

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

| 1. PROJECT DATA | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | Review date: | |
| GEF Project ID: | 801 | | <u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$) | <u>at completion</u> (Million US\$) |
| IA/EA Project ID: | 65575 | GEF financing: | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Project Name: | Central European Grasslands - Conservation and Sustainable Use | IA/EA own: | | |
| Country: | Slovak Republic | Government: | | |
| | | Other*: | | 0.02 |
| | | Total Cofinancing | 0.35 | 0.35 |
| Operational Program: | | Total Project Cost: | 1.10 | 1.12 |
| IA | World Bank | Dates | | |
| Partners involved: | Daphne | Work Program date | | 11/08/1999 |
| | | CEO Endorsement | | 02/14/2000 |
| | | Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began) | | 07/16/2000 |
| | | Closing Date | Proposed: 06/30/2005 | Actual: 06/30/ 2006 |
| Prepared by: Soledad | Reviewed by: Anna | Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 60 months | Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 72 months | Difference between original and actual closing: 12 months |
| Author of TE: Task Team Leader David A. Bontempo | | TE completion date: 06/28/07 | TE submission date to GEF EO: 10/28/07 | Difference between TE completion and submission date: 4 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 ICM | Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG) | GEF EO |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| 2.1 Project outcomes | S | HS | N/A | S |
| 2.2 Project sustainability | N/A | L | N/A | ML |
| 2.3 Monitoring and evaluation | N/A | N/A | N/A | MS |
| 2.4 Quality of the evaluation report | N/A | N/A | N/A | MS |

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

No. The sections of outcomes, achievement of outcomes, impact, and sustainability are well developed, analyzed, and substantiated. However, implementation of M&E system and financial report & cofinancing has not been adequately addressed..

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?
No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

| |
|--|
| <p>3.1 Project Objectives</p> <p>What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?</p> <p>According to the project documents, the global environmental objective was to protect grasslands biodiversity and promote sustainable use of grasslands in Slovakia.</p> <p>According to the TE, there were no changes to the environmental objectives.</p> |
| <p>What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?</p> <p>According to the project documents, the specific objective of the Project was to assist Slovakia to maintain representative samples of unique grassland ecosystems and their biodiversity in both the protected areas and productive landscape, through the promotion of restoration, conservation and sustainable use management practices. In particular, the project is aimed at promoting the sustainable use of the meadows of the SrNP (Slovensky raj National Park), MFNP (Mala Fatra National Park), Morava River floodplain, and Olsavica valley (project areas), through:</p> <p>(a)The preparation and implementation of scientifically sound and consensus based restoration and management plans; (b)The analysis and introduction of incentives to encourage farmers to adopt biodiversity friendly and sustainable meadow management practices; (c)Development of Slovak grassland database as information framework for preparation of national policy for grassland biodiversity conservation; (d)Public awareness and the dissemination of information on best practices; and (e)Training and capacity building for managers and landowners.</p> <p>The development objectives did not change during implementation.</p> |
| <p>3.2 Outcomes and Impacts</p> <p>What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?</p> <p>According to the TE, the four Project Outcomes were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation of management/restoration plans in 4 project areas leading to improved quality of grassland habitats. 2. Non-sustainable economic activities reduced in targeted communities by substituting better practice. 3. Institutions and communities using new tools to better manage and conserve grasslands 4. Improved public awareness about the biodiversity value of grasslands and the economic benefits resulting from their improved management. |

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| <p>4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT</p> | |
| <p>4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)</p> | |
| <p>A Relevance</p> <p>The project is in conformity with objectives and activities of OP#2 and OP4. In addition, according to the TE, the project was fully consistent with a number of goals of the Slovak Republic at that time, as outlined in the National Biodiversity Strategy/Action Plan, approved by the National Council of the Slovak Republic on July 2, 1997.</p> | <p>Rating: HS 6</p> |
| <p>B Effectiveness</p> <p>The project 's outputs and outcomes are commensurate with the proposed objectives. Because the overall impact of the Project is significantly positive, both in terms of the targeted areas and Slovakia's nature conservation goals more broadly, the Outcomes are all rated as Successful. According to the TE, if the Project had been prepared according to the new Results Framework model, some of the "Intermediate Outcomes" – such as the Database, and the certification and farmer training activities leading to EU subsidy opportunities - would be considered Highly Successful.</p> | <p>Rating: S 5</p> |
| <p>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</p> <p>According to the TE, taking the Incremental Cost Analysis performed at Project Appraisal as the starting point, the Project has been Highly Successful in generating far more than the expected economic and financial returns as more farms were certified to receive subsidies for new grassland management techniques under the agri-environment schemes than had been expected. Of the 100,000 ha farms certified, approximately 70,000 ha are now under the agri-environment schemes. Even if some of these farm operations lose their certification, the returns will be in orders of magnitude higher than had been expected at project start</p> | <p>Rating: S 5</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>4.1.2 Impacts</p> <p>Directly related to the success of the project was the work undertaken within outcome #3: Institutions and communities using new tools to better manage and conserve grasslands. The most important 'tool' here was the Grasslands database, which helped Slovakia meet the requirements for completion of the network of Natura 2000 sites, one important component of</p> |
|---|

accession to the EU. Additionally, the database allowed proper identification of grassland habitats which might be conserved under EU agri-environment *schemes*.

