

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		March 2011
GEF Project ID:	642 FSP		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	522	GEF financing:	5,985,000	5,985,000
Project Name:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Tropical Peat Swamp	IA/EA own:	0.0	0.0
Country:	Malaysia	Government:	5,280,000	5,280,000
		Other*:	1,600,000	1,600,000
		Total Cofinancing	6,880,000	6,880,000
Operational Program:	OP#2 Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	Total Project Cost:	13,665,000	13,665,000
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (NRE), Forest Research Institute of Malaysia (FRIM)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		June 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: June 2007	Actual: December 2008
TER Prepared by: Oreste Maia-Andrade	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 60 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 78 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 18 months
Authors of TE: Peter J. van der Meer, Mohd. Nordin Bin Hasan, Juli Edo		TE completion date: February 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: August 2009	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 6 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 AND KEY FINDINGS

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

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

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

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) should be considered a good practice as it is lucid and comprehensive:

- It presents in a good overall quality a sound analysis of the project performance;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The coverage of outcomes and sustainability aspects is, however, not as detailed as it could have been.
<p>2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?</p> <p>No such findings were noted in the TE.</p>

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

<p>a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?</p> <p>According to the PAD submitted for CEO Endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The primary objective of this project is <i>to develop and implement plans</i> and <i>to encourage processes</i> that will ensure the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant genetic, species and ecosystem diversity within tropical peat swamp forests in Malaysia. This <i>will contribute to implementation</i> of the Malaysian Biodiversity Action Plan by providing demonstrations of conservation and sustainable management of peat swamp forests. The project <i>will ensure conservation and sustainable use</i> at three sites, as well as <i>demonstrating</i> what is required for the adoption of a multi-sectorial approach to peat swamp forest management throughout Malaysia. It <i>will support implementation</i> of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention. <p>No change was noted in the TE.</p>

<p>b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)</p> <p>According to the PAD submitted for CEO Endorsement, the project's immediate objectives and outputs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1: To demonstrate the necessary steps in planning for biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource utilization in peat swamp forests. Output 1: Data collection and setting up of a monitoring program and information management system to facilitate management and decision-making Output 2: Well-formulated site management plans, addressing issues such as biodiversity, physical functions and sustainable use. Objective 2: To demonstrate the implementation of biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource utilization strategies in peat swamp forests. Output 3: Conservation and sustainable use of peat swamp forest ecosystem resources and functions demonstrated. Output 4: Inter-agency networks at State level to integrate biodiversity overlays into development planning on peat lands. Objective 3: To strengthen institutional and human technical capacities and awareness. Output 5: Decision-makers, communities and other stakeholders better aware of the importance of conserving peat swamp forests and associated wetland ecosystems. Output 6: Strengthened institutional and human capacities to conserve and sustainably manage biological diversity in peat swamp forests and associated wetland ecosystems. <p>No change of objectives was noted in the TE.</p>
--

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance	Rating: 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding the six outcomes within the project’s three implementation objectives abovementioned, they all have a satisfactory relevance in the accomplishment of project’s global environmental objectives, all related to the Operational Program on Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems since activities were clearly formulated aiming at achieving project goals. 	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: 4
<p>Moderately Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, most of project outcomes were satisfactorily effective, except for systematization of data collection, which was “unfortunately not operational at any of the three sites during the time of the field visit of the TE team and thus it could not be verified to what extent (1) monitoring had taken place and (2) whether survey data had been entered in the IDMS/EMS system.” This aspect does compromise project effectiveness by preventing future initiatives to be based on information gathered and systematized. However, since no other shortcomings related to project effectiveness were noted, effectiveness is then rated as moderately satisfactory. 	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: 4
<p>Moderately Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, most of project outcomes were satisfactorily efficient, which is inferable from the fact that, except for systematization of data collection, all other activities have been well accomplished and the expected financing and cofinancing was fully provided in time. However, lack of further details in the TE on the use of money in specific activities prevents a superior rating than moderately satisfactory on efficiency. 	

