

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review – ID 458

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		03/04/2010
GEF Project ID:	458		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P044175	GEF financing:	8.19	8.19
Project Name:	Biodiversity & Natural Resource Management	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Turkey	Government:	3.35	3.35
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	3.35	3.35
Operational Program:	OP 2, OP 3, and OP 4	Total Project Cost:	11.54	11.54
IA	The World Bank	Dates		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		July 2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: September 2006	Actual: September 2008
Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 74	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 98	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 24
Rajesh Koirala	Ines Angulo			
Author of TE:		TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months):
Kathleen S. Mackinnon				

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	MS	MS	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	Moderate risk	Moderate risk	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	S	Substantial	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. The ICR consists of a detail assessment of project achievements, strengths and weaknesses of project implementation and execution and lessons learned. The appraisal of this project could be applied to better design and management of future projects.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

There are no cases of GEF funds mismanagement that require follow-up. However, the IEG report recommends visiting the project in a few years to examine the extent to which pending activities such as promulgation of biodiversity law, approval of management plans, and resolution of cross-sectoral issues have been realized.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project appraisal document, the global environmental objective of the project was “sustainable conservation of the biological diversity and ecological integrity of selected forest, wetland, steppe and alpine ecosystems that are representative of Turkey's four major bio-geographic zones. These include the Black Sea and Caucasian mountain region; the Central Anatolian plateau; and the European and Mediterranean regions.”

No change in the global environmental objectives of the project has been reported in the ICR.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

According to the project appraisal document, the development objective of the project was “to establish effective, intersectoral, participatory planning and sustainable management of protected areas and natural resources at four selected biodiversity conservation demonstration sites, and build capacity at the national level to facilitate replication of these activities at priority conservation sites throughout Turkey.”

Based on information presented in the ICR, no change in development objectives occurred.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
<p>The project is relevant to both at global and national level. According to the project appraisal document, the project is consistent with the GEF Operational Programs for Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems (OP2), Forest Ecosystems (OP3), and Mountains (OP4). The project's four sites fall within the Global 200 Eco-regions identified by World Wildlife Fund.</p> <p>The project is consistent with country priorities as well. Turkey ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in 1996, and subsequently prepared a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. According to the ICR, the project addresses three main strategic actions mentioned in the Bank's Country Assistance Strategy. The three strategic actions are strengthening policy and management capabilities of the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MEF), promoting stakeholder participation in project cycle, and involving stakeholders in formulating and implementing a natural resource conservation strategy.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<p>The project had mixed performance. It drafted the biodiversity conservation law and prepared four management plans, but their official approval, and hence implementation, did not take place. The project succeeded in conducting all intended activities for raising awareness, but it failed to have information centers fully operational.</p> <p>The project introduced a participatory strategy to rationalize biodiversity conservation policies. Based on this, a new law for nature and biodiversity conservation has been drafted, consulting broadly with relevant stakeholders, but the law has not been approved for implementation. Four management plans, including plans for management of cultural assets, ecotourism, and grazing, have been prepared in a participatory manner, but only one of them got approval by the time project was completed.</p> <p>A total of 150 small grant projects were implemented for community development. The example of projects includes revolving fund schemes and alternative agricultural practices to reduce grazing, timber harvesting, and water use threats to the protected areas. The ICR notes that the small grants program delivered “modest” socioeconomic benefits.</p>	

In terms of capacity building, the project organized relevant training courses and foreign tours for project personnel, ministry staff, and national and local stakeholders (767 individuals participated in within-country trainings and 182 in foreign study tours). The project identified nine sites for replication of effective management systems and provided support for activities such as raising awareness, setting conservation targets, analyzing risk, and preparing action plans. To facilitate planning activities in protected areas, the project published and distributed a “Management Planning Guide” and a publication on “Best Practices in Protected Areas in Turkey”. The project organized Turkey’s first National Conference on Biodiversity and Protected Area Management, and published “Planning and Management of Protected Areas: The BNRMP Experience.” A firm was hired to provide technical assistance and training to Protected Area Management Authority (PAMA) staff in preparing protected area management plans.

The project established a Biodiversity Integration Committee (BIC) to integrate biodiversity conservation into the forest management plans at three project sites, and it prepared, involving relevant stakeholders, forest management plans for two of the sites. The project facilitated the establishment of a Biodiversity Monitoring Unit (BMU) within the MEF. The project built visitor information centers in three out of four sites, but due to lack of staff the centers are not functional. Although visitor planning was completed, little or no management exists on the ground; as a result uncontrolled tourism still poses a threat at some sites such as Koprulu Canyon.

