

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		53	
GEF Agency project ID		1759	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Transfrontier Conservation Areas Pilot and Institutional Strengthening	
Country/Countries		Mozambique	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		STRM-Short Term Response Measures	
Executing agencies involved		National Directorate of Forestry and Wildlife; Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		through consultation	
Private sector involvement		One of the beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		12/12/1996	
Effectiveness date / project start		5/21/1997	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		6/30/2002	
Actual date of project completion		9/30/2003	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.45	0.45 (Trustee Dataset)
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		5.0	4.69 (Trustee Dataset)
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	0.5	
	Other*	2.6	
Total GEF funding		5.45	5.14 (Trustee Dataset)
Total Co-financing		3.10	0.06
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		8.55	5.20
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		3/30/2004	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Michael John Webster	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Siham Mohamedahmed	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Lee Alexander Risby	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		03/31/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

*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	S	S	MS	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	L	U	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	U
M&E Implementation	U	N/A	N/A	U
Quality of Implementation	S	S	U	S
Quality of Execution	S	S	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			S	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to PIR 2003, “the primary objective of the project is to assist the Government of Mozambique to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for rehabilitating, conserving and managing its unique natural environments and globally significant biodiversity through transfrontier, ecosystem-wide approaches.”

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According the terminal evaluation (TE), the “objective of the project was twofold: “(i) to create an enabling policy and institutional environment for the rehabilitation and conservation of the recipient's natural and biodiversity endowments; and (ii) to assist the recipient in the implementation of community-based natural resource management programs.””

The project had four components (1) Institutional and policy development; (2) Habitat and wildlife management; (3) Community mobilization and pilot programs; (4) Monitoring and evaluation including monitoring of institutional strengthening, biological status, socio-economic and community behavior and project implementation.

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

The project objectives and components were not formally revised, however, budget allocations for the four components changed shortly after the grant became effective. The shift came after loss of Swiss counterpart (SDC) funding that was pledged at grant-signing (grant of \$2.6 million), and the devaluation by \$300,000 of the SDR. The project experienced a slow release of counterpart funding for contract mobilization, however, all counterpart funding was eventually released. The project closing date was extended first from the original closing date of June 30, 2002 to June 30, 2003, and the later to September 30, 2003 due to the slower than expected progress.

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 objectives are relevant to the biodiversity focal area objectives. At the point of its approval the project would have been consistent with the objectives of Operational Program on Forest Ecosystems (OP-3). The project was consistent with the Country Assistance Strategy of the World Bank, as well as with the stated policy of GOM and its development plan, and finally the project is relevant to the National Environment Action Plan.

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

The effectiveness of the project is rated Moderately Satisfactory. The project successfully developed and refined the concept of transfrontier conservation i.e. including multiple land-use zones, which cross international boundaries in promoting sustainable conservation and development. This concept, has subsequently been adopted by other donors, such as SADC and NEPAD. The project also provided a platform for numerous follow-on activities by GOM and donors in the area of conservation and tourism.

The project was successful for the following reasons:

- (1) the protected areas have been classified and demarcated, but further efforts are needed to improve infrastructure and park equipment and hence to improve the conditions for better management of these PAs. Poaching in all TFCAs has been reduced and the level of wildlife has increased in all PA's.
- (2) Political commitment to transboundary biodiversity conservation has increased, which is reflected in the signing of international agreements by Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe formally establishing the TFCAs.
- (3) Even though the project did not achieve the objective of Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), some CBNRM activities were carried out including the demarcation of over 70,000 ha of community land by the project, which was not part of the original design and which became an important achievement of the project.

However, on the other hand, there were the following shortcomings:

- (1) Due to the lack of emphasis and resources for tangible outputs at the community level, negligible benefit has been felt by communities.
- (2) The project did not adequately take into account existing situation in the three TFCAs, for example, the very poor infrastructure, which makes marketing of goods difficult and the lack of experience of GOM and local NGOs in implementing community-based natural resource management programs.
- (3) Despite the efforts of the Bank staff and project team to resolve the concerns of the communities living in Limpopo National Park (LNP), the LNP was gazetted as a national park and some animals were allowed to enter the park area. This created a lot of media attention and controversy around the project.
- (4) The potential linkage of biodiversity protection to tourism was not fully achieved. The borrower's report however, questioned the relevance to Mozambique of neighboring countries' experience in linking tourism to conservation since the most promising initiatives involve sport hunting of abundant wildlife, which is not possible in Mozambique where the fauna were substantially depleted during twenty years of war.

