Project Management Information System aagarwal5@thegef.org

To Do | Projects | Reports | Administration | Help | Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: GEF Project ID [ ] Select

<< Back to Project Edit Save Data

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	665
Project Title	Protected Areas Management
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Agency	World Bank
World Bank ID	57346
Country	Yemen
Project Status	Project Closure
Duration	3 years
CEO Endorsement	04/02/1999
Agency Approval	4/2/1999
Project Effectiveness	02/29/2000
GEF Agency Execution Partners	(Select Execution Partners) Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	John Bryant Collier
TE Reviewer	Pallavi Nuka
TE Peer Reviewer	Baljit Wadwha

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	12/31/2003	
Project Actual Completion	6/30/2005	
Project Completion Difference	18	Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	08/08/2005	
TE Submission to EO	11/30/2011	
TE Submission to EO Difference	75	Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	03/12/2012	
TER Submission to EO	03/12/2012	
TER Submission to EO Difference	0	Months

Comments on Delays

The completed TEs for the World Bank are available to the EO immediately through the intranet. Earlier on information available with the EO on completed projects was not perfect because the Secretariat did not track this information systematically. Now that this information is being tracked more systematically, it is easier for the EO to identify the completed projects for which terminal evaluations have not been submitted. This project was not reported to have been completed earlier. Therefore, the EO was not able to access its terminal evaluation, even though it could have been accessed.

ICM received by GEFSEC in 06. GEFEO not informed.

From the TE report: "Implementation was seriously delayed for Hawf and Jebel Bura'a until the last six months of the project, when a concerted effort by the PMU and the consultant resulted in the completion of planned activities."

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US$)	740,000	615,218	83.14 %

Cofinance Amount (US$)	680,000	0	0.00 %
Total Amount (US$)	1,420,000	615,218	43.33 %

Comments on Cofinancing

No co-financing was leveraged. From the TE report: "This project has also suffered from a difficulty in obtaining the required local funding."

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework: 3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory

Project Objectives -

The project brief did not include a logical framework per se. The project summary does outline outcomes, activities and indicators. However these parts are not well linked together and most indicators are not SMART.
From the project brief, objectives were: 'to conserve biodiversity of global significance in Yemen through the protection, maintenance and enhancement of forest ecosystems in arid and semi-arid mountainous areas by promoting sustainable, community-based management of two selected forest ecosystems and by developing replicable systems for preserving biodiversity in Yemen."
The project essentially sought to establish two PAs (the first in Yemen).

Project outcomes outlined in the Project Brief:
1. Detailed PAM plans for protection of threatened ecosystems in two pilot areas based on a strong community participation.
2. Enhancement of supporting policy institutional, legal and regulatory framework for PAM.
3. Enhancement of the assessment of the numbers, scale and extent of biological
resources in the two pilot zones, including a mechanism for long-term monitoring of Biodiversity.
4. Implementation of priority actions including priority community development actions packaged for and submitted to the existing IDA-funded Social Fund and/or the Public Works Fund.

Project supports OP#1, 3, 4.

Comment on Changes

There were no changes to objectives or outcomes during implementation.

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
1. Support to develop community based PA Management Plans for two pilot sites	1. Two community approved PAM plans; Zoning, mapping and targeted biodiversity studies completed; Biodiversity monitoring mechanism in place. 2. Community	1. Increased community awareness to protect Biodiversity. 2. Enhanced policy institutional, legal and regulatory framework for PAM. 3. Improved understanding and monitoring of the scale and	Risk: Insufficient socio-political support for the project.	- Clear political support for project objectives at all levels of government. - Participatory process used to engage local stakeholders and civil society	Sustainable, community-based protected area management (PAM) in two pilot areas.	Sustainable conservation of biodiversity in pilot areas. Models for PAM replicated elsewhere in Yemen.	Edit Delete

	consultation committees including key stakeholders; operational and priority actions discussed and agreed	extent of biological resources in pilot areas		groups with interest in conservation.			
2. Support for priority actions in the two pilot sites.	2.1 . Funding applications submitted to IDA-funded Social Fund and/or the Public Works Fund for priority actions including priority community development actions	2.2 . Priority investments financed (core protected areas and buffer zones) and under implementation.	Risk: Insufficient socio-political support for the project.	- Clear political support for project objectives at all levels of government. - Participatory process used to engage local stakeholders and civil society groups with interest in conservation.	2.4 Community development actions underway and external pressures decreased.	2.5 Reduced stress on biodiversity in pilot areas.	Edit Delete
3. Support to strengthen and publicize the institutional, legal and regulatory framework for PA management in the two sites	3.1 Policies and regulations formulated and submitted for adoption by gov't agencies.	3.2 Enhanced policy institutional, legal and regulatory framework for PAM.	Risk: Insufficient socio-political support for the project.	Clear political support for project objectives at all levels of government. - Participatory process used to engage local stakeholders and civil society groups with interest in conservation.	3.3 Strengthened capabilities of government (EPC), local communities, and NGOs to manage and conserve Yemen's Biodiversity and land resources.	3.5 Models for PAM replicated elsewhere in Yemen.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...							

