

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
				Review date:	10/18/05
GEF ID:	541		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)	
Project Name:	Reducing Biodiversity Loss at Cross-Border Sites in East Africa	GEF financing:	\$12.65 (TE)	Apparently all the GEF funds were spent as anticipated.	
Country:	Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda	Co-financing:	5.530 (GEF db)	Not specified although the TE notes that \$0.5 million from bilateral donors and \$0.5 million from the three country governments did not materialize as envisioned at project planning.	
Operational Program:	4 (GEF db)	Total Project Cost:	\$18.18	\$0,00	
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	FAO, national government implementing agencies, forest departments/agencies, district authorities, a large number of NGOs, local communities	Work Program date		5/1/1997	
		CEO Endorsement		02/04/1998	
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		02/27/1998	
		Closing Date	Proposed: December 31, 2002	Actual: December 31, 2003	
Prepared by: Josh Brann	Reviewed by: Claudio Volonte and Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 5 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 6 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 year	
Author of TE: Jonathan Timberlake and Yakobo Moyini		TE completion date: January 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 6/21/05	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 18 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	See below.		U/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	S given for “Outcomes/Achievements”		S
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	HS		S
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS		U
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A		MS (4.2)

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? **NO** Why? **There is no final accounting of project finances at project end (final co-financing, GEF \$ used); there is some confusion between outcomes and impacts, and impacts are not rated distinctly from outputs and outcomes.**

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

“To reduce the rate of loss of forest and wetland biodiversity in specific cross border sites of national and global significance in East Africa”, there are two Immediate Objectives: (a) To establish an enabling environment that allows local sectoral and development agencies as well as local communities to promote the sustainable use of biodiversity resources; and (b) Resource demands brought into balance with supply at key resource sites. The Immediate Objectives are couched more in terms of utilisation and development than conservation.” (TE)

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

According to the project document the development objectives are listed as the same as the environmental objectives, with the following immediate objectives:

Immediate Objective A: To establish an environment around the cross-border sites where local agencies and communities can promote sustainable use of biodiversity.

Immediate Objective B: To bring into balance the demand and supply of natural resource products, including biodiversity, at the cross-border sites.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

According to the TE, “The project registered many achievements, but it cannot say with any high level of confidence that it met all its objectives. While impacts on biodiversity are difficult to determine, what can be stated categorically is that the interventions targeting the ‘D’ aspects of the ICD approach succeeded, for example water sources were developed and improved cooking stoves were adopted.”

To measure the project’s impact on biodiversity, apparently instead of direct environmental monitoring the project attempted to use the Threat Reduction

Assessment methodology to gauge impact over time. However, according to the TE, “Unfortunately this was not done rigorously and consistently enough across the project sites to give an unambiguous answer. Anecdotal evidence suggests threats and levels of unsustainable utilization were greatly reduced in many forests, but such anecdotal evidence is unlikely to convince skeptical funding agencies.”

A table is given in the TE which summarizes the “achievements”. Against the overall objective of reducing the rate of loss of forest biodiversity in specific cross-border sites, the TE says “Probably achieved, but no objective evidence produced (air photos, consistent TRA). Species loss/gain not recorded.” Under immediate objective A – “Enabling environment in place at key cross-border sites which supports the sustainable use of biodiversity” the following notable achievements are listed: “National policies in place with input from the project, but not possible to verify specific project impact”; “Capacity at local level greatly increased. Joint Forest Management plans developed with communities; many strong local Environment Committees.” Under immediate objective B – “Resource demands brought into balance with supply at key sites” the following notable achievements are listed: “Many forest management plans in place from 3 countries, with elements of conservation; approved by communities but not yet by Forest Depts”; “Anecdotal evidence on improved regeneration in many forest areas, but not measured.”

There is not clear information on project achievements or activities with regard to wetlands, which are included in the environmental objective.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Rating: S

A Relevance

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

At the time of project approval the biodiversity focal area operational program strategies were not well developed. The GEF database lists the project as an OP4 project, when it likely should be considered an OP3 (forest ecosystems) project. Project outcomes address forest ecosystems, and in this sense they are consistent with the OP strategies. There is also little doubt about the global significance of the biodiversity found in this region. However, there is a strong “development” component to this project, which seems to have had much more significant outcomes than the “conservation” aspects of the project.

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)?

