

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	906		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1928	GEF financing:	0.75	0.75
Project Name:	Landscape-scale Conservation of Endangered Tiger and Rhinoceros Populations in and Around Chitwan National Park	IA/EA own:		0.06
Country:	Nepal	Government:		0.22
		Other*:		0.71
		Total Cofinancing	0.98	0.99
Operational Program:	OP-3 Forest Ecosystem	Total Project Cost:	1.73	1.74
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		16 April 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 31 December 2003	Actual: 30 April 2006
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 33 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 60 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 27 months
Author of TE: Sagendra Tiwari Radhika Regmi Michael J.B. Green		TE completion date: August 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 8 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 AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	-	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MS	-	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	-	MU	-	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	HS	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. The TE provided an extensive assessment of weaknesses of the project's design, the obstacles to implementation and a comprehensive analysis of the monitoring and evaluation activities in addition to the overall assessment of achievements and shortcomings of the project outputs and objectives. Additionally the TE provided a comprehensive analysis of the project's impact and long-term sustainability.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project document:

“The goal of the project is therefore to enhance and secure protection and conservation of viable populations of flagship species and their habitat through management of the corridor [the corridor forest linking Royal Chitwan National Park with additional upland habitats], and through the introduction of effective management practices which improve grassland extent and quality.”

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?

The project document and the PIR 2006 list the following as the development objectives of the project:

- Immediate Objective 1: Reducing pressure on the resources in the [BFC] corridor
- Immediate Objective 2: Providing improved and diversified economic options outside the corridor
- Immediate Objective 3: Managing and restoring critical ecosystems important for movements of wildlife.

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change in objectives					
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)	

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or an unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S
A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:
(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?
The project has enhanced and secured protection and conservation of endangered species and their surrounding habitat of the corridor forest by linking the Royal Chitwan National Park (RNCP) to the upland habitats. The conservation of this area and its endangered species is critical because rural communities rely heavily on surrounding natural resources for fuelwood, fodder and other livelihood needs. Further, it promotes community-based eco-tourism which locals directly profit from.
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?
The relevance of the project outcomes/result is in line with the national environmental agenda with respect to the King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation (KMTNC) which was established in 1982. According to the project document the KMTNC Act gives a clear mandate to “complement and supplement the government efforts in nature conservation and protected area management” which is in line with the global environmental objective of the project. According to the project document the project builds on the “management plan used in the buffer-zone” of Royal Chitwan National Park (RCNP) - a park which has been identified as a “landscape of global concern.” Additionally the project outcomes are in line with Nepal's national conservation policy, forest legislation, and Biodiversity Action Plan – all of which emphasize local involvement in the conservation of biological resources due to its sustainability and cost effectiveness.
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?
According to the TE, the project has been successful in reversing the degradation of corridor forest, providing alternative livelihood options, creating awareness about its significance amongst locals, and reducing pressure on the corridor’s resources. The project’s outcomes are in line with GEF OP3 forest ecosystem goals regarding the support of community-based activities in forest conservation areas. However these gains may be short-lived as measures have not been taken to ensure the project’s long-term sustainability. While the government has declared the northern part of the corridor as a protected forest, it has still yet to be officially declared. Additionally the management plan of the corridor forest has not been approved. The project has not resulted in the enactment of any legislation affecting biosafety nor has the government adopted a national biosafety framework.
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)
Nepal ratified the CBD – Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993. The project will facilitate Nepal in meeting its obligation under this convention.
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership ¹
The project does not explicitly intend to promote International Cooperation and Partnership.
b. Effectiveness Rating: MS
The terminal evaluation concludes the project has effectively: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improved the levels of biodiversity within the Corridor</i>; mean regeneration density is 30,001 individuals/ha of which 83% are sal (<i>Shorea robusta</i>); highest regeneration was recorded in northernmost section of the Corridor where density is just below 2,000 individuals/ha threshold. However, at the same time the TE notes the lack of baseline data, makes it difficult to assess the actual level of the project’s achievements. • <i>enhanced environmental awareness</i>: environmental conservation awareness workshops held annually – 1800 participants in 2002, 112 in 2003, 48 in 2005; Green Force Clubs established in all 47 government schools; 130 episodes of <i>Conservation for Development</i> radio programme broadcast every two weeks until 2005 • <i>improved the livelihoods of amongst at least 51% of the targeted 3,500 households</i>; 9% (307 HH out of 3,500 total HH) benefited from ten income generating activities amounting to NRs 2 million. If 1,491 households that benefited from alternative energy initiatives (which indirectly earn income through their saving on fuel purchases) are included and there was no overlap for households who benefited from both initiatives, then 51% of target 3,500 households can be seen as having improved livelihoods • <i>reduced the pressure from grazing, firewood collection and timber extraction along the center of the Corridor</i>: fuelwood collection per day reduced from 18,347 kg in 2002 to 6,629 kg in 2005 and 9,5631; cattle grazing per day reduced from 2,863 in 2002 to 1,456 in 2005; comprehensive data for timber and fodder