Project Performance

Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments

Overall Project Rating: 4 - Moderately Satisfactory

Comment

Despite accomplishment of important project outputs in the last six months of implementation, there is insufficient evidence output quality and achievement of outcomes to warrant a S rating. Project efficiency was also hampered by delays and a slow rate disbursement for the first 3 years.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Last PIR:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	NA
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	

			"The overall GO is upgraded to satisfactory because during the final six months of the Project, both the Hawf and Jebal Bura'a activities were completed."
Outcomes	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Despite accomplishment of project activities in the last six months of implementation, there is insufficient evidence of achievement of outputs and outcomes to warrant a S rating. Project efficiency was also hampered by delays and a slow rate disbursement for the first 3 years.
Relevance	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the Project Brief, the project was relevant to GEF strategic program goals and national priorities.
Effectiveness	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Protected area management plans, a draft legal framework, national and local awareness campaigns, study tours, training, facility upgrades were achieved.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Although the planned outputs were achieved, the most important activities, the PAM plans, were only completed in the last six months of project implementation. The TE report notes that "there was no time for detailed review or follow-up" on the PAM plan component. This component was rated MS in the TE. In the absence of evidence on the quality of outputs and an assessment showing that outputs have led or will lead to achievement of expected outcomes, effectivness is rated MS
Efficiency	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	"Per GEF Policy, the Task Team will conduct a detailed ICM for these activities, which should be completed in November 2005. The ICM will specifically look at cost effectiveness of the project, including the PMU structure."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	

			The project was delayed by 18 months. Furthermore the most important project activities were only completed in the last six months of implementation. One of the TE's lessons also notes that the project "resulted in very high overheads even during periods of project inactivity" and recommends that "medium sized projects like this should remain linked to larger IBRD/IDA investments primarily for a more cost effective approach to managing the project at the country level." In light of this, efficiency must be rated MS

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability	Last PIR:	NA - Not Applicable	Missing last PIR.
	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE report rates sustainability as "Uncertain." "Arrangements for sustainability" is rated MS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess.
Financial	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No mention of sustainability or risks in TE.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely	Considering that the project was unable to leverage co-financing during its 4.5 year implementation period, it seems unlikely that any continued financing will be secured to maintain project achievements.
Socio-political	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No mention of sustainability or risks in TE.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess.
Institutional and Legal	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No mention of sustainability or risks in TE.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess.
Environmental	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No mention of sustainability or risks in TE.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	No comment.

M&E	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Since there is insufficient information to assess implementation of M&E activities, the overall rating for M&E is also UA.
M&E Design	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No assessment of M&E plan at entry.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The project brief includes a very brief M&E plan. $40K was allotted for M&E activities. The M&E plan identifies an MTR, but no TE. The M&E plan did not include a logical framework. Although outcome indicators are listed in the project summary, they largely do not meet SMART criteria.
M&E Plan Implementation	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No information on M&E implementation.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information on M&E implementation in TE report. No mention of the MTR.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No mention of M&E budget utilization.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	The Project Brief indicates that $40K was budgeted for M&E activities. There is no information on M&E budget utilization in TE report.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information provided in TE report.
Quality of Implementation - IA	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Bank performance is rated S. Project management, financial management are both rated MS. The TE further notes that "The project is facing a potential deficit due to currency fluctuations since the contract for Jebel Bura'a was denominated in Pounds Sterling rather than United States Dollars. The situation is improved due to the strengthening of the dollar in the last six months of the project."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	

			The TE report provides little information on implementation. Overall the IA seems to have provided adequate oversight for the project. However implementation could have been improved by exercising more adaptive management and encouraging the PMU to accomplish important activities sooner. Also the exchange rate risk that arose from denominating contracts in GBP rather than $, should have been better managed
Quality of Execution - EA	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	Counterpart funding is rated MS, procurement is rated S.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess.

Agency Specific Project Criteria

Criteria	Document	Rating / Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Government commitment is rated MS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Rated MS due to the slow pace of implementation and no materialization of co-
Financial Planning	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Financial Management is rated MS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The project had high overhead costs. Also, the denomination of a major contract in GBP led to a deficit risk for the project.
Preparation and Readiness	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on review of the Project Document, the project objectives of establishing two PAs were clearly stated and achievable within the given time frame. The National Environmental Council, as a central government agency, was an appropriate choice for executing agency and the project's implementation arrangements were well defined
Stakeholders Involvement	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Public involvement is rated S.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.

