

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 661		Review date:		
IA/EA Project ID: 1343		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name: Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname's Guayana Shield		GEF financing:	9.54	9.54
Country: Suriname		IA/EA own:	0.25	0.11
		Government:		
		Other*:	8.40	5.30
		Total Cofinancing	8.97	5.41
Operational Program:	OP 3	Total Project Cost:	18.51	14.95
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	UNOPS	Work Program date		05/07/1999
		CEO Endorsement		02/14/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		04/08/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 05/01/2005	Actual: 12/01/2006
Prepared by:	Reviewed by: Lee Risby	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 61 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 80 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 19 months
Author of TE: Dirk Kloss and Edwin Mitchell		TE completion date: 04/13/2007	TE submission date to GEF OME: 09/13/2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 5 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

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

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

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

Yes. The terminal evaluation report provides detailed information on accomplishment of results, project expenditure and cofinancing. However, some of its ratings are not consistent with the evidence provided.

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

None have been mentioned.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

<p>3.1 Project Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? <p>According to the project appraisal document (PAD) submitted for CEO Endorsement project goal “is to engender sustainable conservation of the globally significant Guayana Shield tropical forest wilderness biota.”</p> <p>The project goal listed in the terminal evaluation is the same as that listed the PAD. Thus, there have been no changes in the overall global environmental objectives of the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? <p>The development objective of the project as listed in the logframe of the PAD was to that “Government agencies, non-governmental entities, and local communities are maintaining and improving the integrity and viability of Suriname’s priority Guayana Shield ecosystems”</p> <p>The last Project Implementation Report (PIR) for the project (FY 2006) specifies the same development objectives. Thus, there have been no changes in the development objectives of the project.</p>
<p>3.2 Outcomes and Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE? <p>According to the terminal evaluation, “the project had no measurable impact on the three indicators set in the project logframe to determine whether it contributed to the goal of biodiversity protection. Species and biological integrity were neither positively nor negatively affected because the project did nothing that could have affected them: no conservation activity on the ground, and no policy or institutional changes that translated into measurable management change on the ground.”</p>

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

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

A Relevance	Rating: S
The expected outcomes of the project are consistent with the objectives of Operational Program (OP) number 3 of the GEF. This OP aims at “conservation and sustainable use of the biological resources in forest ecosystems.”	
B Effectiveness	Rating: U
Overall the achievements of the project have been very modest.	
According to the Terminal Evaluation the project successfully capitalized and operationalized the Suriname Conservation Foundation (SCF). However, if the actual performance of the project is assessed based on the information provided elsewhere in the terminal evaluation, it appears that by the end of the project the goal of capitalizing the SCF to a corpus of 15 m \$ is yet to be met. The Terminal Evaluation explains that “hopefully” this target will be met by 2010 primarily through accumulation of returns on investments. The TE, however, does not take into account the time value of money, i.e. that a 15 m dollar in FY 2004 is not the same as 15 m in 2010. Further, the project has not made expected progress on grant making.	
Other than this, the achievements of the project were rather limited. Project also drafted management plan for Central Suriname Conservation Project. However, it had limited efficacy in term of policy development and capacity enhancement for biodiversity conservation.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: MU
The project was overambitious. There was a 19 month delay in completion of the project. The capitalization of SCF to the extent desired had not been accomplished by project completion.	

4.1.2 Impacts

The TE does not list any impacts of the project.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources	Rating: L
According to the terminal evaluation creation of endowment lowers the financial risks to the future flow of benefits from the project. The endowment is sufficiently large to cover the financial needs of the target areas.	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
According to the terminal evaluation, although in nineties there was strong government support for environmental conservation, after the project commenced the government has not shown sufficient commitment to this end and has not strengthened the environmental agencies. The Ministry of Labor, Technical Development and Environment is under funded. The political environment, otherwise, has been fairly stable and does not pose any critical risks.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
According to the terminal evaluation the project trained the board members and technical staff of the SCF, which has brought governance capacities to a level which can be sustained independently of external agency support. The project has also created an advisory board, where previous board members and other eminent people can continue to assist SCF management team.	
In terms of presence of sector specific skills the country lacks in professionals trained in forestry. The project has not been able to fill this gap through training of protected area managers and staff, and potential grantees. The lack of adequate operational skills related to forestry sector will poses some risk to the sustenance of the benefits of the project.	
D Environmental	Rating: L
No environmental risks to the benefits that flow from the project.	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
Project has led to creation of an endowment to provide grants for initiatives aimed at addressing forest management related issues. It has build capacities of the board members and the technical staff of the endowment to be able to manage it effectively. However, it has not been able to effect policy changes and facilitate undertaking of conservation activities in the field so far. The actual stream of global environmental benefits is yet to start, so overall it has not had any major contribution in production of public goods.
b. Demonstration
c. Replication
d. Scaling up

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): MS
An analysis of the logical framework of the project shows that some of the key indicators chosen were not appropriate to measure overall project performance – they were too ambitious and changes in measurements of those indicators could not have been reasonably attributed to the project. However, appropriate indicators have been chosen for most of the outcomes and outputs. The M&E plans details the activities that will be taken up and the time frame for those activities. It also presents an assessment of risks and assumptions. However, as also was experienced earlier, the project performance was sensitive to UNDP being able to raise the required cofinancing for the project. The M&E plan did not accurately access this risk even though it was known that raising cofinancing is not among one of the recognized strengths of UNDP.	
B. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): MU
According to the terminal evaluation although the monitoring system provided sufficient information to alert the management in real time about the problems faced by the project, this information was not used by the management to make corrections in project operations. Some of the activities that were found to be infeasible, such as development of bio-prospecting policies and conservation policy support, were not replaced by other emerging priorities. The terminal evaluation also notes that the tripartite review of the project took place only two times, against the expected four, during the first four years of implementation. Consequently, management was not able to deal with the pressing issues confronting the project in real time. The management took corrective actions to reduce delays in grant making and to increase visibility only when the mid term review confirmed the issues that had been raised in annual progress reports. However, the mid term evaluation was also commissioned with delays.	