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

The project was financed by a GEF grant, GOM counterpart funding, and was intended to be co-financed by an SDC grant. Two factors resulted in significant costs changes: (1) At grant signing, the SDC were expected to co-finance the project through a grant of \$2.6 million; however, SDC funds were never forthcoming, and therefore the budget was significantly reallocated; (2) the devaluation of the SDR resulted in a reduction in the project budget of about \$300,000. This cost reduction came off each of the project components.

Fund flow problems caused some delays to activities in the field; however, did not significantly affect the overall project implementation. While some delays in counterpart funding from GOM were experienced, all counterpart funding was received in the end. The total grant was almost entirely used.

The project efficiency can therefore be rated as Satisfactory. Even though the funding was reduced, the project was successful in achieving most of its objectives, and experienced only a short delay.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	------------------------------------

The sustainability of the project is rated as Moderately Unlikely.

Financial: The project has been very successful in leveraging additional resources for the 3 TFCAs, for other TFCAs in the country and generally for the concept promoted by the project. These resources include among others: a) the follow-on TFCA and Tourism Development Project (\$40m) by the World Bank. b) KfW have provided a grant of EU6.1 m and have committed another EU5.8 m to support the development of LNP (to be implemented by Peace Parks Foundation), which is regarded by KfW as a one

of the most exciting current initiatives in conservation. c) USAID is funding a project supporting the development of the Gaza TFCA (Gaza-Kruger-Gonarezhou Transboundary Natural Resources Management Initiative, \$3.5m grant implemented by DAI). d) Ford Foundation provided support to the Chimanimani TFCA for CBNRM. However, the prospect of all this donor funding is not a sufficient guarantee of sustainability. For TFCA to be sustained, it is essential to secure fund from sources outside the government. TFCA sustainability will be influenced by the effectiveness of the eco-tourism promoted by the above mentioned Bank project.

Socio-Political: The terminal evaluation indicated that the government is committed to the 3 TFCAs created by the project and there is also indication that these institutions will be supported by GOM in the future. The national TFCA unit is fully engaged in the preparation of the follow up Bank project. Additionally, the project established strong partnerships with regional and neighboring countries through community awareness activities workshops. This regional integration and the improved environment for investment in eco-tourism will be further strengthened in the follow-on project and are likely to be sustainable.

However, communities and local government have been only marginally involved - they need to be more explicitly involved. Furthermore, there was only limited outreach to the private sector. The last PIR doubts on the ownership of the project concept: when consulted during the PIR mission some partners questioned whether the principle of Transfrontier Conservation has spread wider than a handful of people in the capital of Mozambique.

Institutional: The project has had a substantial impact on improving the institutional capacity of GOM to formulate policy and coordinate government conservation and tourism functions. As a result significant policy development was achieved in different sectors including wildlife and forestry. Land and NRM laws and hunting fees in hunting concessions were revised, in addition to reviewing tendering processes and project approval mechanisms. Also, a nodal institution now exists that is capable of coordinating functions within MITUR and with other Ministries, in particular MADER and MICOA, hence providing an institutional basis for future environmental policy development. Moreover, the concept of Transfrontier Conservation was endorsed in one international treaty and two agreements that were signed by the heads of state of Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe. These treaties and agreements were regarded by SADC as a significant achievement in regional integration; the Elephant Coast Development Agency for Matutuine District (ECDA) in Maputo province was established as an important institution to promote public-private partnerships for tourism and conservation in the area. The establishment of ECDA is expected to have a substantial impact on the functioning of the Lubombo TFCA.

On the other hand, despite numerous institutional development and capacity building activities taking place at the provincial, district and local level, the institutional development impact at the sub-national level remains weak. Finally, there is a lack of capacity within DNFFB regarding GIS technical know-how. The effectiveness to apply GIS technology into various activities as suggested was over-looked during the project preparatory phase.