With respect to raising awareness of key stakeholders, the project facilitated preparation of two national awareness strategies: a National Biodiversity Awareness Strategy and Action Plan (for public awareness on biodiversity) and a Strategy and Action Plan for Capacity Building of Non-Governmental Organizations Related to Biodiversity (NGOSAP). A total of 19 NGOs (11 national and 8 local) participated to prepare the NGOSAP. At the local level, the project developed and distributed brochures, posters, and logos for general public awareness, educational materials for primary school students and an Environmental Education Resource Booklet for use by teachers, NGOs, volunteers. However progress in implementing the strategies was limited.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

Standard appraisals for cost effectiveness such as net present value or economic rate of return were avoided, but according to the ICR, the project was “a very low cost high-impact” GEF project. However there are four main issues related to efficiency of the project. For extensive capacity development of government officials, a firm was hired, but the firm itself took project’s “a great deal of effort” to orient it to provide skills and services of greater relevance. Vehicles for project sites and replication sites were bought at the same time, but due to delays in launching replication activities, vehicles were available in surplus, which were “inappropriately” used by ministry officials. Since piloting activities and replicating activities were not simultaneous, fewer vehicles could have been bought. During the first three years of implementation, achievements were “little”. The project was completed in two more years than originally planned.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

Project’s collaboration with NGO community in most of the activities contributed to build NGO capacity especially in drafting nature protection and biodiversity legislation, participatory protected area management planning processes, and technical assistance on protected area management. The participatory management planning process and the biodiversity database/inventory work introduced through the project are foundations for Natura 2000, which is required for Turkey to enter into EU. Because the nation-wide forest management policy change took place after the BIC initiative was piloted, experience from the project’s initiative contributed to incorporate biodiversity conservation into the revised forest management regulation nationwide. Through small grant program, the project resulted in behavior change of local communities regarding the more sustainable pattern of resource use. The Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) introduced by the project enabled to assess strengths and weaknesses of Turkey’s protected area management network, which could lead to better management of the protected areas. Due to management efforts of the project, Camili was declared Turkey’s first UNESCO Biosphere reserve. The project impacts were significant in Turkey’s interest to align its policy and legal framework for protected area management more closely with the EU. Small grant Program closely related to the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy. Implementation of global best practices in protected area management by the project contributed to the government to align conservation measures with EU policies and institutions. As the protected area management planning was top-down, the project became a platform for the government officials to learn about participatory management practices.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: L
According to the ICR, the government is committed to funding protected areas once management plans are approved, and the plans are being aligned with ministry's own budget processes to ensure that financing would be available for their implementation.	
b. Socio political	Rating: L
As mentioned in the ICR, national government, local government authorities, local communities and NGOs are highly supportive of continuing the project outcomes. One of the key positive outcome project has resulted is the trust between stakeholders (the communities, local authorities and PAMAs), which helps to ensure sustainability of the project outcomes.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
Biodiversity Information Monitoring System (BIMS) has been established and it is operating, but institutional future of the BIMS and further database management responsibilities need to be clarified in legislation. Draft Protected Area legislation has been prepared, but it is not promulgated. According to the ICR, the extent to which good practices of the project is mainstreamed into national and provincial institutions are yet to be observed.	
d. Environmental	Rating: MU
At three of the four project sites, water supply for ecosystems remains a main issue as some other projects draw water on which the ecosystems of this project's sites depend. At one of these sites, Sultan Sazligi, the PAMA has been able to convince local people to release water into the wetland, but as stated in the ICR, the water flow is not sufficient enough to maintain the ecological viability. Similarly, uncontrolled tourism possesses a threat at some sites such as Koprulu Kanyon, and illegal construction within and around project sites still needs to be addressed.	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
As a consequence of the project, nature conservation has been included in school curriculum at national level. According to the ICR, the participatory processes encouraged by the project in preparing the biodiversity law and management plans resulted in greater social cohesion. Local people have been aware of natural resource-based economic opportunities, which were unknown before. Due to influence of the project, there have been increased productive opportunities for women and educational opportunities for children. Income generating activities such as beekeeping, animal husbandry, and craft production play roles in local social development, gender sensitivity and poverty reduction. Awareness raising activities such as publication of guidelines and source book materials have enabled increased knowledge of local people on biodiversity and nature conservation.
b. Demonstration
No example of demonstration is included in the ICR.
c. Replication
The project's good practice had been replicated at nine other sites, with strong local support. This replication provided an opportunity to apply good practice guidelines by the project nation-wide. One of these sites, the Küre Mountains, received a follow-up grant from the Global Environment Facility.
d. Scaling up