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

a. Financial resources	Rating: 3
<p>Moderately Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, although there is a moderate risk regarding the extent to which stakeholder awareness and demonstration of conservation, management and use of PSF will continue after project termination, other aspects – such as sustainable use and knowledge on biodiversity of PSF, site management plans, network of inter-agency at the state level, and institutional and human capacities – are expected to have no problems with regard to sustainability. Financial sustainability is then rated as moderately likely. 	
b. Socio political	Rating: 3
<p>Moderately Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, preliminary results show that the project has been meaningful and important to the nation. Project ownership in all sites is generally strong, although it seems stronger at two particular sites, Loagan Bunut and Klias Peninsula. In a third site, Pahang, the establishment of Wetland Management Committee (WMC) could help to improve ownership. Socio-political sustainability is then rated as moderately likely. 	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 3
<p>Moderately Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding governance, there is a significant assurance provided by the Integrated Management Plans (IMPs). According to the TE, “the IMPs provide a good base for sustainable management at all three sites. In the long run, the IMP could probably facilitate RAMSAR application throughout the nation. To ensure a long run 	

<p>impact, it is important to maintain, at least in the near future, most institutional arrangements and enhanced capacity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, “the establishment of Wetland Management Committee’s (WMC) is considered a useful and necessary step in ensuring continued inter-agency network and effective implementation of the developed IMPs. Also the development of the MPCT’s for the IMP development has led to better inter-agency level communication.” However, despite the institutional achievements, no legal advancements have been noted in the TE, which makes the institutional framework’s sustainability moderately likely. 	
d. Environmental	Rating: 4
<p>Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has significantly achieved its development objectives, except for data systematization. In direct terms, the TE demonstrates that environmental sustainability has now a high potential to continue in Malaysia. Although systematization of data could facilitate future management for new executors, other aspects – such as sustainable use and knowledge on biodiversity of PSF, site management plans, network of inter-agency at the state level, and institutional and human capacities – were well accomplished and allow for a likely environmental sustainability. 	

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

<p>a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>	
<p>The amount of cofinancing worked well throughout project implementation and more than doubled the GEF funds, which was fundamental for project implementation/execution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, “the total contribution committed by the UNDP/GEF amounted to USD 5,985 million for the five-year implementation (Inception Report). Non-GEF international financing amounted to USD 2,4 million while the Government of Malaysia including the state governments provided USD 5,339 million in financial support and an estimated USD 4,389 million of in-kind support.” • As highlighted by the TE, “The largest project expenditure was on project management which included remunerations for consultant and project staff.” • The non-achievement of data systematization was often remarked in the TE as the project’s main failure. It is not fully clear in the TE why such a big project in terms of funds failed in this aspect. Therefore, cofinancing expenditure might not have been managed at best. 	
<p>b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>	
<p>Delays did not compromise project objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, the project’s estimated duration was 60 months (five years), but the National Steering Committee (NRC) endorsed an 18-months extension. No other mention of any delays is noted in the TE. 	
<p>c. 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.</p>	
<p>Country Ownership was an important aspect of this particular project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government of Malaysia was fully involved in project execution and provided a significant amount of cofinancing. The direct participation of the NRE and FRIM well complemented the country ownership. 	

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

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): 5
<p>According to the PAD submitted for CEO Endorsement, M&E design at Entry was satisfactory, allowing for a detailed monitoring of project implementation through periodic reports, publications and activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Ongoing project monitoring will be provided in accordance with established UNDP procedures and will be provided by the UNDP Malaysia County Office with support from UNDP/RBAP/GEF. Overall supervision 	

of the Project will be the responsibility of the PSC, which will meet at least once every twelve months. The National project director will call meetings of the NSC.” The Project support Unit will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports: Inception Report, Annual Program/Project Report (APR), Periodic Status Reports, Technical Reports, Project Publications, Terminal Report, Other Publications and Publicity Activities.