Yes, the project appears, for the most part, to have met its objectives as envisioned in the project document. The main difficulty is a lack of a strong monitoring and evaluation system under the project by which to document these results. It may be useful, however, to raise some questions about the assumptions on which the project design was based: although the project appears to have achieved its objectives, it is not clear that this has or will have the desired impact on biodiversity resources in the cross-border sites, since there appear to remain a number of threats to the biological resources targeted by the project. Unfortunately it is nearly impossible to see the impact since the project monitoring and evaluation plan was unsatisfactory. In addition, given the slow response time of biodiversity resources to interventions, it will likely be some time before the full effect of the project can be gauged. This is especially true since the first of the project’s immediate objectives was to improve the enabling environment (through policies and management plans and structures). If the enabling environment has in fact been improved, it will be a matter of years before the effects can be seen in the biosphere.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?
<p>The project demonstrated its cost-effectiveness by showing that it did not exceed the funding levels of similar projects in the region. The project ended up disbursing \$2 million/year, which is double the average of GEF biodiversity project (according to the Biodiversity Program Study). However, this anticipated rate of spending may be due to the fact that it was a regional project with 3 countries involved. The TE indicates that there were some problems associated with this rate of spending, but it is not clear what the problems were. The need to slow down the rate of spending to increase effectiveness was apparently the primary reason for the project receiving a one-year no-cost extension. The TE notes that “the project exhibited significant weaknesses with respect to financial control” resulting in project funds being exhausted ahead of schedule in Kenya and Tanzania. However, the TE also notes that there were no negative comments from any of the audits. Additionally, there were some initial difficulties in finding a satisfactory funding disbursement mechanism in Kenya which caused a delay in this country at the beginning of the project, but this was eventually resolved. Also, according to the TE, the FAO regional office in Ghana was responsible for handling many of the administrative aspects of the project. This arrangement did not work well as there were many delays and bureaucratic difficulties. The TE recommends that these arrangements should have been handled by the relevant FAO country offices.</p>

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

A Financial resources	Rating: 4
There are follow-on financial resources to help to continue supporting project initiatives, although the majority of these appear to be through additional short-term donor funds or other projects, rather than through any particular long-term mechanism. The exception to this generality is that apparently some CBOs have taken over some project initiatives through which these organizations have established or plan to establish continuous financing, such as through user fees for water supplies put in by the project.	
B Socio political	Rating: 5
Although the project was not specifically targeted towards capacity building, there was some capacity built. According to the TE, many communities are supportive if not enthusiastic about the JFM and local-level community forest management institutional structures. Apparently the relevant national-level institutions are accepting of these arrangements. It is difficult to generalize in this sense given the broad geographic reach of the project.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 6
This was addressed under the first immediate objective of the project. According to the TE, the project made many positive inroads in this area. Based on the information provided in the TE, this was a strong point of the project in both Uganda and Tanzania, although less so in Kenya. The project was able to involve and get buy-in from the government at different levels, and project objectives have been integrated into institutional management structures. Only time will tell if in the long-run the TE's optimistic views become reality.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: N/A
Some alternative livelihoods were introduced, although there was apparently a low-level of uptake at the community level.	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: 5
There are no specific instances of replication identified, although the TE identifies some components of the project that may be replicable in other circumstances. The TE indicates that on the whole the overall project approach would likely not be replicable in other regions because the project was tailored specifically to this region, and grew out of the particular context there. However, the issue of potential replication within the region is not addressed. The TE does mention a couple of projects that were in some way derived from this project, but these appear to just be offshoots rather than actual instances of replication. Some of the	

successful project approaches, such as the introduction of JFM and community environmental conservation committees could be replicable on other parts of these countries now that this project has developed the potential for these approaches. In addition the TE notes that the Uganda Wildlife Authority is now using TRA methodology as part of its M&E system.

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

<p>A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.? Rating: U</p>
<p>As described in the TE, this was the primary shortcoming of the project. There was an attempt at a project M&E system made using the TRA methodology, but this was not applied in a sufficient manner to be useful. Otherwise there was apparently no systematic attempt made at data collection. The indicators initially identified at project planning stage were weak or absent and needed revision later in the project.</p>
<p>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management? Rating: S</p>
<p>According to the TE the project log frame was revised at some point in the project. Also to the credit of the project, some changes were made at the mid-term evaluation.</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? NO</p>

4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

<p>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?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A team of committed people with a strong shared vision are central to project success. - In ICD projects there should be clearly-articulated links between the C (conservation) and the D (development) if the activities are to have a sustained impact on conservation. - Linkages between forest conservation and water supply are strong in arid and semi-arid pastoral areas. This provides a good entry point for conservation projects, especially those concerning catchment forests. - NGOs can be effective partners, and can increase project outcome sustainability. - Clear impact-orientated indicators are needed in a logframe in order to determine conservation impact. - The provision of baseline data on, for example, forest status and biodiversity, is needed before project interventions start. This should form part of project activities.

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.

4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
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

4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Three aspects of the project are rated as HS, which do not seem to be entirely justified. Also, the fact that outcomes and impacts are slightly confused contributes to a lack of clarity and completeness in terms of evidence presented to justify project ratings.	3
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	5
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report does not include any figures on the final project costs by activity, and does not provide information on the final actual co-financing levels. There is a brief discussion of project financial management in section 3.2.1., but this is not substantiated with actual figures.	2
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? The TE has an extensive discussion on the project's M&E systems, and accurately identifies and assesses the shortcomings of the project in this area.	6

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.	Yes:	No: X
Explain: There is not really enough information in the TE to undertake a technical assessment of the project impacts. The TE specifically addresses project impacts in one section, though this is not done in a systematic way (simply through a series of seemingly unstructured bullet points), and there is confusion between outcomes and impacts. Also, for some of the identified impacts there is no real evidence offered – for example, one of the impact bullet points says that “communities are now more aware not just of the ecological goods and services provided by these forests, but also on the necessity for careful management to ensure their sustained provision.” This is a fairly dubious statement to begin with, and there is no evidence offered to demonstrate how it is clear that communities are now more aware.		
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? NO.		

4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any) Project document, GEF online database.
