

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		09/29/2006
GEF Project ID:	798		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1376	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.75	0.54
Project Name:	Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog's Territories (SUMMIT)	IA/EA own:	0.01	0.01
Country:	Philippines	Government:		
		Other*:	1.26	1.25
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	1.27	1.26
Operational Program:	3, 4	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	2.02	1.80
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	CARE Philippines	Work Program date		-
		CEO Endorsement		01/18/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		06/26/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: <b>05/31/2004</b>	Actual: <b>05/31/2005<sup>1</sup></b>
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: <b>47 months</b>	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: <b>59 months</b>	Difference between original and actual closing: <b>12 months</b>
Author of TE:	Spike Millington Errol Gatumbato Salve Narvadez	TE completion date: <b>05/2005</b>	TE submission date to GEF OME: <b>06/08/2006</b>	Difference between TE completion and submission date: <b>13 months</b>

\* 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

GEF EO 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). GEF EO 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. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	<b>S</b>	<b>S/MS</b>	-	<b>MU</b>
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	<b>U</b>	-	<b>U</b>

<sup>1</sup> From PIR2005

2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	S	-	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

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

No.

Although the TE presents a comprehensive assessment of the project design, outcomes and specially sustainability, the assessment of project implementation and costs per activity is not as complete.

Further, appropriate annexes were not included in the TE report.

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

No.

**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 brief:

“The biodiversity of Mount Isarog is protected, and effectively and efficiently managed for sustainable use, with the full cooperation and collaboration of different stakeholders”.

The TE has no specific information on the Project’s Global Environmental Objectives.

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

Although the project’s development objectives are not specifically mentioned in the TE, it describes that the project consists of six components:

1. Strengthen the capabilities of Mount Isarog National Park (MINP) key stakeholders in community-based protected area management.
2. Increase income-generating opportunities to decrease environmental pressure on the forest resources of the park
3. Rehabilitate/restore degraded areas of MINP
4. Increase land tenure security in the adjacent communities to encourage investment in sustainable agriculture activities
5. Generate updated information on MINP’s biodiversity and socio-economic status of adjacent communities
6. Increase public awareness of the value of MINP and its conservation and the impact of human behavior on it.

The project brief mentions the following objectives:

1. Stronger conservation and management policy and practice, initiated and implemented through the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB), Government of Philippines (GOP), NGOs, Community Based Organizations (CBOs), companies and universities.
2. Increased environmental literacy and ethics among MINP stakeholders, and favorable changes in public policy for MINP.
3. Increased public understanding of MINP’s value and the impact of human behavior on its habitat and biodiversity.
4. Measures to reduce pressure on MINP’s habitat and biodiversity developed and implemented, and biodiversity conservation fund generated.
5. Enhanced land tenure security amongst primary stakeholders.

According to the TE, the project adopted several of the recommendations from the Mid-term review; such as, scaling down of land tenure security targets, integration of capacity building activities into all components, a focus on sustainable agriculture in the sustainable livelihood

component, prioritizing support to the stronger CBOs to “pull” weaker ones along, and strengthening of the Project Management Office (PMO).

### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The TE describes following outcomes and impacts:

- 184 Mount Isarog Guardians (MIGs) recruited, trained, deputized, and mobilized for forest protection and law enforcement; and have become an effective deterrent to illegal activities, particularly timber poaching, wildlife harvesting and slash-and-burn activities. Community activities led by MIGs have gained wider acceptance with various levels of support already expressed by CBOs, Local Government Units (LGUs), the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and NGOs.
- The forest rehabilitation component was very successful and provided the basis for an economically viable income generating activity that can be expanded, based on resource management agreements. Four out of 5 municipal-level (Reforestation Management Agreements (RMAs) providing for the co-management of existing reforestation/Assisted Natural Regeneration sites and with a 10-year assured funding for maintenance and protection activities have been executed. The other municipality is currently undergoing an on-going negotiation.
- Eight districts declared as conservation farming communities and now adopting community sustainability indicators.
- The Department of Land Reform and CARE came-up with a MoA that facilitated the processing of leasehold and Certificates of Land Occupancy Awards (CLOAs) of 205 farmer-beneficiaries.

## 4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

### 4.1 Outcomes

#### A Relevance

**Rating: MS**

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

The project was very much in line with the catalyzing sustainability of protected area systems strategic priority, and also with OP3 priority of promoting conservation of biological diversity and endemic species. As one of the oldest parks in the Philippines, Mt. Isarog is one of the few remaining bastions of Philippine “megadiversity”, and is home to 93 bird and 26 mammal species that are endemic to the Philippines.