- With regard to M&E, “an Annual Project Report (APR) shall be prepared and to submit to UNDP. The APR must be ready two weeks prior to the TPR. The APR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TPR meeting. The National Project Director/CTA presents the APR to the TPR, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the TPR participants. The NPD/CTA also informs the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Six-monthly APR’s will be provided during the first two years of the project to ensure that design and inception activities are closely monitored, and subsequently the APR will be done on an annual basis. Separate reviews of each state component may also be conducted if required by the NSC. Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators will be built into the project in consultation with UNDP.”
- The exact documents to be prepared by the M&E were: **Terminal Tripartite Review (TTR)**: The terminal tripartite review is held in the last month of project operations. The Project support Unit is responsible in preparing the Terminal Report, and to submit to UNDP. It shall be prepared in draft sufficiently in advance to allow review and technical clearance by the executing agency at least two months prior to the terminal tripartite review. The Terminal Report will serve as the basis for discussions in the TTR. The terminal tripartite review considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its immediate objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective, and decides whether any actions are still necessary. **Project Implementation Review (PIR)**: A major tool for monitoring the GEF portfolio and extracting lessons is the annual GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR). The PIR has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from ongoing projects. The PIR is mandatory for all GEF projects that have been under implementation for at least one year at the time that the exercise is conducted. A project becomes legal and implementation activities can begin when all parties have signed the project document. The PIR questionnaire is sent to the UNDP country office, usually around the beginning of June. It is the responsibility of the Project CTA to complete the PIR questionnaire, with the oversight of the UNDP Country Office. **Mid-term Evaluation**: An independent Mid-Term Evaluation will be undertaken at the end of the second year. The Mid-Term Evaluation will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of for follow-up activities. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the final evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. **Regular Monitoring and Evaluation**: The project will also be closely monitored by the UNDP Country Office through quarterly meetings or more frequently as deemed necessary with the National project Director, and the Project support Unit. This will allow to take stock and to trouble shoot of any problems pertaining to the project quickly to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.
- Considering that M&E plan at entry contained SMART indicators and an appropriate data analysis system to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives, M&E design is rated as satisfactory.

b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): 4
Moderately Satisfactory:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were regular quarterly meetings, and minutes of meetings were properly kept. Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) were produced and an independent mid-term review was conducted. At the end a final evaluation was undertaken. However there were no plans to monitor the project after its termination. The project accounts were audited annually and annual reports of the finances of the project were produced as a Report of the Auditor General of the government of Malaysia. • For having enabled good tracking of progress towards project objectives, but considering the lack of plan for sustained monitoring post-project, as well as the lack of details regarding M&E implementation, the M&E system is rated as moderately satisfactory. 	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution	
a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): 5	
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): 5	
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and	

suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

Satisfactory:

- The UNDP country representative had regular meetings with project management (CTA) to discuss project progress and delivery rate as provided by the PIRs, which is considered to have effectively communicated strategies and facilitated the consultation and coordination in decision-making and operational activities. Quality of implementation is then rated as satisfactory.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): 5

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

Satisfactory:

- According to the TE, “all procedures related to advances of funds required by the UNDP Procedures for National Execution have been complied with by FRIM as the [Executing] Agency in accordance with regulations and procedures of the government of Malaysia. It would appear that due diligence was observed in the management of the funds for the Project.”
- To the TE, “key stakeholders participated during its formulation and there was good technical and financial support from the Government through FRIM, the Forestry Departments and Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment. [...] FRIM could also receive funding to implement the EMS in the long-term. The positive attitude towards biodiversity/forest conservation has been nurtured to such an extent that it enabled FRIM’s participation in the carbon off-set program of Malaysia’s airlines, MAS.”
- Referring to Execution, the TE remarks that “Overall, project implementation at the site level was satisfactory to highly satisfactory. However, the effectiveness of the implementation of data collection and monitoring was regarded as moderately unsatisfactory as the Integrated Database Management (IDBM) system is currently not operational at all sites.”
- Therefore, considering FRIM’s good compliance of UNDP instructions, an appraised management diligence, stakeholder engagement, and even civil recognition through the air company involvement, but having remarked that operationality of the database at all sites was not yet accomplished in the time of field visit, quality of execution is rated as satisfactory.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the *outlined* outcomes-to-impact pathway?

Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts / GEB
To demonstrate the necessary steps in planning for biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource utilization in peat swamp forests.	Data collection and setting up of a monitoring program and information management system to facilitate management and decision-making Well-formulated site management plans, addressing issues such as biodiversity, physical functions and sustainable use.	A more sustainable use of the areas by local communities was realistically acknowledged to ensure the positive co-existence of the biodiversity conservation areas and local communities. Conservation and sustainable use at three sites, demonstrating what is required for the adoption of a multi-sectorial approach to peat swamp forest management through- out Malaysia.	Conservation and sustainable use of globally significant genetic, species and ecosystem diversity within tropical peat swamp forests in Malaysia. Implementation of the Malaysian Biodiversity Action Plan by
To demonstrate the implementation of biodiversity	Conservation and sustainable use of peat swamp forest ecosystem resources and functions		

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

<p>conservation and sustainable resource utilization strategies in peat swamp forests.</p> <p>To strengthen institutional and human technical capacities and awareness.</p>	<p>demonstrated.</p> <p>Inter-agency networks at State level to integrate biodiversity overlays into development planning on peat lands.</p> <p>Decision-makers, communities and other stakeholders better aware of the importance of conserving peat swamp forests and associated wet- land ecosystems.</p> <p>Strengthened institutional and human capacities to conserve and sustainably manage biological diversity in peat swamp forests and associated wetland ecosystems.</p>	<p>Involvement of an important national company, Malaysian Airlines (MAS): The SEPPSF is also the first forest site that could benefit from a commercial airlines carbon off-set program, which will help fund programs to protect a natural carbon sink.</p> <p>The establishment of Wetland Management Committee's (WMC) is considered a useful and necessary step in ensuring continued inter-agency network and effective implementation of the developed IMPs.</p> <p>WMC helps to support to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention.</p>	<p>providing demonstrations of conservation and sustainable management of peat swamp forests.</p> <p>At the global level, the carbon-offset program should ultimately mitigate the adverse effects of climate change and have significant long-term impacts on biodiversity conservation in PSF in Malaysia.</p>
---	--	--	--

b. What are the actual (*intended or unintended*) impacts of the project?

Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts and to *impact drivers* (Impact drivers are the *significant factors* that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

Considering the assessed outcomes, it is inferable from this project that the main impacts and impact drivers were:

- Data collection and monitoring:** In fact, systematization of data collected was “unfortunately not operational at any of the three sites during the time of the field visit of the TE team and thus it could not be verified to what extent (1) monitoring had taken place and (2) whether survey data had been entered in the IDMS/EMS system.” *However*, although this aspect does compromise project effectiveness by preventing future initiatives to be based on information gathered and systematized, data collection and monitoring enabled more to be known about the flora and fauna of peat swamp forests in Malaysia. This is certainly an impact driver for many reasons. At all three sites more detailed information about the flora and fauna became available through inventory and assessments that formed part of the multi-disciplinary assessments (MDA) at each project site. Population and species richness, endemism, species distributions, and the socio-economic role of species in the livelihoods of local communities were documented, in general as well as in detail at selected survey sites. The information gathered provided estimates of baseline levels of biological diversity that would form the basis for a longer-term monitoring program. Data from biodiversity “expeditions” were published widely disseminated in technical and popular publications. According to the TE, “this would not have happened if the project had not been implemented. The biodiversity surveys and monitoring provided an assessment of the integrity of the forest ecosystem in the project sites. In addition, all data were placed in a GIS database that formed the basis for the development of a common information management system at all project sites.
- Community involvement:** The participatory rural appraisal (PRA) included appraisal of the biodiversity in the project areas and their value. This enabled local communities to become more aware of the importance of biodiversity conservation. Such participatory appraisal also provide local communities with insights into the need for inter-sectorial coordination in planning resource use and of the complex nature of decision-making with regard to balancing resource use for enhancing human wellbeing, and the need to reduce threats to biodiversity in peat swamp forests (PSF).
- Qualitative reporting:** The IMP reports are generally clear and sound, following a logical sequence. They give substantial and relevant background information on the assets and threats to the sites, and give a range of concrete strategies and actions, which will neutralize these threats. In each site different management zones were identified based on both biophysical and socio-economic factors that enable more logical preparation of biodiversity and other plans (e.g. ecotourism). The TE reports that the IMPs had a direct influence on local policies and were endorsed by the respective State authorities in 2007. Ownership of the IMPs seems to be strong which is a direct result of the interactive approach chosen for its development.
- Area/Park management system:** The presence of local communities dependent of continuing sustainable

use of the areas were realistically acknowledged and factored into the planning and decision-making process, to ensure positive co-existence of the biodiversity conservation areas and local communities.

