

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form**

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 505		Review date:		
IA/EA Project ID: 459		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Mountain Areas Conservancy Project (MACP)	GEF financing:	10.60	NA
Country:	Pakistan	IA/EA own:	1.50	NA
		Government:	0.75	NA
		Other*:	5.95	NA
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	8.20	NA
Operational Program:	OP4	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	18.80	NA
IA	UNDP	<b>Dates</b>		
Partners involved:	Min. of Environment, Local Government and Rural Development	Work Program date		NA
		CEO Endorsement		Feb 1999
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		March 1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: Nov 2005	Actual: UA
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: Lee Risby	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 79 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: UA	Difference between original and actual closing: UA
Author of TE: Tortell, Nizame, Spergel, Zaman and Shafiq		TE completion date:  Aug 2006	TE submission date to GEF OME:  July 2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date:  11 months

\* 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**

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	S	NA	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	NA	NA	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	NA	MS	NA	MU
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

No. The terminal evaluation report does a good job of analyzing the performance of M&E system in terms of its design and implementation. The exposition on other sections, however, has gaps.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

No such issue has been mentioned.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES****3.1 Project Objectives**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?</b></li> </ul> <p>According to the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) the objective of the project is “to protect and ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity in Pakistan’s Karakoram, Hindu Kush, and Western Himalayan mountain ranges through application of a community-based conservation paradigm.”</p> <p>According to the terminal evaluation and the PIR there has been no change in the global environmental objective of the project during its implementation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?</b></li> </ul> <p>According to the PAD the immediate objectives of the project was “establishment and effective long-term management of four community-based wildlife Conservancies covering wide ecological landscapes and zoned for multiple uses, backstopped by an enabling institutional, policy, regulatory, and financial framework.”</p> <p>According to the terminal evaluation and the PIR this has not changed during project implementation.</p>
<p><b>3.2 Outcomes and Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?</b></li> </ul> <p>According to the terminal evaluation the project produced satisfactory global biodiversity benefits due to appropriate site selection that has contributed to conservation of species and ecosystems endemic or in some other way unique to the mountains of Pakistan.</p> <p>It further informs that the project also had an impact at the community level – it has raised awareness of the value of natural resources such that perceptions among the communities have changed; village communities are now think about sustainability of the resource rather than simply their immediate needs; they are also more amenable to balancing their needs with those of the ecosystem so as to ensure the latter’s survival. The project has also had an impact on the mountain environment of Pakistan and continued support to the project activities will build upon these gains. High country pastures are being rested, stock numbers are being reduced, forests are not being cut down for firewood, habitat and environment is being protected.</p> <p>The terminal evaluation also reports following impacts: the spread of the Valley Conservation Committee (VCC) and the conservancy approach to other valleys; the model wildlife legislation for NWFP which stands to be emulated in other jurisdictions; the commitment by the Government of Pakistan to fund a US\$8 million project to consolidate and follow-up on the work of MACP; the improved relations between communities and Government agencies.</p>

#### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

<b>A Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
The project is within framework of operational program 4 of the Biodiversity focal area. This program focuses on conserving the mountain ecosystems. Since the project aims at ensuring sustainable use of biodiversity in Pakistan’s mountain ranges through application of a community based conservation paradigm, its expected outcomes are consistent with the GEF’s global environmental objectives.	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<p>According to the terminal evaluation, the indicators selected to track progress towards achieving project objectives were not appropriate. After making this qualification, it concludes that the project did make satisfactory progress towards achievement of project objectives. It reports that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results of awareness and motivation work are excellent. However, more work needs to be done on helping the local communities appreciate the ecological principles better.</li> <li>- Satisfactory progress was made towards achievement of village eco-development component.</li> <li>- Eight valleys have benefited from the sustainable resource use and livelihoods component under the project – the terminal evaluation suggests that such initiatives need to be taken up in other areas as well to sustain the interests of the valley conservation committees of other areas. It suggests that more efforts are required to further diversify the livelihood base of the valley communities and the initiatives should also take</li> </ul>	

<p>into account marketing requirements for livelihood activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project has been able to draft various legal instruments and has trained government personnel. However, the proposals made by the project are yet to be accepted by the government. Thus, the project has not succeeded on this dimension to the extent expected.</li> <li>- Expectation that a biodiversity fund will be in operation and will be contributing towards meeting the recurrent costs of conservancy management has not been fully met.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) <span style="float: right;">Rating: S</span></b></p> <p>The project was completed with a delay of about a year. However, terminal evaluation does not indicate that the delay negatively affected project efficiency. The approaches used in the program aim at seeking greater involvement of the local communities in conservation of the globally important local biodiversity resources. The project has also established mechanisms that will facilitate sustenance of the interest of the local institutions in protecting local biodiversity. Overall, it seems that the project has been efficient and cost effective.</p>