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 TE, the TFCA project represented at the time the unique window of opportunity to protect areas of global biodiversity significance. It is possible that if the project had not been implemented, many of the TFCAs currently designated as PAs would not have been allocated for conservation. The project document asserts that due to severe financing limitations, if the GEF had not funded the project, activities envisaged under the project would not have taken place at all. Furthermore, after SDC funds were withdrawn, GEF became the essential financier of this operation, without which, none of the existing achievements would have happened.

\$2.6 million grant co-financing from SDC was cancelled between the time of project approval and grant effectiveness. This had a substantial impact on the scope of component 1 (activities in the Lubombo TFCA were curtailed) and Component 3 (a range of activities were reduced) though effective reprioritization of expenditures ensured that component 1 achieved its key activities and impacts.

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 was designed as the first phase of a 10-15 year program of donor assistance. Due to its complexity, the project took 5 years to prepare as determined by the broad range of reforms and activities planned at the national, provincial, local and community level, the number of implementing institutions, the very poor infrastructure in the three TFCAs, and the very limited capacity of government and the NGOs that existed in the country at the time, where the country was emerging from a protracted civil war. Moreover, the project design did not address the resettlement issues, for example through an involuntary resettlement safeguard or other measures.

Lack of capacity in all levels of government to give adequate attention to the project caused delays, particularly in the early years of operation. In addition, the change in responsible government ministries from MADER to MITUR, firstly under the DNAC and later in an autonomous TFCA unit reporting directly to Minister significantly impacted implementation. The project did not begin to deliver until this final move into its current form.

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:

According to the previous TER and the TE, the importance of the project was not fully appreciated by many officials at first as the government showed little interest during early preparations although project objectives were reflected in the national strategy document of the GOM, in particular, the National Environment Action Plan. The interest of the government increased substantially during project

preparation as the project shifted from the original conservation-focused concept to the broader concept of Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCA) including conservation, community development and regional integration through multiple-use zones. This lack of ownership by GOM during project preparation, may have been because the full potential benefits of the project – in particular, for regional integration and development of the nascent tourism industry – may not have been fully appreciated by the GOM at the time.

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: Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-------------------------------

According to the TE, the M&E design at entry is Unsatisfactory. No logical framework was developed during project design (this was not required by the GEF at that time), and no M&E was implemented during the project which, is a major shortcoming of the project. A consultant was contracted to prepare an M&E system for the TFCA in 2002. The M&E process guidelines prepared by the consultant using indicators proposed in the GEF/WB TFCA document were assessed to be complicated and difficult to implement. Despite repeated requests from the Bank to design and implement an M&E system (this point was stressed in many aide memoirs and the mid-term review), no system was ever put in place. The design was believed to be impractical to implement and it was believed to be too late in the project to implement the system.

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

According to the previous TER, no M&E system was put in place. A design was done in early 2002, however the design was believed to be impractical to implement. As the project was supposed to be a pilot project, testing new methodologies for use in later projects, the lack of a robust M&E system is a serious omission, as lessons cannot be fully captured with sufficient rigor. The expected outcomes from the multiple activities needed to be more rigorously assessed through a logical framework analysis, or similar strategy/design tool, to ensure the project was more focused and the project objective, global objective and indicators were clear and understood by all stakeholders.

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: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

According to the information provided in the terminal evaluation, the Bank's performance in identification, preparation assistance and appraisal benefited from a high level of commitment from Bank staff and consultants working under difficult conditions. The resulting project was important and innovative; however it had significant weaknesses. The project took a long time to prepare (5 years), and did not receive sufficient commitment from GOM. The project design took the Bank's priorities into account, and worked closely with the government to ensure the project was aligned to GOM priorities; however, overall, GOM had not bought-in to the concept to a satisfactory level. However, as this was a pilot project which was explicitly piloted innovative new approaches, the lack of government buy-in during preparation is not seen as a hindrance to the project achieving positive outcomes.

On the other hand, the supervision of the project was consistent and satisfactory, despite a high turnover of TTL's in Washington. According to the TE, this is due to two factors: most TTL's shared a common understanding of the project and worked hard at ensuring continuity of supervision; and more importantly, the project benefited from high quality, consistent field presence of the same technical expert throughout supervision. Strong management from the field meant that the relationships with GOM were well managed and the implementing agency could draw on accessible Bank expertise.