C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Unable to assess.
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess. Some of the M&E activities were delayed. However it is not clear whether it was due to lack of timely funding.
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No. There were major concerns pertaining to project design, indicators and assessment of risks.

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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?
According to the TE following lessons could be learnt from the project: Lessons on project management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commencing a project with an inception workshop would have provided the stakeholders with an opportunity to identify themselves with the project and to clarify roles. - A well functioning project coordination committee with quarterly meetings is essential. - A well integrated full time project coordinator can increase the success chances of a project - Adequate supervision and quality adjustment of sub contracts are hard to manage from a far. It requires close cooperation with local coordinator and ideally staff continuity. Lessons on Foundation and Asset Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fluctuating money markets are a foreseeable risk for which the project design must plan provisions. - Capacity to monitor and information sharing on asset management must be with the entire board. - Alternative spending and fund raising scenarios can help trust fund projects deal with income fluctuations. - Young boards need constant qualified advice. - The failure of baseline investments to materialize must be assumed as a risk. - A project must adapt or be revised instantly when changed baselines cause failure. - Projects should monitor and report on anticipated baseline investments. - A project should use several avenues to deal with public sector inefficiencies. Lessons on Conservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Best practices can also be formulated and shared on the stakeholder participation in the formulation of the management plans. - More lessons can be obtained from the consultations with the local communities, to better understand their perception of management and co-management.
List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
The terminal evaluation provided following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reinforce implementation of some of the still unfulfilled mid-term recommendations. To Capacity Building Support Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Undertake a management support mission for the SCF Capacity Building Support now. - Review the project document and logframe - Support institutional reform and conservation capacity building as the highest priority. - Strengthen the project coordinator. - Establish and monitor individual work plans for local partner organizations. - Safeguard sustainability of core staff financing, avoid salary dependence on grant projects. - Ensure that STINASU makes profit to help pay for conservation. - Demonstrate to government and citizens measurable success (income) from protected areas. - Implement the recommendations for resource mobilization strategy made three years ago. - Undertake financial project audit at the beginning of 2008. To the SCF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote SCF's image, independent identity, and its conservation programme; implement the new vision. - Review the Operations Manual as a living document. - Develop solid grantsmanship and improve the quality of submissions by SCFs potential grantees.

- Strengthen the implementation capacity of local partners (NGOs, CBOs).
- Proactively influence the institutional environment and adjust SCF programs to fit.
- Help projects supported by SCF grants to develop sustainable income prospects of their own.
- Shift grant priorities over time from institutional to reserve management.
- Develop and coordinate a pipeline of projects that effectively contribute to the creation of a sustainable management of the CSNR and SNR.
- Publicize grant opportunities and proposal training in multiple media, newspapers and radio.
- Professionalize preparation and implementation of a public relations strategy.
- Raise the capacity of board members and retain a good balance of those well trained, critical and constructive members on the board.
- Avoid divisive debate and monitor undue political alliances in board voting, e.g. on matters affecting minority groups and promote pragmatic conservation approaches.
- Add a youth representative, an international fund raiser and another conservation organization to the SCF board.

For protected area management and policies

- Support institutional reform and conservation capacity building.
- Enable NCD to implement in good quality and cooperation the management and operational plans for CSNR and SNR.
- Make the CSNR project with NCD a success. This is the most important SCF project.
- Redefine stakeholder/right holder roles in conservation in a constructive spirit.
- Empower communities in reserve management.
- Integrate bio-genetic resources issues into the nature conservation act during its 2007 revision.

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

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.

While rating project performance the terminal evaluation has focused more on what is likely to be achieved in future rather than what was achieved up to the point when evaluation was done. Consequently, poor actual performance of the project has been mitigated by the expectations of improved follow up to the project.

4.6.2 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?	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? There are some inconsistencies. For example the overall performance rating does not match well with the narrative. The narrative is more or less complete and covers most of the issues that are expected to be covered by a terminal evaluation.	MU
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The terminal evaluation report does provides sufficient information on sustainability of the project achievements	S
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	HS
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	MS

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

Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?

Yes, there was a difference in the expected and actual cofinancing. Cofinancing did not materialize due to

<p>the extent anticipated as the implementing agency was not able to get actual commitments from other bilateral donors. Even contributions for UNDP were lower than what had been promised.</p>
<p>Due to insufficient materialization of cofinancing capitalization of the SCF was not completed in time and the grant making activities have been delayed. In absence of adequate cofinancing the project was not able to provide for many activities that would have made the project more effective.</p>
<p>Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>Yes, there was a 19 month delay in completion of the project. Even so many of the activities were not accomplished to the extent expected at the time of project inception. A major cause of delay was insufficient institutional capacities and lack of adequate state interest and support. Hiring decisions were not made in a timely manner. Preparation of management plans for the protected area were delayed, consequently the conservation activities planned to be financed by the project were also delayed. Thus, delays made on accomplishment of critical activities further delayed accomplishment of other activities.</p>

<p>4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.</p>	<p>Yes:</p>	<p>No: X</p>
<p>Explain: The terminal evaluation provides fairly complete information on accomplishments and failings of the project.</p>		

<p>4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)</p>
<p>PIR 2006, Project Appraisal Document.</p>