#### 4.1.2 Impacts

<p>According to the terminal evaluation the project has produced satisfactory global biodiversity benefits by the virtue of appropriate site selection. It has increased awareness of the local community on conservation of local biodiversity. As a result, high country pastures are being rested, stock numbers are being reduced, and habitat is being protected. However, the evidence presented in the terminal evaluation to support these conclusions is thin.</p>
---

**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= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

<p><b>A Financial resources <span style="float: right;">Rating: ML</span></b></p> <p>According to the terminal evaluation report the assets of the biodiversity fund are now valued at US \$ 3.0 m. However, they need to increase to \$ 5.0 million for the fund to become operationalized. However, there is a risk that the GEF investments in this fund might be returned if the commitment to increase the assets of the fund to \$ 5 m is not met.</p> <p>Local funds, including both valley conservation fund and women's conservation fund, were established at the village level and at the time terminal evaluation was drafted their combined value was US \$ 0.37 m. The communities are also depositing all the proceeds from the trophy hunting fees, fines levied by the communities and compensation under the customary law, to these funds. A share from the proceeds of timber sales and rent of community owned pastures is also being deposited. Thus, at the local level arrangements have been made to reduce financial risks.</p>
<p><b>B Socio political <span style="float: right;">Rating: L</span></b></p> <p>Although the terminal evaluation indicates that the project faced socio-political hurdles during implementation. However, these hurdles are rooted in the local context. At a more macro level the socio-political support for such activities is adequate. For example, Government of Pakistan has committed to fund a US\$8 million project to consolidate and follow-up on the work of MACP. This shows that socio-political risks to the gains made by the project are low.</p>
<p><b>C Institutional framework and governance <span style="float: right;">Rating: ML</span></b></p> <p>Although the state institutions that address wildlife conservation issues are sufficiently strong, the local community institutions are weak and it may not be possible to address this in the short to medium run just by increasing the financial investments. This said the terminal evaluation indicates that efforts on education and awareness and creation of community level funds may help in sustaining interest of local communities in conservation activities – thus reducing the local governance related risks.</p>
<p><b>D Environmental <span style="float: right;">Rating: L</span></b></p> <p>No such risks are foreseen in terminal evaluation.</p>

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

##### a. Production of a public good

The project contributed to conservation of biodiversity in the mountainous regions of Pakistan. It built institutions that are promoting and will promote biodiversity conservation and has increased awareness of the local communities on biodiversity conservation related issues. It has also contributed towards developing the local livelihoods base.

##### b. Demonstration

##### c. Replication

According to the terminal evaluation report the Palas Conservation and Development Project (PCDP) in Indus Kohistan has used MACP as a model for community based conservation institutions. Government agencies have used this experience to design other biodiversity conservation projects to facilitate recovery of key species. Similarly the valley endowment fund (to pay for conservation expenses) approach has been replicated by the WWF through conservation projects in Bulahshbar and Qarambar valley.

#### d. Scaling up

#### 4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

<b>A. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MS</b>
The M&E design included in the PAD includes project objectives and outcomes, the corresponding indicators, targets, and the risks involved. However, some of the chosen indicators are not appropriate to track progress of the project and time frame for achievement of results was not specified for indicators.	
<b>B. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MU</b>
According to the terminal evaluation during project implementation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- During implementation resources devoted to M&amp;E were reduced based on the premise that M&amp;E could be addressed better as a crosscutting theme of other components. However, this did not happen and M&amp;E activities were not adequately integrated in the project framework.</li> <li>- The information from the M&amp;E system was not used in an effective manner.</li> <li>- Despite lack of legal basis the local communities have been effective in monitoring compliance with the protection norms.</li> <li>- The survey and monitoring results are not sufficiently reliable to gauge project's success in protection of endangered species.</li> <li>- A participatory monitoring framework would have helped the valley conservation committees to report according to their objectives and identify areas which were still unaccomplished or weak/strong.</li> </ul>	
The terminal evaluation rates the performance in implementation of the M&E system to be marginally satisfactory. However, the observations made across various sections of the report seem to suggest that there were substantial flaws in the implementation of the M&E system.	
<b>C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document?</b>	
Yes.	
<b>C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation?</b>	
No. The budget for M&E activities was curtailed with the hope that M&E activities could be integrated in other project components. However, the actual integration was inadequate.	
<b>C.3 Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b>	
No. The indicators specified to track performance were not appropriate. The resources for M&E activities were curtailed as a result of which the M&E activities suffered. Information from M&E system was not used for adaptive management.	