Overall, the Implementing agency performance is rated as Satisfactory.

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

As per the information provided in the terminal evaluation, GOM contributed to all preparation activities adequately. Personnel from DNFFB were active members of all Bank preparation missions and contributed as appropriate. The interest of the government improved substantially during project preparation as the project concept shifted from the original conservation-focused concept, to the broader TFCA concept including conservation, community development and regional integration through multiple-use zones.

The Government interest in the project was mixed over the life of the project. The initial implementation of the project by MADER (DNFFB) was slow in progressing. The transfer of the project from MADER to MITUR caused substantial delays in the project due to unresolved institutional disputes. Under the current arrangement, the project benefits from a high degree of positive involvement by senior government officials and appears to be a priority for GOM.

The TFCA unit as it exists in its current form has a highly motivated, capable and professional staff that has demonstrated a high level of commitment to the project. However, the project did suffer some problems with performance during implementation, in particular, delays due to insufficient familiarity with the Bank's procurement guidelines, and insufficient implementation capacity, delaying procurement and disbursement schedules. However, by the end of the project, all capacity issues had been resolved. A number of financial management deficiencies were experienced during the project: audit delays, out of date software, and the lack of financial management personnel in the TFCA unit; however, these were all adequately resolved.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

This project had some environmental impacts. The habitat and wildlife management has improved in 3 TFCAs. The protected areas have been classified and demarcated but further efforts (infrastructure and equipment for the parks) are to be done to improve the conditions for a better management of these PAs. According to the previous TER, the establishment of one of the world's largest conservation areas (GLTFP) is perhaps the highest profile achievement of the project. The establishment of the Elephant Coast Development Authority (semi-autonomous development agency for Matutue District) and the protocol for the Lubombo TFCA are also significant achievements. Poaching in all TFCAs has been reduced and anecdotal evidence is that the level of wildlife has increased in all PA's.

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.

According to the previous TER, the socioeconomic changes were unsatisfactory. Due to the lack of emphasis and resources for tangible outputs at the community level, negligible benefit has been felt by communities. This was a serious concern for a number of stakeholders that were interviewed in the TE. This concern needs to be balanced by the stated project strategy to first concentrate on the policy and institutional environment, before developing infrastructure and income-generating activities which may be the focus of a follow-on project. The physical activities implemented by the project include some CBNRM activities in Chimanimani, Banhine, Zinhave and Limpopo, and land demarcation activities in each TFCA. In addition, some of the physical activities planned under the project were being

implemented by other donors: CBNRM in Chimanimani by Ford Foundation, development of LNP by KfW and the management plans and other activities in GLTFCA by USAID. No data exists on the impact of CBNRM, for example, on increased incomes or improved livelihood.

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 had a substantial impact on improving the institutional capacity of GOM to formulate policy and coordinate conservation and tourism functions of government. A nodal institution now exists, the TFCA unit, within MITUR, to liaise with counterparts in neighboring countries on matters of tourism and conservation; to implement donor projects in the sector (e.g. the follow-on project) and to coordinate, through park management units, activities in the TFCA unit and effectively manage conservation activities in their jurisdiction.

Many of the institutional development activities i.e. capacity building, training, logistical support, technical assistance etc. were done within DNFFB and SBFFB in the three provinces in which the TFCAs are located. While many institutional development and capacity building activities did take place at the provincial, district and local level, the institutional development impact of these activities is modest; however, according to the TE this will be a greater focus during the follow-on project. Sub-national capacity building is clearly also affected by the broader decentralization agenda of GOM.

b) Governance

The project made significant progress in the development of policies and institutional capacity for biodiversity conservation. According to the TE, the capacity of national government to formulate policy, plan and give technical guidance to the TFCAs and the conservation sector has been greatly enhanced. A small, flexible unit that is able to coordinate within MITUR and with other Ministries, in particular, MADER and MICOA, now exists, and this gives an institutional basis for future environmental policy development.

