

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA						
					Review date:	8/12/05
GEF ID:	84		at endorsement (Million US\$)	After credit cancellation and GEF grant re- denominati on from SDR - US\$	at completion (Million US\$)	
Project Name:	Ecodevelopment	GEF financing:	\$20	\$17	\$16.03	
Country:	India	Co-financing:	\$54	\$46.3	\$44.98	
Operational Program:	3	Total Project Cost:	\$74	\$63.3	\$61.01	
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>				
Partners involved:				Work Program date	05/03/95	
				CEO Endorsement	08/05/1996	
				Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)	12/27/1996	
				Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2002	Actual: 06/30/2004
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 6 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 8 years		Difference between original and actual closing: 2 years	
Author of TE: Kathy Mackinnon; R. R. Mohan		TE completion date: 10/31/04	TE submission date to GEF OME: 5/19/2005		Difference between TE completion and submission date: 7 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	N/A	Not available	Not available
2.2 Project outcomes	S	S	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	Likely	Non-evaluable	Likely
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	N/A	Not available	Satisfactory
2.5 Quality of the	N/A	N/A	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

evaluation report				
-------------------	--	--	--	--

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No, because the ICR did not rate the outcomes against the original project objectives rather than the modified project objectives (given that these were not officially changed), specifically when rating the achievement of project outcomes. However, other aspects of the ICR can be considered good practice such as the cost breakdown by activity, financiers (including GEF fund allocations), and at appraisal, after project restructuring and at completion, despite some shortcomings mentioned below in the section of the quality of the ICR.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

To conserve biodiversity by implementing the ecodevelopment strategy of the Government of India in and around seven protected areas (PAs).

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

Specific objectives were:

- (I) to improve capacity of PA management to conserve biodiversity and increase opportunities for local participation in PA management activities and decisions;
- (II) to reduce negative impacts of local people on biodiversity, reduce negative impacts of PAs on local people, and increase collaboration of local people in conservation efforts;
- (III) to develop more effective and extensive support for ecodevelopment;
- (IV) to ensure effective management of the project; and
- (V) to prepare future biodiversity projects.

The ICR indicated that at the Midterm review (MTR) the objectives were reviewed to focus on implementation of ecodevelopment activities around the seven PAs, the number of planned community organizations was reduced from 806 to 581 communities, cost allocations were revised and US\$8 million of the Credit was cancelled. In addition, the preparation of future biodiversity projects objective and related activities was dropped. However, the project development objectives were not formally revised to reflect these changes.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The ICR mentions that the project has achieved its global objective by (i) strengthening the protection and management of 6020 Sq. Km of recognized global importance for biodiversity; (ii) adding 18.19 Sq. Km of additional protected areas (Gir Park); (iii) developing new processes, systems and capacity to implement and expand the ecodevelopment model in all 7 PAs and collaborating with local communities. In addition, simple monitoring systems, involving PA staff and villager participation in self-monitoring, demonstrated measurable decreases in threats to PAs as dependence of communities on the PA decreased and their livelihoods were enhanced. The ICR reports that communities became active in conservation activities such as protection against poachers, and that there are some early indications of habitat restoration and increases in wildlife populations. Some other key outcomes mentioned were:

- A new participatory and community based strategy for protected areas conservation was successfully pioneered.
- The project enhancing community commitment and financial strength by requiring each community to raise 25% of investment costs. By the end of the project, the aggregated value of these community funds had reached US\$4 million.
- About 580 community organizations ("Ecodevelopment Committees") were established (compared to the original target of 806 communities and the revised target at mid-term review of 569).
- IUCN monitoring questionnaire revealed that there was a significant improvement in people - park relationships in comparison with the pre-project situation.
- Other sample socio-economic surveys indicate improved incomes due to increased agricultural

productivity(irrigation) and other incomes (ecotourism).

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Are the project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes and impacts (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?

Rating: MS

The ICR indicates that notwithstanding the very positive qualitative achievements, the number of community organizations established is nearly 30% lower than the original target of 806 communities. There was no formal revision of the project objectives to reflect this reduction decided during the MTR. This has serious implications to the project outcomes because not all buffer zone villages were able to prepare microplans and some original target villages crucial for conserving the ecological perimeters of the parks were excluded from the process. However, at the same time additional emphasis and funds were placed on targeting the most needy and forest-dependent members of communities.

