GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

			Review date:	10/26/05
GEF ID:	797		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
Project Name:	Conservation of Biodiversity in Mt. Myohyang	GEF financing:	$0.75	$0.75
Country:	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)	Co-financing:	$0.9143	$0.9083
Operational Program:	OP4	Total Project Cost:	$1.6643	$1.6583
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		10/18/1999
		CEO Endorsement		01/11/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		7/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 04/29/2003	Actual: 3/2004
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 2.75 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 3.66 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 0.9 years
Author of TE: Graham Baines, An Chol Ho		TE completion date: March 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 6/21/05	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 year and 3 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	No rating	N/A	Unable to assess (only anecdotal evidence)
2.2 Project outcomes	S	No rating	N/A	S
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	No rating	N/A	MU
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	No rating	N/A	MS
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No ratings were provided for the criteria listed above.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the Project Summary, the objectives of the project were to protect biodiversity in Mt. Myohyang in Central DPRK identified as globally significant based on the rich altitudinal variations in forest-types and high species richness of plants and animals including many threatened and/or endemic species (threats include overharvesting and pressures from tourists and local communities)

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

According to the Project Summary, to initiate a protected area management scheme that focuses on biodiversity conservation, demonstrating a model of protected area management for the rest of the country. This would be achieved by:

1) Developing appropriate information systems and outreach activities
2) Strengthening the institutional and policy base
3) Strengthening management and developing a management plan.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The TE indicates that the project produced a satisfactory management plan for the area and that there was a Cabinet-level decision to reorient the roles of the Ministry and Department of Environmental Protection towards Protected Areas (PA) management. In addition, there was a Cabinet decision to establish protected area management systems and rearrange protected areas throughout the country. For example, the government satisfaction with the project results led to a cabinet decision to add 90 Km2 of adjacent forest land to the project area, a 37.5% increase. This included areas formerly managed as production forest on a 30-year cutting cycle (It has been 28 years since the last harvest). The TE indicated that this increase could slow the decline in the populations of the Asian Black Bear and some endangered birds such as the Long-tailed Goral, but the TE indicated that there was no data to verify this. In addition, according to the TE, Mt. Myohyang is not of sufficient size to maintain global significance as there is a real prospect that some of its globally significant species will gradually be lost. To ensure that Mt Myohyang maintains global biodiversity significance, action is needed to ensure biodiversity protection in the Myohyang-Rangrim forest corridor.

As a result of the project, PA management is also engaged in removing invasive species of plants and local authorities outlawed the collection of endangered medicinal plants from the protected areas and in exchange, established plantations[1] to harvest these species as well as firewood. The TE indicates that the project also strengthened the capacity of Ministry of Land and Environmental Protection by developing their staff and improving their policies. The project also strengthened the capacity of the Korea Nature Conservation Union to disseminate information which resulted in the production of information (e.g. biodiversity guides) and increased local schools involvement.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts	Rating: MS
A Relevance	

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

---

[1] This information could not be verified independently either during the TE or MTE missions or by project management.

Yes, both objectives and outcomes were consistent with the focal area and strategies for OP4, Mountain ecosystems. In addition, the TE indicates that the project maintained its relevance to the needs and priorities at the national level and it is assessed to have maintained its relevance at the global level. In this regard the TE adds:

- The Project concept has its origin within the DPR Korea National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan;
- Outcomes from the Project have been used as a basis for national actions regarding PA classification and PA management planning;
- Relevant country representatives have been actively involved in Project implementation;
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project; and
- The government has approved policies and modified regulatory frameworks in line with the Project's Objectives and Outcomes.

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)?**

The TE indicates that the implementation of the PA management plan for Mt Myohyang still hasn't taken place in full and depends on better definition of roles among government agencies and further increasing capacity and understanding among PA management staff on the importance of biodiversity conservation and action plans. According to the TE effective dissemination was not possible because capacity building could not be completed in the short time frame of three years. The TE indicates that although the project contributed to increasing the area under protection by 37% (compared to the initial area), there is no way of assessing the impact this had on biodiversity beyond anecdotal claims, such as reduction on PA resource extraction regarding endangered medicinal plants and firewood extraction. This was worsened by the fact that not the entire protected area was made accessible to the project staff and management during implementation due to security concerns of the government. Sustainability issues also decrease the effectiveness of the outcomes. In conclusion, although the project significantly contributed to the achievement of the objectives and a lot of credit has to be given to the fact that the initial capacity was very low (e.g., in many areas of capacity building for key stakeholders the project had to start by defining what was biodiversity, conservation and protected area), more work needs to be done to achieve the objectives and thus a moderately satisfactory rating on effectiveness is appropriate.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

- **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?**

The TE indicates that the Mid term evaluation found that the time allocated for the project was too short. The TE also indicated that the implementation of some project activities may not have been as efficient as possible. The cost effectiveness of the project can be said to be limited because the objectives were only partially achieved in project time frame.