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> collection is not available (according to TE) Established a living museum to help conserve Tharu culture and indigenous knowledge. <p>The TE indicates the potential for the project's effective implementation was compromised by ineffective internal monitoring of the project through the logframe (logical framework) as well as the weak management of information generated by the project.</p>
<p>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: MS</p> <p>According to the TE, with the exception of the component on effective management of grasslands, which was dropped after the Mid-term Review concluded it to be "too ambitious", the project outputs and outcomes have been achieved to "greater or lesser extents". The only significant failure that was identified is the (continuing) lack of policy on the community-based management of the forest north of the Highway. However it is to be noted, that the project's achievements may have been underestimated in the Final Evaluation due to the lack of baseline data.</p> <p>The Maoist insurgency delayed the delivery of the project's outputs and led to the extension of the project. Although the project was extended by two years, it was done at no additional cost. The total amount committed in the project document, \$ 1.738 million is the total amount that was disbursement by end of the project.</p> <p>Additionally the establishment of endowment funds</p> <p>d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated)</p> <p>No trade-offs for the project were identified in the TE.</p>

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

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= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<p>a. Financial resources Rating: MU</p> <p>Endowment funds have been created to fund the development and maintenance project's specific programs. While, the interest accrued from these endowment funds is used to cover the operational cost of these programs, the TE concludes the interest is insufficient to cover their costs. Evaluators are especially concerned that without the diversity their income base, the sustainability of the Child Education Development Programmes,/Environment Teachers' Forum and the Tharu Cultural Museum is threatened. The assessment of the long-term sustainability of the Anti-Poaching endowment fund which finances anti-poaching units for the National Park and the Buffer Zone is difficult to assess without in-depth study. While funds may not be sufficient, these endowments can be used as financial leverage to secure additional funds from other local sources.</p>
<p>b. Socio-economic / political Rating: MU</p> <p>According to the TE, the project has succeeded in engaging many stakeholder groups (i.e. Community Forest User Groups (CFUG)) amongst the target population which is evident through their level of ownership and commitment to the project's objectives of restoring the BFC. Most of the project activities were implemented at the community level through these CFUGs. However, according to the TE, the same level of ownership and commitment is not evident amongst the project's partners (such as the NTNC, UNDP, and Department of National Parks & Wildlife Conservation). This is especially evident in their lack of concerted action to address the need for a policy on the management of the forest north of the Highway which has held up the development of an integrated management plan for the entire BFC.</p>
<p>c. Institutional framework and governance Rating: MU</p> <p>According to the TE, the project has successfully built capacity of local community institutions, including Forest User Groups and cooperatives, which are supportive of the corridor's integrated conservation and livelihood development objectives. However, the TE notes there is less capacity building with respect to the planning, managing and monitoring of biodiversity for concerned stakeholders to be fully capable of carrying on biodiversity conservation.</p>

² Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

The TE cites the concerns about the Barandabhar Forest Conservation Committee, which has not been instituted, even though it has been a year since the project ended. This is critical as the Committee is essential in overseeing the future management of the corridor. The TE notes the status of the Corridor at the end of the project is “fragile” and “unstable” ecologically speaking in terms of biodiversity and socio-economically with respect to local communities. The stability of the project outcomes is contingent upon the institutionalization of proper policies and the extent to which “institutional structures are consolidated and income-generating activities are replicated among the local community over the next 5 to 10 years.”	
d. Environmental	Rating: L
No environmental risks were identified.	
e. Technological	Rating: L
No technological risks were identified.	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders
The terminal evaluation assessed stakeholder participation to be marginally satisfactory. The project has been credited for the reduction in the exploitation of natural resources of Forrest Corridor and adopting alternative means of sustaining the livelihoods of locals through the engagement of various stakeholders across the target population. However a similar level of ownership and commitment is less apparent amongst the Project’s partners. This is evident in the inability of Tri-Partite Review Group members to address the outstanding need for the corridor to be officially recognized as a protected forest or a forest management plan to be approved.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors
No specific mention of institutional changes.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
According to the TE, the project was unable to produce the necessary policy changes to help ensure the project objectives and outcomes will sustain. For instance, while the government decided to declare the northern part of the corridor as a “protection forest” it still remains to be officially declared and the management plan of the forest still remains to be approved. Additionally nothing has been done, policy-wise, regarding the excessive speeding above the 40 mph limit along the section of Highway that passes through the Corridor.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
NO
There is no follow-on financing.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
No mention of champions within the terminal evaluation.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? 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? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The actual cofinancing was equal to the amount specified in the project document (\$0.99m vs 0.98m). The extent to which cofinancing affected the project’s outcomes is not discussed in the TE.
b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The Royal massacre of June 2001 and the Maoist insurgency near areas next to Barandabhar Forest Corridor impacted the timeline of the project. The UNDP decided to maintain a low profile which resulted in the delayed implementation of activities and truncated of some research and monitoring activities. This was the key reason the project was extended for an additional two years, however at no-cost. The delay did not produce significant changes to the project outcomes and to its sustainability.

³ Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

<p>c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.</p>
<p>The NTNC, the executing agency, has legal mandate to support the Government's nature conservation and protected area management efforts. The MTE raised concern regarding how the project was being managed. It appeared there were "differences in perception" between the National Trust for Nature Conservation (NTNC) and the UNDP. The Trust saw the project as part of an integrated community-based program in Chitwan while the UNDP was focused on providing "rigorous accountability in its implementation." It appears from the TE, country ownership seems to have taken backseat with the adoption of the logframe following the MTE. The logframe was intended to "to produce a more objective and robust basis" in the management of the project which may have sidelined the country's specific ambitions for the project.</p>