The extensions in project implementation may be the cause for the 60% increase in management costs which reduces the project's cost effectiveness because these funds could have been used to include all the communities as originally planned had the project stayed on track.

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

A Financial resources

Rating: L

The ICR indicates that at the national level, the Government of India seems committed to provide continued financial support to the ecocodevelopment program and wildlife conservation because plan allocations for wild life conservation has been stepped up from Rs. 1700 million to Rs. 4700 million and there are signs that this may increase even further.

At the park level, regional coordinating committees in several park areas are providing links between the PAs and other government agencies to better integrate PA and ecocodevelopment objectives into regional development. This has allowed some parks to access funds from State PA funds and foundations funded by PA visitor fees. In addition, all PAs have identified and are accessing additional sources of funding to maintain ecocodevelopment efforts including access to regular government funds for rural infrastructure.

At the community level, almost all Ecocodevelopment Communities (EDCs) have accrued substantial funds in Community Development Funds (CDFs) (approx. US\$ 4 million). However, the ICR indicates that the sustainability of the EDCs beyond the project depends on the EDC's ability to effectively manage and utilize the CDF as revolving funds with financial accountability and transparency (regular audits). In this regards, all PAs have developed guidelines and procedures for utilization of CDF funds, but Ranthambore and Palamau parks need to provide additional training to improve management. In addition, the creation of community infrastructure helped to increase income and employment of poorer members through wage labor and thus reduce pressure on natural resources.

B Socio political

Rating: ML

The ICR notes that substantial progress has been achieved in mobilizing local communities for conservation through the formation of EDCs and linking them with financial institutions and local governments. Sustainability is more likely in communities where capacity building efforts have been high.

The ICR reports diverse activities in education and public information, resulting in greater public awareness and support for the parks. However, several actions need completion to better enable the project's sustainability: (i) The majority of the community organizations still need to prepare action (sustainability) plans for the post-project period; (ii) a number of the villages crucial for conserving the ecological perimeters of the parks have not participated in the project and need to be brought in.

C Institutional framework and governance

Rating: (L)

At the national level, the ecocodevelopment strategy has been incorporated in the approach to the

<p>10th National Plan documents and ecodevelopment has been institutionalized as a fund delivery and management model both nationally and at the state levels. Commitment and interest of GOI is also visible through a request for a landscape based follow-on project, which will cover other non project sites.</p> <p>The ICR also indicates that state governments in all states (except Kerala) have issued clear enabling orders for ecodevelopment. These were made open-ended and applied state-wide so that specific site experiences can be replicated at other PAs. Many of the project activities are already integrated into regular Forestry department operations and the Ministry of Environment and Forests provides regular funding to finance ecodevelopment activities. These achievements increase the institutional sustainability of the outcomes.</p>
<p>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.) Rating: Likely</p>
<p>The ICR reports that Ecological sustainability has been built into PA management plans (e.g. zoning for visitor and wildlife management; habitat restoration and water management; clearance of invasive species; recommendations for an expanded buffer zone at Periyar and creation of Meghamalai Sanctuary across the border in Tamil Nadu). The ICR indicates that the improved relationships with villagers and participatory monitoring show that threats from village use of PA resources have been substantially reduced at all PAs.</p>
<p>E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability rating: Moderately likely</p>
<p>There is replication potential of the Ecodevelopment approach as evidenced by the renewed interest shown by the Government of India policy and financial support and by the new project Rural Livelihoods and Biodiversity Conservation which will build on the project's lessons. However, objective "V. to prepare future biodiversity projects" was dropped and this objective was critical for the replication and catalytic outcomes of the project.</p>