However, while all the capacity building activities at provincial and local level designed in the project were performed, the resultant capacity at the sub-national level remains weak. Some progress has been made in creating an enabling environment for private sector investment in conservation and tourism; however, no investments were actually realized. The extent and profile of the international collaboration has probably been the most successful outcome of the project. One international treaty and two international agreements have been signed between GOM and neighboring countries. The project has succeeded in formulating and developing the concept of transfrontier conservation, a significant achievement in regional integration.

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.

There was no unintended impact reported in the TE or 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.

As a measure of the success of the pilot, the TE mentions that other donors (KfW, USAID and Ford Foundation) have invested in the concept, and a platform for further Bank projects in tourism development and conservation has been created. The project has received extensive media coverage, for example, from environmental journals such as National Geographic on the concept of transfrontier conservation.

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 of the project were given in the previous TER:

- (1) Institutional development is a time consuming process that requires commitment from all stakeholders, and extensive capacity building.
- (2) Conservation and community development projects need to demonstrate clear linkages to economic objectives such as growth, income generation or poverty reduction in order to retain focus and ensure sufficient benefit flow to beneficiaries.
- (3) In order for a pilot project to produce results with new methodologies, a monitoring & evaluation (M & E) system must be in place at project effectiveness.
- (4) Land demarcations are the first steps in ensuring that communities are not overwhelmed by private sector operators and are not marginalized during the development process.
- (5) Conservation and community development projects need to demonstrate clear linkages to economic objectives such as growth, income generation or poverty reduction in order to retain focus and ensure sufficient benefit flow to beneficiaries. For instance in this project, the

importance of tourism was not well recognized until the TFCA unit was inadvertently established in MITUR. Better understanding and clarification of the economic potential of tourism in TFCAs would have encouraged a greater interest in the project from government and other donors earlier on.

- (6) Addressing the needs of communities living in currently designated protected areas--or in areas slated to be so designated--needs to be given top priority, and agreements with all interested parties need to be reached before the project is approved. Communities and local and provincial governments need to be involved in the project right from the beginning, particularly where resettlement may be involved.
- (7) Creating an enabling environment for the private sector and encouraging good investors is a difficult and complex challenge. In similar projects, an advisor dealing with private sector issues should be appointed early on in the project. Future projects need to engage potential investors during project preparation in order to anticipate a realistic role for the private sector.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE:

- (1) Issues of major importance, like land, need an integrated approach which involve the CAS and a range of lending and AAA activities. In some ways, the potential of this project – for achieving regional integration and creating a platform for tourism development – was under exploited by the Bank. This was partially because the project was small and may have been assumed to focus solely on conservation.
- (2) Conservation and community development projects need to demonstrate clear linkages to economic objectives such as growth, income generation or poverty reduction in order to retain focus and ensure sufficient benefits flow to beneficiaries.
- (3) Sensitive issues such as communities living in future National Parks need to be dealt with up-front with all stakeholders and resolved before approval.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provides sufficient details of project achievements, a critical assessment of the relevant shortcomings and factors affecting project implementation making it possible to rate the achievement of objectives. However, it is short on quantitative data, specifically on project impacts owing to the failure to develop a monitoring system. The borrower's report is particularly helpful as it presents in detail the achievements and constraints experienced in each TFCA. The TE also include an annex on additional requirements for GEF reporting.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing,	The terminal evaluation is internally consistent and the evidence presented substantiates the statements except for a point regarding sustainability. The TE rated project	MU

and ratings well substantiated?	sustainability as likely while noting that for long-term sustainability provincial and district governments need to be more involved in managing the conservation areas.	
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE presents a critical assessment of the project's sustainability, and it discusses the exit strategy in terms of transition arrangements to regular operations.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE includes a detailed lessons learned section that omitted questioning launching of such a project immediately after war. The TE also lacked any recommendations regarding the implementation arrangement of similar future projects.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The Annex 2 of the TE provides expected and actual total project cost by component and by procurement arrangements. However, there is a discrepancy between project cost information in Annex 2 and the financial planning co-financing table on page 48. There are no details in Annex 2 too on either expected or actual counterpart financing by government.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE assessed the M&E system briefly. It mentions that a system was developed by a consultant during the time of the project but it does not give any details on the components of this system.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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