- **Involvement of an important national company:** The SEPPSF is also the first forest site that could benefit from a commercial airlines carbon offset program. Malaysia Airlines’ (MAS) carbon offset scheme will help fund selected United Nations-sanctioned programs such as the SEPPSF areas to protect a natural carbon sink. This program aims to not only generate awareness of the carbon footprint of air travellers but will also provide a means of compensating countries that maintain carbon sinks. At the global level this would ultimately mitigate the adverse effects of climate change. The availability of such carbon-offset funds can ensure strict observation of sustainable forest management guidelines that can contribute to enhanced biodiversity conservation in the SEPPSF. This will have significant long- term impacts on biodiversity conservation in PSF in Malaysia.
- **Institutionalization:** The establishment of Wetland Management Committee’s (WMC) is considered a useful and necessary step in ensuring continued inter-agency network and effective implementation of the developed IMPs. Also the development of the MPCT’s for the IMP development has led to better inter-agency level communication.
- **Awareness Raising:** Generally the project has contributed to a more positive attitude towards conservation of biodiversity in the Forest Department in all three states. Awareness programs were conducted at all sites and the publications produced were widely disseminated in the print and electronic media. Much is available about the outputs from the project where lists of its activities, training courses, partners, publications etc have been published on the website of the project. The positive attitude towards biodiversity/forest conservation has been nurtured to such an extent that it enabled FRIM’s participation in the carbon-offset program of Malaysia’s airlines, MAS. The number of brochures, leaflets, media releases, books produced by the project was impressive and it will in all probability continue to enhance awareness of importance peat swamp forest in Malaysia and elsewhere.

c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?

Considering the assessed likelihood of outcome sustainability, it is inferable from this project that the apparent risks to impacts were:

- **Lack of plan for a sustained interest after project termination:** According to the TE, although there is a moderate risk regarding the extent to which stakeholder awareness and demonstration of conservation, management and use of PSF will continue after project termination, other aspects – such as sustainable use and knowledge on biodiversity of PSF, site management plans, network of inter-agency at the state level, and institutional and human capacities – are expected to have no problems with regard to sustainability.
- **Lack of local ownership in one of the project sites:** According to the TE, preliminary results show that the project has been meaningful and important to the nation. Project ownership in all sites is generally strong, although it seems stronger at Loagan Bunut and Kliang Peninsula. In Pahang, on the other hand, the establishment of Wetland Management Committee (WMC) could help to improve ownership.
- **Lack of legal framework:** no legal advancements have been noted in the TE, which might represent a moderate risk to the institutional framework’s sustainability.
- **Lack of effective data systematization:** effective systematization of data could facilitate future management for new executors.

d. Evidence of Impact

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?	X		
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project. According to the TE, “The presence of local communities dependent of continuing sustainable use of the areas were realistically acknowledged and factored into the planning and decision-making process, to ensure positive co-existence of the biodiversity conservation areas and local communities.”			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic</u> level?	X		
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

According to the TE, “Involvement of an important national company, Malaysian Airlines (MAS): The SEPPSF is also the first forest site that could benefit from a commercial airlines carbon off-set program, which will help fund programs to protect a natural carbon sink, should ultimately mitigate the adverse effects of climate change and have significant long- term impacts on biodiversity conservation in PSF in Malaysia.”			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)		X	
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?		X	
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?		X	
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts? No negative impacts were reported in the TE.			
e. Monitoring of impacts			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion? The establishment of Wetland Management Committee’s (WMC) is considered a useful and necessary step in ensuring continued inter-agency network and effective implementation of the developed IMPs. Also, WMC helps to support to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention.	X		
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?		X	

6. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

The key lessons, good practices and approaches provided by the TE are (general and per site):

General

1. The voluntary carbon market can be an effective way to improve sustainable management and conservation of PSF. The SEPPSF approach for Carbon project MAS is coordinated by WMC. There will be a trust fund under NRE. The fund will be used for better management and control of the FR.
2. The SEPPSF IMP was used as a blue-print for the development of an integrated management plan for Perak Protected Forest (300 ha; Belum-Temenggor Rainforest). This was done in cooperation with WWF and MNS.
3. Communications strategies and their implementation must be developed by experienced communication professionals. More often than not different target groups require different communications skills and the communications professional engaged to influence the private and commercial sector interests need not necessarily be the same professional effective with community groups.
4. The profile of a project can be raised by involving senior politicians in its key events. This contributes