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: U/A |
| There is no discussion on the financial sustainability of the project in the TE. | |
| B Socio political | Rating: ML |
| Political support for the project was key for its success and it was needed to ensure Slovakia's met its EU Accession deadlines related to the selection of Natura 2000 sites and to include agri environment measures in the national agricultural strategy. | |
| C Institutional framework and governance | Rating: L |
| <p>The production of the Grasslands Teachers Manual, and training of teachers, has high likelihood of sustainability, as this has given teachers a new and positive interactive tool for their classroom use. The manual itself has been certified by the state Ministry of Education for use in the teacher training curriculum at university. Results from the experiments are already being incorporated into pasture management practice, and this has the possibility for replication much more broadly.</p> <p>In addition, according to the TE, some elements of the project have very high sustainability, such as the grasslands database (which is the largest species and habitat database in Slovakia, and is crucial for longer-term monitoring of payments under the agri-environment schemes), and the implementation of new management techniques, especially in the Morava River and the Olsavice Valley, as well as in the PAs themselves.</p> <p>Also, in the case of the national parks, the state authorities have a professional interest in maintaining the biodiversity of the habitats under their responsibility. And because the management techniques are relatively lower-cost, the authorities appear ready to continue with the implementation.</p> | |
| D Environmental | Rating: L |
| The project does not face any environmental risks. | |

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good

The project contributed to knowledge creation and sharing. For example, through the production of the Grasslands Teachers Manual, and training of teachers, has high likelihood of sustainability, as this has given teachers a new and positive interactive tool for their classroom use. The manual itself has been certified by the state Ministry of Education for use in the teacher training curriculum at university. Results from the experiments are already being incorporated into pasture management practice, and this has the possibility for replication much more broadly.

b. Demonstration

The production of the Grasslands Teachers Manual, which has been certified by the state Ministry of Education for use in the teacher training curriculum at university. Results from the experiments are already being incorporated into pasture management practice, and this has the possibility for replication much more broadly.

c. Replication

The management planning methodology has already been expanded to new operations specifically on a new German/Slovak project which would develop plans for 10 new PAs.

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): 5S

The project itself previews the establishment of a two-level monitoring system:

- i. Within project areas to monitor implementation of restoration and management measures.
- ii. National monitoring system of grassland biodiversity based on results of field inventories during development of national grassland database

The Project Document states that project monitoring and evaluation activities will be supervised by Bank supervision missions. Monitoring activities will consist of regular reporting on development of project activities and achieved outcomes. Monitoring of biodiversity will be carried out in accordance with restoration and management plans developed during project. An internal assessment of progress of project will be conducted annually.

B. M&E plan Implementation

Rating (six point scale): 4 M S

Although there is no discussion of M&E implementation in the ICM, the report is very complete in details about each output and each outcome. For this reason, the M&E implementation was considered satisfactory.

In addition, the indicators as originally described were in some cases very difficult to measure. The TE report states that during the Mid-Term Review (MTR), it was determined that the Logical Framework itself should be revised in order to

provide better clarity as to which indicators reflected outputs and which reflected outcomes. Therefore, according to the TE, changes were agreed to the Outcome Indicators, Project Outputs, and Output Indicators.

C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?

UA. The ICM does not include this information, nor does the project document.

C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?

UA. The ICM does not include this information..

C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?

U/A. There is not sufficient information to call it a good practice.

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, the Project provides numerous lessons in many areas including:

- i) small interventions such as this MSP can dramatically affect the policy dialogue, particularly where state institutions need guidance on how to design and implement various agricultural support schemes (and in this case in particular, with reference to state conformity with international/regional agreements (EU));
- ii) without the correct framework of ongoing support, most importantly in terms of: a) new rural entrepreneurial activity; and b) properly-targeted government support; it is not clear that habitat restoration can be sustained;
- iii) new management planning techniques have already allowed dramatic improvement in the areas targeted by the project: it is clear that introduction of such techniques is welcomed by PA administrations, as they have made the job much easier. In these areas, run by competent public institutions, sustainability is more likely (vs. smaller plots managed by individuals);
- iv) the importance of thorough and regular consultations, over a long period of time, to affect behavior change in rural populations;

List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The main recommendation for Bank management relates to the cost to the Bank of implementing the GEF MSPs vs. the impact: there has been recent discussion that the MSPs are costly, in incremental terms, e.g. though the project amounts are small, the projects still requires substantive involvement from the TTL. This is accurate, but perhaps not the entire "story". This MSP has demonstrated that even with a modest investment, significant impacts can be delivered. This project is a somewhat unique case, because Slovakia's entry into the European Union provided unique leverage for the implementing agency to influence policy. But even so, the experience here indicates that MSPs can have quite dramatic results. If the right strategic opportunity presents itself, the Bank should still consider being the Executing Agency for MSPs.

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.

None

| 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? | 5 |
| B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? | 5 |
| C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? | 4 |
| D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | 5 |
| E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | 2 |

| | |
|--|---|
| No. The TE does not include the actual project costs per activity. | |
| F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? No assessment of M&E system is provided in the TE. | 2 |

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? |
| No discussion on this topic is provided in the TE |
| 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? |
| Although the project closed 12 months after it was proposed, there is no discussion of the main reasons for this in the TE and how it affected the project results. |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|
| 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. | Yes: | No: x |
| Explain: | | |

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

| |
|--|
| Grant Reporting and Monitoring Report (2005) ICM (2006) Project Document |
|--|