#### 4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b>
The terminal evaluation lists following lessons:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attractive economic incentives, such as the income received from trophy hunting and ecotourism, provide good reasons for communities to take a keen interest in conserving their natural resources. These incentives may, however, not be sufficient by themselves in achieving this.</li> <li>2. The economic incentives derived from sustainable use of natural resources must be based on a "portfolio" of resources to ensure an equitable spread of benefits among various communities and valleys.</li> <li>3. A gender balanced team at all the levels (including at decision making levels) is important to ensure meaningful participation of women and the poor in project interventions.</li> <li>4. Community empowerment is a continuous process requiring patience, time and resources translated into concrete actions and follow up.</li> <li>5. The conservancy approach as such is based on the principle of integrated management of natural resources which inevitably should engage all the related actors.</li> <li>6. The number of village/valley based organizations created by various donors can actually hinder community empowerment if it is not well-coordinated and linked.</li> </ol>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. The MACP tripartite partnership between government, communities and a non-government organization, has encouraged a new culture of mutual trust and accountability.</li> <li>8. There should not be a generalized response to address constraints to participation of women, but the circumstances of each situation should indicate the right course of action.</li> <li>9. A wide catchment of stakeholders must be given the opportunity to participate during the project formulation stages so as to ensure a feeling of ownership among prospective partners and other stakeholders.</li> <li>10. Without an adequate system for collecting and evaluating data to monitor the progress that has been made and to assess reasons for success or failure, community based NRM and biodiversity conservation projects may not hope to achieve sustainable benefits.</li> </ol>
<p><b>List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation</b></p> <p>According to the terminal evaluation following conclusions should facilitate follow up action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More work needs to be done to facilitate the communities in understanding the ecological principles;</li> <li>2. In order to ensure that the knowledge created during implementation of the project is not lost after project closure, there is a need for a knowledge sharing strategy.</li> <li>3. A gender balanced team should implement such project so that greater participation of women could be ensured.</li> <li>4. If there is a follow up project, it is unlikely to start right away and the time gap could be substantial. Therefore, the project – even when there is a follow up phase – should have an exit strategy.</li> <li>5. Log frame should be used as a planning and diagnostic tool. The M&amp;E design should establish indicators, targets, timeframes, resources, and responsibilities.</li> <li>6. Conservancy boundaries should be revised and made compatible with administrative boundaries.</li> <li>7. A stronger emphasis is required for linkages and synergies at valley level with government functionaries, civil society organizations and the private sector. The project should establish formal arrangements with different line agencies for the provision of services to the communities.</li> <li>8. The MACF articles of association should be amended to more clearly and unequivocally limit the permissible activities that it can fund to the recurrent costs of conservancy management and to the MACF's administrative costs.</li> <li>9. Key documents should be translated in Urdu for wider dissemination. A final validation of experiences workshop should be organized with the participation of project personnel and community members to identify and record lessons from the project.</li> </ol>

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** 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 the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.</b>
None

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	S
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b>	MS
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b>	S
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>	S
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The terminal evaluation does not present any information on actual project costs and cofinancing mobilized. The terminal evaluation was completed before project completion. Even so, it should have provided information on progress made till that point.	U
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b>	HS

**4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.**

<b>Co-financing and Project Outcomes &amp; Sustainability.</b> 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, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
Unable to assess
<b>Delays and Project Outcomes &amp; Sustainability.</b> If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
The expected duration of the project was about 6 years. It was completed with only a year's delay. Given the complex nature of the project due to its implementation context, this is just a moderate delay. For the most part it does not seem to have affected project outcomes and sustainability. The only area of concern has been inadequate mobilization of cofinancing for the biodiversity fund due to which there is a risk that the GEF contribution might be returned.

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

<b>Yes:</b>	<b>No: X</b>
-------------	--------------

<p>Explain:</p> <p>The terminal evaluation report presents a fairly detailed account and analysis of the outcomes and M&amp;E system of the project. The provided information seems to be sufficient.</p>
---

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

PIR 2006, PAD
---------------