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report explained the outcomes and impacts thoroughly and comprehensively, with the cost and co-financing of each project activity explained.	<b>Satisfactory</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and substantiated its ratings in most cases. However, more explanation on the project delay is needed and ratings for M&E are unsubstantiated.	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability assessment examines some of the potential risks to the outcomes of the project, but it is lacking in detail and does not contain any assessment of environmental risks, including the effect that climate change will have on tiger habitats.	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The report does not describe any specific lessons learned, but only states that its experience running the Global Tiger Summit will be useful for other related initiatives.	<b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report gives a list of key outputs produced by the MSP, including the cost supplied by the GEF and co-financiers for each item. However this list does not include information about which co-financier supplied the money for each activity, so it was more difficult to assess the value of individual donors.	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Although the report gives project M&E a "Satisfactory" rating, there is no description, evidence, or justification to back it up. The M&E for this project was not handled by the project managers but instead by the National Organizing Committee, which may explain the lack of information.	<b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>

TE Quality =  $(.3*(5+4)) + (.1*(4+1+4+1)) = 3.7 = \text{MS}$

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

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