Need for Follow Up	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Nothing in the TE report indicates a need for follow-up.
Gender Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Although the project brief notes that 'Care must be taken to involve women in the project by reinforcing this active participation", there is no evidence in the TE that the project did so.
Effects on Local Population	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	The TE report notes that a local awareness campaign carried out.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	The TE report notes that a local awareness raising campaign carried out, but it is unclear what effect (if any) this had on the local

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess	No information provided.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess	Community development was part of the project design, but there is no information provided in the TE report aside from noting that activities under this component were satisfactorily
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not mentioned in the TE report or the Project Document.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	This was not part of the project design.
Democratic Governance	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess	No information provided.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess	The development of park management plans through community consultation and participation was part of project design. However there is no information provided in the TE report on how this was carried out.

Progress to Impact

Progress to Impact	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to Assess	No mention of impacts in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	1 - Low or Negligible Progress	There is no information in the TE report to suggest progress to impacts. The TE notes that PAM plans were completed, but there is no information on if or how these plans are being implemented. Similarly, the TE report notes that priority actions were implemented but without further detail, it is not possible to assess the impacts of these priority actions.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	"Knowledge exchange" rated "Modest"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The TE report notes that National and local awareness campaigns were completed.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	"Development/strengthening of institutions" rated "Modest"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project has developed a Draft Legal Framework for establishing national protected
Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	"Client policy/program implementation" rated "Modest"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess. Protected area management plans have been drawn up, but not yet implemented.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	No information in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project demonstrated how to establish PAs and develop management plans. The lessons and experiences from this project will be used to inform future initiatives that seek to establish

Criteria /	Document	Verification	Comment

Categorization of Results / Investment			
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	No mention of financial mechanisms in the TE report or in the Project Document.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Although the Project Document refers to activities that would "finance development and promote alternative livelihoods," there is no mention of a financial mechanism for this purpose. The TE report does not refer to financial mechanisms.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	'Replicability" rated "Uncertain". "While the model is replicable, the overall capacity of the EPA within the Government of Yemen remains weak; therefore, such an activity is unlikely to be replicated without some sort of external financing."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	No evidence of replication within the project's lifetime or soon after.
Upscaling	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	No mention of upscaling.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.
Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	No evidence of mainstreaming biodiversity issues into larger national policy framework. This is not mentioned in the project brief either.

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document	
Environmental Stress Reduction	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	GEFEO Review	

Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
N - No	Demonstration Site	Intended	No evidence of stress reduction in project lifetime.	Edit Delete

		Add New Row...				
Environmental Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		N - No	Demonstration Site			Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
Socioeconomic Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Boundary**	**Intent**	**Comments**	
		N - No	Demonstration Site		No indication of socio-economic changes.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
Arrangements for Impact M&E	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility**	**Comments**			
		Y - Yes	Biodiversity monitoring systems developed as part PA management plans.			Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE report is quite brief and contains several information gaps. Although reference is made to a more detailed ICM, such a document is not available on PMIS or on the Bank's website.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.

Outcome Assessment	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE report assesses achievement of outputs in each component. There is no assessment of outcomes.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information provided regarding stakeholder consultation.
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	There is no assessment of sustainability.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Lessons and recommendations are well-founded given the data on implementation. These lessons could be more comprehensive. I.e. Why were overhead costs so high? How could implementation arrangement be streamlined?
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	Disbursement information is provided. However costs are not presented on a component or activity basis.
M&E Asssessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	No assessment of M&E design or implementation.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	Results are not compared to indicators outlined in the Project Brief.
Consultation with Stakeholders	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information provided regarding stakeholder consultation.
Compliance with Guidances	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess.
Compliance with UNEG Norms	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	NA for WB MSP.
Addressing of ToR requests	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No ToR.

Independence of Report	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information to assess.

Lessons & Reccomendations

Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Capacity Building		Medium sized projects like this one should focus more on implementation of activities at the national and community levels rather than on funding large studies.	Edit Delete
Financial Planning		The PMU structure for this type of small/medium sized activity should be reconsidered, as it resulted in very high overheads even during periods of project inactivity.	Edit Delete
Financial Planning		Close attention to procurement to ensure that contracts are written in same currency as grant is needed to prevent currency fluctuation issues like those facing this project in the last year.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Capacity Building		The teams major recomendation is that medium sized projects like this should remain linked to larger IBRD/IDA investments primarily for a more cost effective approach to managing the project at the country level.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

<< Back to Project Edit

Save Data

A product of the Global Environment Facility