But the TE identifies that not all the project outcomes were relevant with OP strategies. For example, regarding the sustainable livelihood component, the TE concludes that the strategy adopted by the project was not adequate to target the primary threat-doers and therefore had negligible impact on the protection of MINP.

#### B Effectiveness

**Rating: MU**

- **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 concludes that the project design was very ambitious, given the scope of the objectives and activities and the limited time frame of 4 years. Its design was unclear about the goals and approach of the project, particularly the linkage between conservation of MINP and the development of sustainable livelihoods. This resulted in compartmentalization of the project rather than implementation of an integrated strategy.

The TE assesses that the capacity of some stakeholders in certain areas has increased as a result of project activities, but that it is very difficult to know the degree to which increased capacity has met project expectations or contributed to achieving project objectives. In addition, it identifies that there is a lack of baseline data against which project accomplishments may be measured. It also assesses that even though the project’s land tenure security component objectives were scaled down after the Midterm evaluation the project achieved only limited success. In contrast, the project surpassed its target of reforested hectares. It not only rehabilitated 401 hectares, but has also been successful in generating more livelihood

opportunities. In conclusion, even though the project succeeded in delivering several outputs, it wasn't as effective in achieving expected outcomes.	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>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 and did that affect cost-effectiveness?</b></li> </ul>	
<p>According to the TE, a big setback was that the PAMB operations were suspended for almost two years as a result of the “treasure hunting fiasco” in November 2002. Also, the relatively high staff turnover, including project managers, resulted in poor institutional memory throughout the project. On the other hand, the project was very efficient regarding the rehabilitation and restoration of the MINP degraded areas. The PIR2005 mentions that the development cost was lower than the government standard and the survival rates achieved were greater than the standard. The project closing was extended from 2004 to mid-2005.</p>	

<b>Impacts</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?</b></li> </ul> <p>The TE mentions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In terms of achieving its goal of conservation of MINP, the project has laid the basis for improved conservation, notably through support to the mobilization and organization of community-based park guards (MIGs) and raising awareness of the values and importance of the park, as well as rules and regulations regarding its management.</li> <li>- In terms of sustainable livelihoods, the project has invested a great deal of effort in supporting the creation and building the capacity of CBOs for production, savings, credit, and marketing and promoting organic farming. However, the impact has been limited because of the longer time frame needed to build effective organizational capacity and poor linkage to threats to the park.</li> </ul> <p>The reviewer finds that the low likelihood of sustainability of the project's outcomes will most likely downplay its expected impacts.</p>

**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.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
<p>As described in the TE, given its lack of resources, limited capacity and dependence on contracted personnel (through the project), the Protected Area Office (PAO) will likely be unable to carry out its mandate as both secretariat to the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB) and the DENR operating unit for MINP management.</p> <p>The financial sustainability of the CBOs post-project must also remain in doubt since loan repayment rates are poor and the economic returns to organic farming uncertain.</p>	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
<p>According to the TE, several CBOs and municipal councils have indicated that they are not fully aware of what is happening with regard to the PAMB, and most LGUs have still to articulate what support they may be able to provide for the conservation of MINP.</p> <p>It also concluded that PAMB feedback to communities is generally poor, and despite project Information, Education and Communication efforts, there is still a perception among some that the MINP is an “open” resource. In addition, some Community Based Biodiversity Monitoring Groups (CBBMGs) have expressed doubt as to the utility of their data collection and question their continuation after the project.</p> <p>Finally, it mentions that land access of tenured migrants remains a major issue at the PA and is a major threat to its biodiversity conservation.</p>	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
<p>According to the PIR2005, the DENR-PAO resources, staffing and sense of ownership over the</p>	

project remains low. With expected reassignments in PAO and the Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office (PENRO), there is a higher risk that current interventions will not be sustained beyond the project life.

The TE concludes that the post-project sustainable mechanisms such as the creation of the CBO federation (SUSLIVES Inc.), and of a network of People's Organizations were implemented very late during the project duration and are very dependent on the project support and organization.

**D Environmental**

**Rating: ML**

The TE found that many communities are still heavily dependent on abaca plantations inside the MINP (covering 2500 hectares).

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: <b>MU</b>	

**4.3 Catalytic role**

**1. Production of a public good**

According to the TE, the project supported PAMB in commissioning several valuable technical and policy studies relating to a Visitor Management System for MINP, Feasibility Study for Relocating Non-Tenured Migrants (NTM) outside MINP, Water User Fee System for MINP, Resource Use Assessment of Potential Buffer Zones in MINP and Site Compatibility Assessment for the Cultivation of Indigenous Tree Species in MINP.