As a result of project efforts, biodiversity management has been included in a new forestry regulation, which ensures the biodiversity conservation in all new forest management plans nation-wide. One of the replication sites of the project, Camili, is declared as Turkey's first UNESCO Biosphere Reserve, and 3000 hectares of one of the project site, Igneada, has been declared as a National Park from its original status of conservation area. The project drafted a new law for biodiversity conservation, meeting international standards and involving relevant stakeholders, and the law is awaiting official promulgation.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The proposed co-financing, which constitutes 29% of the total project cost, was materialized. The ICR does not provide discussion on co-financing; however, it could be said that it was essential for the extent of activities carried out by the project.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution. According to the ICR, a firm was hired to design a project, but the output was weak, and the project had to be redesigned. The Bank provided close supervision, and the quality of the project design was “highly innovative and ambitious”, given the institutional and legal context for nature protection in Turkey. ICR considers that the project’s design “over-estimated” management capacity within General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP) and General Directorate of Forestry (GDF), and “underestimated” the manageability of many of the critical issues which were affecting selected sites. The Bank translated the Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) into Turkish and piloted it at the four initial project sites. This improved M&E system, and consequently the performance of the project. Because the MTR concluded that the project performance was unsatisfactory, the Bank provided frequent inputs to help address these shortcomings. A senior Bank staff and government were closely involved in making decision to drop off the construction of park facilities at Köprülü Kanyon National Park. This led project to divert resources in more pressing areas. Through regular field visits in connection with activities related to other projects, Bank staff supervised the project team regularly and frequently. When travel was restricted following September 11, videoconference facilities were used for face-to-face interactions. In order to intensify supervision of procurement and financial management, these responsibilities were transferred to the Bank’s Country Office from the Bank headquarter.
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) MS
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency. According to the ICR, EA focused more on “the most difficult and intractable” rather than on easier issues at the beginning of project. As a result “little” was achieved during the first 3 years of the project. In interest of the government/EA, MTR provided corrections, and their implementation resulted in “significant” improvement of the project performance. It was able to establish “excellent” relationships with the broad conservation community (NGOs and academicians), and worked consistently to develop and disseminate good practice materials. Overall fiduciary compliance was “quite good”, but making commitments and disbursing fund were slow, until sometime after the MTR, because of multiple approvals required. Among the four project sites, two were managed by GDNCNP as National Parks and the other two by GDF as Forest Reserves. One of the challenges faced by the project was achieving consensus between these two Directorates, who had different authorizing environments and institutional cultures. According to the ICR, the PAs managed by GDNCNP was slow to appreciate the challenges and benefits of participatory PA planning and management, and the PAs managed by GDF remained understaffed. The issue of understaffing was repeatedly raised during supervision, but was never fully solved.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects
The ICR reports following lessons learnt from this project: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A project needs to be realistic both in designing and setting objectives and indicators, especially when the project attempts to apply new management practices that require considerable institutional and legal change.2. Institutionalizing change requires a substantial time frame and “buy-in” from different levels of society such as local communities, PAMAs, and decision makers. Such change should begin before the project completes.3. The extent to which capacity was fully mainstreamed within the GDNCNP was limited because of insufficient staffing at the PAMA level and using short-term consultants for some key tasks.4. The Small Grant Programs contributed to build trust and cooperation at the local level by building good will and partnerships, and outreach activities such as the national conference and other collaboration with NGOs at both site and national level helped to advance conservation agenda by strengthening and improving partnerships between government and civil society.

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

<p>5. A project needs to be large enough (in size) relative to the country so that project activities have the visibility to act as a country model for future investments.</p> <p>6. To address cross-sectoral issues that influence outcomes of a project, the Bank could play a much stronger role in integrating GEF supported biodiversity conservation priorities into its larger portfolio through its dialogue with government.</p> <p>7. Convening a conference could be a useful mechanism for engaging stakeholders, establishing a learning network, and disseminating good practice.</p> <p>8. It would be important that future projects related to protected area management and natural resource management apply international good practices.</p>
b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
No recommendation is provided in the ICR.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.
NA

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. 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 a detail assessment of project outcomes and achievement of objectives.</p>	S
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete, and the ratings have been substantiated.</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report contains proper assessment of project sustainability.</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are supported by the evidence, and are comprehensive.</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing, but discussion on co-financing is omitted.</p>	S
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report thoroughly examines evaluation of project M&E system.</p>	S

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.
NA