	<p>considerably to public awareness of the project and peat swamp forest conservation through the media exposure brought about by the publication of news on the activities of the senior politicians.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Good relations with a varied media community (print and electronic) are essential for successful and widespread coverage of the project and peat swamp conservation in the press. 6. Ownership of the IMP was very strong because of the interactive way it was developed. The establishment of the MPCT (Management Plan Core Team) was essential in this.
Pahang	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pahang approach for Carbon project MAS is coordinated by WMC. There will be a trust fund under NRE. The fund will be used for better management and control of the FR. 2. Perak 300 ha of Protected Forest (Belum-Temenggor Rainforest). An integrated management plan has been made in cooperation with WWF and MNS. The Pahang IMP was used as a blueprint.
Sabah	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formation of core team (acting as a hands-on task force) essential to obtain inputs from all stakeholders and for the preparation of the MDA reports that provided input into the IMP. 2. Any gaps identified by the core team needs to be quickly rectified by the appointment of suitable experts/specialist to produce the necessary information. 3. Ownership of management plan is very important and will pave the way for smoother implementation. 4. Management plans needs to complement existing statutory plans (local authority structure and local plans). 5. In dealing with specific issues within management plans (e.g. boundary extension) it is important to determine which agency is taking the lead. 6. MDA's are a useful and essential tool for rapid appraisal of the status of an area and provide indispensable information for the development of sound management. However, if more time and money had been available specialist studies would have been a better way to organize these assessments.
Sarawak	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allowing the Sarawak Forestry Corporation (SFC) to take the lead in preparing business and tourism plans led to their ownership of the management plan. This ensured more committed engagement and strong adoption of the IMP by the stakeholders.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The main recommendations given in the TE are:

1. All parties involved in the project (EPU, MONRE/FRIM, UNDP) should collaborate to initiate the establishment of the trust fund for sustainable management and conservation of all threatened peat swamp forests sites in Malaysia. Funds should be used to ensure the use of the IMPs at all locations and where IMPs have yet to be developed, commission management authorities to prepare IMPs using funds made available by the Trust Fund. The source of finances of the Trust Fund should be as diversified as possible and include monies collected from timber harvesting revenues and other sources like the Malaysia Airways carbon-offset program.
2. In order to ensure sustainable management and continued implementation of the IMPs at all three sites, ownership is needed by the respective states. The national wetland policy of NRE could support this through liberation of resources and maintained support.
3. Ecological monitoring should be incorporated as a standard operational procedure (SOP) in the forest departments in Pahang, Sabah and Sarawak. The IMS should be made a standard Forestry Department software package and be implemented by the GIS sections in each Forestry Department. FRIM and the Forest Research Divisions at Sarawak and Sabah should provide technical support in implementation of both the SOP and IMS.
4. Access to LBNP should be seriously addressed and improved. The road to Loagan Bunut needs to be improved so that tourists can visit the Park more easily. We recommend stronger action of the NREB in addressing erosion problems with plantation establishment and forestry activities in the areas surrounding LBNP in order to stop sedimentation of the lake.
5. The market for voluntary carbon-offset program should be further investigated as PSF contain a lot of carbon both below and above ground. The existing monitoring programs form a good base for carbon accounting but may need to be expanded. The funds can be used to further improve management at all three project sites, for instance to further progress rehabilitation activities. There is also potential to involve local stakeholder groups here.
6. The developed capacity and information on PSF currently being kept at FRIM UNDP office should be safeguarded for future use. We applaud the plans to maintain the UNDP office at FRIM as a PSF information centre.

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

No other sources were consulted.

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

7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The coverage of outcomes (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness) is not as detailed as it could have been. However, the coverage of impacts is sound and consistent.</p>	4
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</p>	5
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The coverage of sustainability aspects is not as detailed and explained as it could have been.</p>	3
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p>	5
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p>	5
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?</p>	5

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

No other sources were consulted.