**2. Demonstration**

According to the TE, the Threat Reduction Assessment (TRA) results served as basis in formulating the ordinance prohibiting wildlife hunting in Guinaban, creating the Watershed Management Council in Hiwacloy, imposing the regulations on the cutting of coco trees in Comaguinking, and creating the ordinance prohibiting electric and poison fishing in Lupi.

**3. Replication**

**4. Scaling up**

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

**A. In retrospection, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)**

**Rating: MS**

The project brief states that CARE Philippines was directly responsible to GEF for financial and non-financial oversight and overall management of SUMMIT. In addition, data on performance indicators was to be gathered and reported on a quarterly and annual basis. According to the TE, M&E of the project was constrained by use of a poorly-articulated logframe, which lacked precision in defining outputs and indicators. It describes that the project M&E plan included the implementation of a Biodiversity Monitoring System (BMS) and a TRA. According to the TE, while the BMS tools used were not ideal proxies for assessing habitat and biodiversity status, they had the advantage of being easy to apply by non-specialists.

**B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible**

<b>for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure? Rating: S</b>
<p>According to the TE, the project established Community-based Biodiversity Monitoring Groups (CBBMGs) in seven municipalities to undertake monitoring using BMS tools, and received training in methodologies such as transects walk surveys, photo documentation, field dairies, etc. Regular M&amp;E of forest rehabilitation was carried out on a quarterly basis by a team of DENR, municipal LGUs, MIGs, CBOs, PAMB representatives, and NGOs. The TRA proved to be an essential tool to identify site-specific threats and threat-doers, but was implemented rather late into the project. The TE mentions that the PMO did a very good job at reporting and documentation.</p>
<b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? Rating: S</b>
<p>The TE doesn't include any information on the M&amp;E budget, but its assessment of M&amp;E implementation makes no mention of any budgetary constraint. The Project brief does not provide any specific information on this issue either.</p>
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b>
<p>Yes. The implementation of the TRA was an innovation made by the project that allowed retrospective monitoring (critical in the absence of baseline data). And although it had some weaknesses in the design (such as inappropriate categorization of direct threats), it proved to be a very useful monitoring tool. The creation of CBBMGs and the use of simple BMS tools can also be considered good practices, as long as the tools are used to measure relevant indicators and all stakeholders fully appreciate their utility.</p>

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<b>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?</b>
<p>The major lessons described in the TE are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The design of a co-funded project needs close collaboration among donors and with the implementing agencies to assure a common approach and goals, even if each donor contributes to different components and has different reporting criteria and requirements.</li> <li>- In areas where previous conservation projects have been implemented, it is important to revisit previous project documentation and lessons learned to serve as inputs.</li> <li>- In the absence of clear and binding agreements, accountability and responsibilities are not clearly defined, understood nor internalized. For example, representation of the district on the PAMB did not necessarily lead to the institutionalization of the partnerships between PAMB and district LGU. This could have a negative effect on the project sustainability.</li> <li>- It is critical that incentives are created for relocated people that reinforce the move away from destructive activities and that perverse incentives (such as loss of potential TM status) are not encouraged for continued park settlement and exploitation.</li> <li>- Biodiversity monitoring can be a useful tool for increasing awareness and mobilizing communities to be involved in PA protection and management.</li> </ul>

**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 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.

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for

example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
No additional information was available to the reviewer.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p><b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Yes. It contains a comprehensive assessment of the failures in project design and the effects it had on the achievement of objectives.</p>	<b>S</b>
<p><b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> The TE is consistent in general but the reviewer finds that a few of the ratings are not substantiated. Example: rating the achievement of project objectives as Satisfactory for protection of biodiversity even though it previously mentions that local populations still have plantations inside the park, that there are many unresolved tenure issues, and that the main threat-doers were not identified /targeted until late in the project.</p>	<b>MS</b>
<p><b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> It provides a comprehensive assessment of sustainability of the various components and activities of the project.</p>	<b>HS</b>
<p><b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Although the TE presents many lessons classified by project component, some of them are not very comprehensive and could be considered findings.</p>	<b>MS</b>
<p><b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> No. The TE explains that the way that donor financial systems are set up made it very difficult to estimate financial allocation and use by individual component. Information on co-finance is presented in Euros.</p>	<b>U</b>
<p><b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> While the TE gives a complete assessment of the BMS and TRA systems, it fails to present complete information on the M&amp;E system for the entire project (for example the monitoring of activities implemented in the sustainable livelihood component).</p>	<b>MS</b>

**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.

<b>Yes:</b>	<b>No: X</b>
-------------	--------------

Explain: Project impacts were limited and the sustainability of several of its outcomes unlikely.

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

Project brief, PIR2005, PIR2004