

### GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	10/12/05
GEF ID:	534		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Conservation and Management of Habitats and Species, and Sustainable Community Use of Biodiversity in Dinder National Park	GEF financing:	\$0.75	Not available
Country:	Sudan	Co-financing:	\$1.1	Not available
Operational Program:	OP1	Total Project Cost:	\$1,85	\$0,00
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Sudan Wildlife Administration	Work Program date		03/13/1998
		CEO Endorsement		06/25/1998
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2002	Actual: July 2004
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Claudio Volonte	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 2 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 4 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 2 years
Author of TE: Paul Scholte Mustafa Babiker		TE completion date: Feb 2005	TE submission date to GEF OME: 8/8/05	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 6 months

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A		N/A	
2.2 Project outcomes	S		N/A	MS
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A		N/A	MU
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A		N/A	MU
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? There was no presentation of actual project costs, the ratings were not consistent with the statements in the text.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The Project document indicates that the project objectives were to conserve globally significant biodiversity and remove root barriers [to conservation] in Dinder National Park by encouraging species conservation and the sustainable use of resources through the integration of local communities in the utilization and management of natural resources. The TE indicated that there were no changes to these objectives.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

- Conservation of the Biodiversity of the park through development and implementation of a management plan.
- Long term sustainable conservation of biodiversity in the established park by encouraging species and habitat conservation and maintenance of the park as a coherent ecosystem.
- Long-term sustainable management of the Buffer Zone through the integration of the local communities living inside and along the borders in the sustainable utilization and management of the natural resources of the park. **Enhancement of the livelihoods of the communities living in and around the border of the Park by encouraging them to participate in community oriented projects, which will provide them with renewable resources on a long-term basis.**

The TE indicates that there were no changes although the project budget was reduced, making the timeframe and activities overoptimistic and causing delays in project implementation schedules.

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

- **The TE indicates that the project contributed to the formulation and subsequent approval (by the Wildlife Administration) of a management plan that constitutes a solid base for future management of Dinder National Park which includes zoning of the national park into a core zone around the Dinder river drainage system, buffer zones and transitional zones.** This was the first park management plan prepared in Sudan and 400 copies of the plan in English and Arabic were in press during the evaluation.
- The TE indicates that as a result of the project workshops and interactions with the communities neighboring the park, some improvements in the relationship between these communities and the park authorities can be observed. Communities are authorized to extract dead wood and small quantities of construction materials which have resulted in reduced firewood extraction, woodcutting and reduced burning in the park.
- The TE indicates that the project assisted in the provision of water pumps to supply water to villages that are now engaged more in horticulture and agro-forestry farming with a more reliable water supply. As this expands, this may contribute to reducing pressure on park resources that are under peril.
- No impacts were mentioned in the TE.

### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

#### 4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Rating: MU

##### A Relevance

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

Yes, the project outcomes were consistent with the OP strategies.

##### B Effectiveness

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

Although the project developed a management plan for the park, its full implementation has not taken place yet according to the TE. The TE indicates that there is a need to clearly lay down the responsibilities of the Wildlife administration, state services and authorities and other institutions in the implementation of the management plan. Also some key studies for specific outputs of the