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

<p>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: S</p>
<p>The OED evaluation summary indicates that baseline measurements for monitoring were completed and impact monitoring integrated into the PA management plans. However, the ICR has limited quantitative data for the biodiversity achievements. Quantitatively measuring such impacts, especially at this early stage, is clearly difficult. However, more systematic discussion in qualitative terms and specific inclusion of data wherever available - for instance, the results of the participatory monitoring, animal population surveys and specific hectares of habitat restored - would have better enabled evaluation. A "Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool" was established and monitoring of all PAs was strong.</p>
<p>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management? Rating: S</p>
<p>There were no precise examples of adaptive management derived from the M&E system. Perhaps an example of adaptive management was the turn around the project underwent. The project had a slow take off and the progress was unsatisfactory in the initial periods. Though the project became effective in December 1996 the flow of funds was delayed by a year. Project had to undergo several changes during implementation and was rated unsatisfactory. At scheduled closure (June 2002), the Government of India requested extensions subject to satisfactory performance against agreed criteria. Based on actual performance against the criteria, Six parks got 2 one year extensions and one park could get only a one year extension. The project cost allocations were restructured after canceling US\$ 8 M from the Credit and GEF Grant (US\$ 2.2 M) in June 2002.</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No</p>

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.)

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?

- **Strengthening park-people relationships.** The project helped improve relations between forest departments and local people from a high conflict situation to one of improved cooperation through: (i) increasing trust and transparency in functioning and empowerment of EDCs; (ii) joint training of ecodevelopment committees and forest front-line staff, and joint visits to other PAs; (iii) additional skills provided through contract staff (e.g. sociologists, women development officers, ecologists and special training provided through specialist NGOs); (iv) use of early grants to help the poorest members of the community with community infrastructure and income opportunities to reduce poverty and subsistence poaching; and (v) empowerment of local communities, particularly poor groups, by offering voice and choice through participation in planning, implementation and monitoring of ecodevelopment activities.
- **Village development linked to forest protection.** The creation of microplans and community funds linked village development to PA protection and provided villagers with choices about livelihood and development options. These microplans need to recognize differences among households, in terms of economic status and degree of dependence on PA resources for livelihood. For transparency and accountability microplans need to be available in local languages and accessible in the village. Billboards listing ecodevelopment activities and funding allocations proved a useful mechanism for ensuring transparency.
- **The need for sustainability planning:** In a community driven environmental management project, there is need to establish the features for participating communities to remain motivated and financially viable. Each PA prepared an action plan to this effect, and a number of communities also prepared plans, but this was not the general case.
- **Community driven projects may need program-type support:** New community organizations and government processes may need longer to fully mature and become sustainable than the period available in a conventional investment project. A program approach or use of follow-on projects may be better. (The Region is now preparing a follow-on project, but this is currently envisaged only for new PAs.)
- **Project extensions should harmonize with time requirements for community investments:** The two successive one year extensions for this project created uncertainty regarding funding beyond the first year. As a result, not all of the communities were able to participate, reducing ecological protection. For a community driven project, if an extension is justified, the extension period is best made as a one-time decision in line with the time required to complete ongoing community investments and/or to start and complete additional investments.

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
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The OED evaluation summary indicates that the ICR is thorough, discusses issues reflectively, and is well structured around assessment by development objectives and components. The ICR report presented a complete account of project achievements and shortcomings.</p>	5 (S)
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Yes, the report was consistent and presented sufficient evidence to substantiate claims; however, the ICR should have rated the project outcomes based on the original objectives since these were not formally changed.</p>	5 (S)
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes</p>	5 (S)
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes</p>	5 (S)
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes. The breakdown of project by activity, Financiers (including GEF fund allocations), and at appraisal, after project restructuring and at completion is an example of good practice for other GEF projects. However, OED indicates that the ICR did not provide a component-wise cost breakdown of actual expenditures by type of expenditure. At least an explanation of why the project management was 60% above planned costs would have been desirable.</p>	5 (S)
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? OED indicates that a more systematic inclusion of data on achievements and impact would have been helpful. Where not available, a qualitative discussion on achievements could have been included.</p>	4 (MS)

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: X

No:

Explain: Given the number of issues that remain to be resolved to ensure proper protection of parks through the involvement of all relevant communities, it would be very useful to assess how these issues play out in the coming years as well as the resulting biodiversity conservation impacts. The OED evaluation summary proposes an audit and indicates that further assessing the project's design features and performance would be relevant to other biodiversity conservation programs embarking on participatory approaches.

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)

OED Review, ICR and project document