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

A Financial resources	Rating: MU
Even though the government seems committed financially, the TE indicates that government resources are limited. The TE raised the issue that the project design did not contemplate other financial sustainability alternatives such as working the local hotel in the PA, etc.	
B Socio political	Rating: MU
The TE indicates that more local ownership of the PA management plan particularly by county-level agencies, the Forest Management Unit and Scenic Spots Management Unit at the PA is needed to increase sustainability. In addition, the TE indicates that PA neighboring communities were not listed in the Prodoc as Project beneficiaries, even though the last activity listed was intended to address community needs. Therefore the communities of people living in the vicinity of the PA's boundaries were not engaged as	

Project stakeholders. Despite some efforts by PA rangers to promote understanding of the PA's biodiversity values among local residents, the PA may still be seen by these communities as an interference with their livelihoods. The TE indicates that without this community engagement, the Mt Myohyang experience offers only a partial model for a national approach towards biodiversity conservation through protected areas.

C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: MS

The TE indicates that more involvement of key players (e.g., the Academy of Sciences), and better cooperation among those involved (especially among national and local agencies) was needed to increase institutional sustainability. Also more resources and time were needed to further develop local PA staff.

D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: MU

The TE indicates that the project actions such as fuelwood and medicinal plant plantations should have an impact on reducing pressure on natural resources, but that some issues remain in terms of the quality of the cultivated medicinal plants because recreation of the conditions where they grow naturally has been difficult. In addition, the TE indicates that Mt. Myohyang is not of sufficient size to maintain global significance as there is a real prospect that some of its globally significant species will gradually be lost. To ensure that Mt Myohyang maintains global biodiversity significance, action is needed to ensure biodiversity protection in the Myohyang-Rangrim forest corridor.

E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: MU

The TE indicates that the level of understanding and skill needed to initiate new forms of biodiversity conservation awareness or new programs for different PAs has not been achieved yet thus the outcomes of the demonstration objective of the project still remains to be seen.

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

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: MS

The TE indicates that the monitoring targets for project implementation were refined by the Project Planning Adviser and included in an updated implementation schedule that was attached to the Project Document. However these lost their relevance as the realities of implementation dawned, some activities had to be modified and the over-ambitious targets of the original design were recognized.
The TE indicates that the project carried out extensive surveys of animal groups considered on immediate management significance. However, data on some medicinal plans and fish was insufficient to measure impacts. Working with park rangers, the project identified vulnerable areas within the park subject to human stress and prepared maps with this information for the management plan. However, the TE indicates that a full analysis of vulnerable areas did not take place and no socio-economic surveys were carried out by the project, nor was there a complete survey of neighbors perception of the park (some work was completed but there was no follow up).

B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?	Rating: MS

The TE indicates that biodiversity indicators including baseline conditions (surveys that were carried out on birds and mammals traditional medicinal plants) were included in the management plan and PA regulations that and led to restriction in the harvesting of medicinal plans to specific quotas and permit requirements. However, the TE indicates that less information on rational use of biological resources by local communities was collected than was needed for effective management planning.

Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No

4.4 Lessons
Project lessons 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?
The TE mentions the following key lessons:

- An assessment of training needs should be done before project design and should be reviewed once project staff and other stakeholders are aware of their roles and project objectives. Adequate time must be allowed for training to move beyond knowledge acquisition, to grow into conceptual understanding and mature into confident application in biodiversity management. This means that projects like this one

should be implemented over the course of five years, and designed to provide for a more measured rate of implementation.	
• It is important to consider including the surrounding landscape of a protected area in the management plan. Extensions, corridors and other arrangements can increase the viability of migrating populations and thus the global significance of the Protected Area. In the case of this project, the TE indicated that Mt. Myohyang is not of sufficient size to maintain global significance as there is a real prospect that some of its globally significant species will gradually be lost. To ensure that Mt Myohyang maintains global biodiversity significance, action is needed to ensure biodiversity protection in the Myohyang-Rangrim forest corridor.	

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?** Yes, the TE contains a good assessment of outcomes measured against the project objectives, and indicators for the project brief.	S
B. **Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?** No ratings were provided but the report was internally consistent and provided sufficient evidence to substantiate the statements.	S
C. **Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes**	S
D. **Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?** Yes	S
E. **Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?** The TE provided actual costs and cofinancing in an aggregated form but not per activity.	MS
F. **Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?** Yes	S

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: The management plan still needs to be implemented and an M&E system has to be place to make the technical assessment of impacts worthwhile.		
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? None mentioned		

4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)
Project brief and last PIR