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

<p>a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MU</p>
<p>It appears from the outset of the project, the M&E system was insufficient to monitor the project's results and track its progress towards achieving the project's objectives. The project document provided a very vague outline of the project's M&E plan as it only indicated the project's progress would be evaluated yearly using government personnel and outside evaluators and yearly financial audits would be conducted by independent auditors. The project design lacked a comprehensive M&E framework such as a logframe and baseline indicators from which to monitor the project's progress and achievements, which are also the key criticisms found in the TE. Additionally, the improper appraisal of the existing and potential threats to the conservation of the Barandabhar Forest established unrealistic and inaccurate project targets from the project's inception.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MU</p>
<p>Throughout the project various activities were undertaken in the internal monitoring and review of the project such as quarterly and annual work plans, financial reports, field visits, and annual meetings of the Tri-Partite Review Group as well as the completion of Annual Project Report which is key to the PIR. Additionally, it is important to note that, although external, monitoring and evaluation through the Mid-Term Evaluation and UNDP/GEF Assessment Mission played a pivotal role in identifying the key weaknesses of the project design and implementation, out of which came the need to the establish a logframe.</p> <p>However, while the logframe was later integrated as a part of the M&E framework this and other M&E tools (i.e. annual Project Implementation Report) were not used to "maximum effect" to document progress during the implementation of the project due to 1) lack of project survey data at the end of the project 2) lack of baseline data for proper comparison 3) when finally incorporated after the Midterm-Evaluation, the various agencies had differing versions of the logframe 4) inconsistencies between some of the indicators in the logframe and those used in the project implementation report 5) lack of supervision and guidance in the use of the logframes 6) reporting errors in the Project Implementation Report 7) a management information system that was inaccessible and ineffective in disseminating information.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?</p>
<p>UA. According to the project document, GEF contributed \$29,370 and the KMTNC \$10,000 to the M&E activities. In total from the outset the \$39,370 was the total budget for M&E activities or 2% of the entire project budget. The TE indicates the UNDP, as the implementing agency, should allocate sufficient resources to provide the necessary supervision and guidance in the use of the logframe. However it is difficult to fully assess, without an extensive review of the costs of resources involved to determine if sufficient amount of funding was available for M&E activities.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?</p>
<p>See above.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</p>
<p>There were two main evaluations that occurred during the course of the project: Mid-Term Evaluation in February 2003 and UNDP/GEF Assessment Mission in November 2003. According to the terminal evaluation both evaluations are credited for playing a critical role in identifying weaknesses and catalyzing the changes in the project design and implementation which contributed to the overall success of the Project. The UNDP/GEF Assessment evaluation is credited for granting extension to the Project, utilizing remaining funds and releasing funds from UNF which were</p>

frozen following the Mid-Term Evaluation. Additionally, the TE praises the NTNC for its ability to glean and apply lessons from these evaluations to successfully realign the project. However despite extensive monitoring and feedback, the policy for managing the forest north of the Highway and a management plan for the Barandabhar Forest Corridor remains to be formulated.

As previously mentioned, its needs to be noted that overall M&E tools were not used to “maximum effect” due to the various difficulties the evaluation team experienced (see section 4.5b). Factors such as lack of baseline data, of effective information management, and proper guidance and supervision of use of the logframe were amongst a few of the many factors that affected the monitoring system’s effectiveness.

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.

No. The M&E system was plagued with problems throughout the entire life of the project. Since the beginning, the project had weak project design and concept due to the omission a logical framework and inadequate appraisal of existing and potential threats to the Forest Corridor. Even after the logframe had been incorporated the lack of information management and proper guidance prevented the effective utilization of the logframes during the project’s implementation. In the end the project’s lack of baseline and end of project survey data made it difficult to gauge (and underestimated) the extent of the project’s achievements. As a result this projects M&E system would not be considered a good practice for other projects. However, it must be noted the Mid-Term Evaluation and the UNDP/GEF Assessment Mission were critical in identify key weaknesses in the project’s design and providing recommendations which helped to turn the project around.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS

b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

Overall project implementation was effective which is evidenced by the number of wide-ranging activities that were successfully executed amongst local communities. The project’s achievements are noteworthy in consideration of the period of armed insurgency during which much of the work was implemented. However, initially implementation was constrained by weaknesses in the project design such as inadequate appraisal of existing and potential threats to the Barandabhar Forest and most notably the initial absence of the logframe which was later incorporated after the Mid-Term Evaluation.

The TE criticizes the implementation agency and the executing agency (NTNC) for failing to account for weaknesses of project document prior to its signing. The original absence of logframe in the project document continued to plague the project’s implementation until the end as it was seen as an “add-on” wasn’t fully integrated in the project implementation process. Combined with absences of the logframe at the outset of implementation, the lack of proper baseline data, and weak management, accessibility and lack of dissemination of information that was generated contributed to the ineffective internal monitoring of the project. Additionally the executing agency had little to no experience in using the logframe. The TE indicates the UNDP, as the implementing agency, failed to allocate sufficient time and resources to provide proper supervision and guidance in its effective use.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale) MS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The executing agency was the National Trust for Nature Conservation (NTNC), a non-governmental organization under the Government of Nepal’s Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Forests & Soil. The NTNC fulfilled the role of a government agency which UNDP engaged with in the execution of the project. Regardless of the significant amount of time and energy invested by the NTCNC, one of the issues that continued to plague the project is the lack of a policy for managing the forest north of the Highway which has in turn stalled the development of an integrated management plan for the Forest Corridor. However, the NTNC was praised in the TE and credited for learning and integrating

