

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		12 th Sept 05
GEF ID:	803		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Project	GEF financing:	0.748	0.748
Country:	Tanzania	Co-financing:	0.845	0.845
Operational Program:	3 / 2	Total Project Cost:	\$1.593	\$1.593
IA	UNDP	Dates: Oct 2000 – June 2003 (no cost extension to Jan 2004)		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		Dec 1999
		CEO Endorsement		March 6 th 2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Oct 2000
		Closing Date June 2003	Proposed: October 2003	Actual: January 2004
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 2years 8 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 3years 4 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 8 months
Author of TE: D. Hartley		TE completion date: November 2003	TE submission date to GEF OME: June 20 th 2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1year 5 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	S	N/A	N/A
2.2 Project outcomes	HS	S	N/A	HS
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	S	N/A	S
2.4. Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	S	N/A	S
2.5. Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

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

example of a 'participatory evaluation methodology' with significant stakeholder participation in the data collection and analysis from Government agencies (DCCFF) and the local communities. However, the evaluation does not meet the requirements of UNDP / GEF as many of the ratings for impacts, outcomes and sustainability are not 'formally' provided. Overall the evaluation is moderately satisfactory

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

The Core Conservation Area (The Proposed National Park) within the Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation and Development Area (biodiversity conservation and community development) is effective, productive, harmonised and sustainable in the longer term.

- **Any changes during implementation?** None recorded

- **What are the Development Objectives?**

To conserve the unique biodiversity of the forest reserve and associated buffer zone known as the Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Area while enhancing the livelihoods of the surrounding communities.

- **Any changes during implementation?**

Yes, revised objective:

The income and environmental security of 5,000 households in Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Area is enhanced, while biodiversity flourishes.

In essence, the revised objective turned around the originally development / global objective and placed emphasis on local incentives for conservation and therefore global environmental benefits. The revised objective was more consistent with Government of Zanzibar (GOZ), CARE and community interests.

3.2 Outcomes

- **What were the key expected outcomes and impacts indicated in the project document?**

1. Jozani is gazetted and managed as a National Park under relevant Legislation
2. Institutions involved in natural resources management Jozani-Chwaka Bay area strengthened and enhanced.
3. Financially, socially and ecologically sustainable protected area management systems in place at the Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Area
4. The decline in rare and endangered fauna and flora is halted and recovery promoted while knowledge of Jozani biodiversity is increased.
5. Jozani adjacent communities are committed to and empowered to manage and benefit from their own resources.
6. Operational legislation and policies appropriate to conservation and development in the Jozani-Chwaka area advocated.
7. Jozani adjacent communities develop appropriate alternative income generating activities which reduce community dependence on natural resources and assist in community development.

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

The outcomes were consolidated at the beginning of the project: Four outcomes / immediate objectives are assessed in the TE:

1. Communities around the Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Area manage natural resources effectively;
2. The Zanzibar Department of Commercial Crops, Fruits and Forestry implements enabling policies and provides adequate support to communities for effective community-based natural resource management;
3. Communities around Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Area develop and implement environmentally friendly on-farm and off-farm income generating activities (IGAs)
4. JECA effectively supports communities to manage natural resources and income generating activities.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance

Rating: HS

- In retrospect, were the project's objectives, its design, expected outcomes (original and/or modified) consistent with the focal areas/operational program

strategies?

The project objectives, design and expected outcomes (original and modified) were fully consistent with OP3 / OP2 and the GEF Operational Strategy. There are several reasons:

- The project was clearly focused on conserving a globally threatened species – Zanzibar Red Colobus and the Ader's Duiker, and the important coastal swamp forest habitat which is unique to Zanzibar. Therefore, the global environmental benefits were clear and relevant for GEF funding and eligibility criteria;
- The Government of Zanzibar (GOZ) recognized the importance of conservation in the Zanzibar Biodiversity Strategy both in terms of its global significance and through its potential to contribute to economic development as a tourist attraction – hence there was clear country ownership, which was demonstrated by the GOZ gazettelement of the conservation area as a 'National Park in January 2004;
- The project built on previous GEF and bilateral assistance to the GOZ for conservation in Zanzibar.
- The project design placed considerable emphasis on development and testing of linkages between conservation and developments through the implementation of alternative income generating activities / co-management approaches to engender sustainable socio-economic incentives for conservation; and tourism revenue sharing mechanisms to provide financial sustainability for park management and community development micro-projects – these outcomes were largely achieved under implementation.