project still remain to be done such as the hydrology systems of the Dinder wetlands and River during the seasons to improve their management and biodiversity and control the silting problems. Other shortcomings are discussed under sustainability.
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems?</b></li> </ul>
Although the project had some achievements under its objectives, it did not accomplish the three objectives described above which reduces the cost effectiveness.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
The project was unable to measure whether there had been any increases in income among local communities as a result of the project activities. Some tourism infrastructure has already been put into place by the project and was handed over to the Wildlife Administration, which in its turn contracted a tourist company for the daily management. However, the high costs and regulations involved in visiting Sudan and Dinder NP, makes neighboring East Africa with more facilities and spectacular wildlife, a much more attractive tourist destination. Therefore financial sustainability is unlikely without further government support.	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
According to the TE, much work still remains to be done with the communities in the area. Although the violent clashes between park scouts and poachers have reduced as a result of the project, relations remain tense. This park conflict is only the “downstream” part of a much wider land use problem in which pastoralists are squeezed out of the areas neighboring the national park states by the unauthorized expansion in (mechanized) farming. Thus pastoralists have to move to other areas of the park and the scouts shoot their cattle as it invades park areas. The TE makes several recommendations to begin more cooperative work with the communities but the results still remain to be seen, thus socio political sustainability is moderately unlikely.	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
The TE indicates that the government showed strong commitment to conservation of the park as indicated by the large number of park personnel (15 officers and 285 scouts) and infrastructure available (communication systems, solar energy, water pumps, vehicles, etc). However, the TE indicates that the intervention capacity of the personnel remains a concern, particularly regarding their training and leadership skills, high turnover of officers, as well as their lack of presence/access to the park year round (rainy and dry season). Some personnel should be selected to work with the local communities and assist in their development. Although support was achieved for a land use plan at the local government level, no support has been obtained yet from the Federal Minister of Agriculture to put the appropriate policies in place. In addition, other conflicts of land use with the powerful Farmers union at the State Legislative Assembly has also prevented further progress in adopting land use plans catered to the interests of pastoralists.	
<b>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
Cattle farmers are still invading the park in search of water and fodder especially during the dry season when resources are already limited for the existing biodiversity. Environmental sustainability will also depend on this issue being resolved. The TE also indicates that the continuing downward trend in wildlife numbers since the late 1960s is concerning. To cite only one example: since the start of the project, tiang, an antelope that roams beyond the park boundaries during the rainy season, has gone extinct. The general reasons behind the changes are largely known (rainy season habitat disturbances, poaching, competition with livestock, reduced flooding, etc.), but no information exists on their relative importance.	
<b>E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability</b>	<b>Rating: Unable to assess</b>
None described	

**4.3 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE**

<b>A. Effective M&amp;E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&amp;E system in terms of the tools used such as:</b>
--

<b>indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
The TE did not contain an explicit assessment of the project M&E system. The TE indicates that the project designed and used a logical framework to track progress of activities and deliverables but a formal M&E system to measure biodiversity improvements would take place in the following phase (consolidation phase) of the project, thus suggesting that the system was never put in place during the project. Some large mammal and bird surveys were conducted, but the TE indicates that the methodology and data were not reliable.	
<b>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
The project used the World Bank/WWF Management effectiveness tracking tool to monitor progress in the implementation of relevant activities and decide on the next steps but the tracking tool assessment was filled out in February of 2005, when the evaluation mission was carried out so there is no indication that it was used for adaptive management during the project.	
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice? No</b>	

#### 4.4 Lessons

Project lessons 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>
Development interventions associated with the management of protected areas have been criticized of commanding meagre resources compared to administrative costs (personnel, vehicles, etc.). Conservation projects, despite their experimental nature, encounter pressures to increase their coverage beyond resources already committed. Such pressures come from local communities as well as officials who conceive project interventions as services rather than experimental endeavours to be replicated in the future. Spreading the limited resources for community development interventions over a wider area characterized by a poor transportation and communication infrastructure not only increases the costs of the project, but also casts grave doubts on the sustainability of its impact.

**4.5 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 the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

<b>4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>
In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.
N/A

<b>4.5.2 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> Yes, it presents an assessment of outcomes and achievement of objectives. However, the TE could have been more critical at times of the project shortcomings	MS
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> Yes, the report provided a wealth of information on the situation and progress regarding each objective and expected output but the ratings were often out	MS

of touch with the explanation. For example, there were clear issues that compromised the formulation of policy proposals to promote long-term sustainability of the park ecosystem as described above under institutional sustainability yet the rating was “Highly Satisfactory” for sustainability and “Satisfactory” for outcome. Ratings for approach, M&E, sustainability, and attainment of output were provided for each project output and no aggregated ratings for the project outcomes were provided in the TE.	
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> Not explicitly but the TE provides sufficient information to make an assessment of sustainability and mentions the UNDP consolidation phase project as a possible continuation.	S
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Yes, but it could have been more comprehensive. All, except one of the statements in the lessons section were actual conclusions.	S
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? No</b>	HU
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> Not explicitly and it could have provided a more critical assessment	MS

**4.6 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>
-------------	--------------

Explain: UNDP has taken the initiative to finance a consolidation phase 2004-2007 for the project. Until a solid M&E system is put in place and this continuation project is completed there would be little value on conducting a technical assessment of project impacts.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? None mentioned in the TE

**4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**  
**Project document and 2004 PIR**