⁴ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

lessons that came out of the Mid-Term Evaluation and the UNDP/GEF Assessment Mission to realign the project.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

The following are lessons, good practices that were mentioned in the terminal evaluation that may be applicable to other GEF projects:

- i) Project partners are responsible for ensuring the project concept and design are sound and take into account any outstanding or potential weaknesses prior to the approval of the project document and during the development of the Inception Plan.
- ii) A three-year time frame to implement projects which promote and develop alternative means of livelihood among local communities should be reconsidered. Projects of this nature should be instituted within a five-year time frame, at minimum, with provisions for extension for the long-term (up to 10 years), or alternatively, broken up into a series of smaller projects that can be phased over a longer time frame to ensure proper implementation and monitoring of project activities.
- iii) Logical framework (Logframes), when provided with proper guidance and supervision, may be effective tools in monitoring the implementation of projects.
- iv) Economic feasibility studies should precede interventions to provide alternatives and more sustainable means of livelihood of which a “multi-skills approach” may be more likely to increase sustainability.
- v) Management interventions should take into account social, economic, political and scientific factors, with monitoring as appropriate.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

- i) Proper measures should be undertaken to review the Project Concept and Design prior to signing the Project Document and development of the Inception Plan. Project concept and Design should not be separate from the project’s implementation and be subject to evaluation, with ratings, to produce a more balanced final evaluation.
- ii) If absent from the project document, a logframe should be developed at the outset of implementation. The UNDP, as implementing agency, should allocate sufficient time and resources to provide the necessary supervision and guidance in its use.
- iii) The Government of Nepal, specifically the Ministry of Forests & Soil Conservation, need to take measures to ensure that the Corridor is managed in accordance with the *Barandhabar Forest Corridor Management Plan*, establish the Barandhabar Forest Conservation Committee and to formulate new regulations for managing the National Forest.
- iv) UNDP Nepal should provide the necessary support in the 1) establishment of Forest Conservation Committee; 2) representation of this Committee on the Terai Landscape Arc Steering Group; and 3) formulation of the policy for managing of the National Forest Corridor.
- v) More innovative approaches supported by government and local communities need to be explored to combat poaching of wildlife in the Corridor. Additionally a study should be undertaken of the number vehicle and animal movements along the Highway that crosses the Corridor to help in the development of measures to mitigate the movement of vehicles through the wildlife corridor.
- vi) The replication of income-generating activities amongst other households within the target group is a high priority. A multi-skills approach should be adopted which provides households with year-round income generation opportunities.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

-

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 terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The report provides an extensive assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts.	HS (6)
b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The TE is internally consistent, with a through analysis of the project design, implementation, outputs, and outcomes. The report includes ratings which, for the most part, have been substantiated within the TE.	HS (6)
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? According to the TE, it was difficult for the project exit strategy be properly assessed as the Barandabhar Forest Conservation Committee had not been instituted to oversee the future management of the Corridor. Without this committee in place, it was difficult to asses and report the project exit strategy.	MS (4)
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Many of the lessons are comprehensive with many being applicable to other GEF projects. While many of the lessons presented can be supported by the evidence that was presented in the TE, others have less supporting evidence from the TE.	S (5)
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report does not include actual co-financing used. It includes the actual project costs but does not parse the costs by activity.	MU (3)
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report assesses the strengths and shortcomings of the monitoring and evaluation system especially the initial absence of the logframe (and its later integration) and the lack of guidance for its use as well as lack of baseline date to assess project's level of achievement against the 2002 benchmark. The report also highlights the lack of attention and resources to collect relevant data for M&E purposes.	HS (6)

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

-

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

--

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)

--