B Effectiveness

Rating: HS

I. To what extent did the project achieve the expected outcomes as described in the project document?

In general, the TE indicated that the project achieved the majority of the outcomes (as described in the project document):

1. Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park was gazetted in 2004
2. Institutions involved in conservation (DCCFF) have been strengthened in terms of providing support to the process of gazettelement; promotion of community involvement in conservation and management of the National Park; in short DCCFF has been transformed into a modern and conservation organization
3. Financial, economic and socially sustainable PA management systems were achieved in terms (i) **Financial sustainability** – tourism revenue sharing scheme has in part provided funds to the DCCFF (approx 30% of NP managerial costs) and to community (for microdevelopment projects and crop damage compensation scheme). The main weakness in the system is the reliance on tourism. Although this is perhaps the only option. (ii) **Economic sustainability** – Communities have also developed tourism-based micro-enterprises, which are linked to savings and credit (micro-finance). These developments are sustainable in so far as Zanzibar continues to be a major East African tourist destination; (iii) **Social sustainability** – The pre-project situation baseline was one of social conflict and rejection of the conservation by the communities (particularly the National Park ideal). The TE indicated that the projects interventions have effectively turned the situation around in the majority of the villages buffering the National Park. Most people now support the National Park and see it as bringing development opportunities to the area (also confirmed by the GEF Local Benefits Study). Furthermore, the environmental legislation has supported community-based institutions (Village Conservation Committees (VCCs)) to co-manage forest areas inside and adjacent to the National Park. So communities now have increased role and responsibility which they previously did not have.
4. **Environmentally** – census data shows that the project interventions have arrested and reversed the decline in the Red Colobus Monkey and reduced encroachment into the Jozani Forest (see also GEF Local Benefits Study). The project built on the previous donor interventions to secure the long-term environmental status of the Jozani through National Park gazettelement. There have also been improved community attitudes to conservation and monkeys are now seen as a source of revenue as opposed to a problem (ibid).
5. **Jozani communities have become empowered** through the establishment of the VCCs to become 'officially' involved with the management and conservation of resources. Ultimately, the sustainability of Jozani depends on continuing and building the working relationships established between the DCCFF, Sheha (local village chiefs) and VCCs;
6. The project consolidated previous donor support policy changes to enable the VCCs. The project also supported the legal process and recognition of Jozani Conservation Area as a National Park. The GOZ passed the National Park legislation in 2003 and gazetted the park in January 2004.
7. **Development of IGAs was achieved.** The IGAs were innovatively supported through the savings and credit (micro-finance) scheme. The TE indicates that the scheme reached about 2500 people

<p>in villages adjacent to the National Park. However, most the business depend either directly or indirectly on tourism – hence they are vulnerable to changes in the international tourist trade and this could be problem in the future. Furthermore, the project was unable to effectively target the IGA and savings and credit to meet the needs of the poor.</p>	
<p>II. Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? Explain Rating: HS</p>	
<p>The TE indicates that the outcomes addressed the key threats that were identified in the project document notably: resource conflicts (caused by red colobus monkey crop raiding) with communities and poor conservation attitudes; lack of alternative and additional livelihood opportunities and uncertain conservation status of the conservation area and lack of appropriate institutional arrangements (see I above)</p>	
<p>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: HS</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an assessment of outcomes 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? Where there any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems that delayed or affected in other ways the implementation of the project? 	
<p>The TE did not formally evaluate 'cost effectiveness'. However, it is implicit from the review of the outcomes that the project achieved a satisfactory level of cost-effectiveness. Indeed, given the relatively modest GEF budget (US\$0.75m) the project was able to leverage significant co-financing from other donors (McKnight and Ford Foundations / CARE Austria) as well as generating community inputs through the savings and credit scheme which either directly or indirectly contributed to conservation objectives. The project did attempt to expand into wider areas (e.g., Nungwi) away from the core Jozani location. These were judged not be effective. However, this is a relatively minor failing and does not influence the rating of 'highly satisfactory'.</p> <p>The TE indicates that there were no significant political, bureaucratic or admin problems that delayed the project.</p>	

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

<p>A Financial resources Rating: L</p>	
<p>There is a tourism revenue sharing scheme in place which partially covers GOZ / DCCFF management costs of the Jozani National Park. Furthermore, it does provide funds to the communities for small development projects (water, sanitation etc). Although financial sustainability is dependent on tourism at present Zanzibar is a major destination for international tourists in East Africa and the industry has been developing rapidly. Assuming the GOZ manages tourism development appropriately then it is likely that there will be a sustainable flow of resources to cover some managerial and community costs.</p>	
<p>B Socio political Rating: L</p>	
<p>The GOZ was fully supportive of the project and the major outcome of the gazettelement of Jozani National Park. The social outcomes of the project were significant in terms of the savings and credit groups, which have begun to operate on their own. However, a common complaint was that the time-frame was too short for social changes to become fully developed.</p>	
<p>C Institutional framework and governance Rating: L</p>	
<p>The project developed the institutional capacity of DCCFF in several aspects: changed the mindset of the DCCFF from a protection and policing orientated organization to a more people-centered approach; allowed DCCFF to develop a range of institutional and social partnerships within GOZ and with communities (Shehas) and so created more constructive working relationships. The project also assisted the GOZ and DCCFF implement the environmental legislation and supported the creation of the VCCs, which provide a new conduit for co-management. DCCFF does still need to improve its social science skills in the post project phase. CARE and DCCFF created JECA (Jozani Environmental Conservation Association) – as a service delivery agent for CARE associated with savings and credit / IGA activities. In the post-project institutional landscape JECA is the weakest link – it has remained donor dependent; it became too reliant on one key individual (the director) who subsequently resigned at the end of the project; it has function only with the context of the project and has lacked a longer term post-project vision.</p>	
<p>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.) Rating: L</p>	
<p>The project secured the protection of Jozani-Chwaka Conservation Area through gazettelement as a National</p>	

Park. Bolstered the protection of the area by providing financial mechanisms (revenue sharing scheme) and institutional support for DCCFF. Furthermore, it also reduced conflicts between people and Red Colobus Monkeys by developing links between tourism (development) and conservation. At project end the decline of the monkeys had been arrested.	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: ML
The savings and credit scheme has been locally successful and has replicated, and could be broadly replicable in other rural development / community projects beyond the conservation context.	

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 project collected and analyzed data for a socio-economic and environmental baseline. However, regular monitoring against the baseline was not undertaken. It is somewhat disappointing that the project did not re-run the baseline social assessment at closure to ascertain a more precise and 'objective' measure of socio-economic improvements that were qualitatively reported on in the TE by the evaluators and other stakeholders (although the GEF Local Benefits Study did carry out both quantitative and qualitative assessments. But the baseline was not made available to the study until after data collection). Environmental monitoring (qualitative and quantitative) can generally be considered to be good. Census was undertaken to monitor the recovery of the Red Colobus populations as well as monitoring of the Jozani Forest.	
B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?	Rating: S
The project experience with adaptive management was good in that changes were made to project objectives / outcomes to consolidate those outlined in the prodoc. The savings and credit scheme approach was tested at the beginning of implementation which resulted in the adoption of a different type of method (see GEF Local Benefits Study for details); IGA development was based on extensive consultation and market analysis at the beginning of implementation so that these key interventions were targeted more appropriately. This was a good example of adaptive management to enhance the achievement of project objectives and sustainability.	
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No, although the projects PIR systems and other reporting to partner donors were acceptable (TE – rates them 'satisfactory'), the baseline survey was not measured against by the project or at the final evaluation. This was a missed opportunity.	

4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

Strengths	Weaknesses
All the lessons were generated by project stakeholders through the participatory M&E process	Lessons tend to be too focused on project details as opposed to distilling aspects that can be of assistance to development of new interventions. Not all the lessons are linked to evidence presented 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?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change requires time - Successful implementation of livelihood security projects requires longer periods of implementation a minimum of 5 years • Developing the capacity of the project partners reduces the dependency on external expertise • Logical frameworks can be used as flexible tools to assess strategic direction, as well as providing the benchmark for work planning and monitoring, but in order for this to be achieved it is necessary to reassess the log-frame and the indicators at regular intervals. Logical-frameworks do not have to be set in stone - especially in relation to important evolutions within projects - but it is necessary to use the formal opportunities built into the M&E process to discuss and endorse any changes in direction. 	

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.

4.5.2 ratings	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?	4
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	5
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	4
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	1
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	4

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 outcomes / impacts of the project have been substantially documented by UNDP / CARE and the GEFOME. This project is probably one of the most well-studied and documented GEF MSP.

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

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

GEFOME (2004) Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Project. Local Benefits Study. GEFOME. Washington DC