

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	932		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1285	GEF financing:	2.10	NA
Project Name:	Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas of Russia' Kamchatka Oblast, Phase 1	IA/EA own:	0.07	NA
Country:	Russia	Government:	0.23	NA
		Other*:	2.54	NA
		Total Cofinancing	2.77	NA
Operational Program:	OP 4	Total Project Cost:	4.87	NA
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation	Work Program date		Feb 2001
		CEO Endorsement		Jan 2002
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Jun 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: Jun 2004	Actual: Jul 2004
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: DRAFT	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 24 Months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 25 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 Month
Author of TE: David Vousden Galina Fet		TE completion date: June 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: May 2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 23 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

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	S	NA	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	NA	NA	U
2.3 Monitoring	N/A	NA	NA	S

and evaluation				
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

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

Yes, with qualifications. The terminal evaluation report is sound in terms of coverage of achievement of project outcomes and outputs. It also describes the methodology used to assess performance and covers issues related to monitoring and evaluation, replication and lessons in a comprehensive manner. However, it does not provide figures on financial aspects, including co-financing, of the project. Also issues related to cost effectiveness and sustainability have been covered in a patchy manner.

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

None.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the TE the global environmental objective of the project is to “*help secure the global benefits of conserving biological diversity in all protected areas in Kamchatka Oblast by demonstrating replicable, sustainable approaches to biodiversity in four existing representative protected areas.*”

A slightly different version is listed in the project proposal document. According to it the global environmental objective of the project is to “*secure the global biodiversity benefits of the Kamchatka Peninsula’s protected areas by demonstrating sustainable and replicable conservation of globally significant biodiversity in four different existing protected areas.*”

The difference in the objectives listed in the two documents is only semantic in nature. Thus, it could be said that there have been no changes in the Global Environmental Objectives.

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

According to the TE, the development objectives of the project are to:

- Strengthen the protected areas’ administrative and management capacity;
- Enable the development of a more rational and supportive PA legal foundation;
- Increase stakeholder biodiversity conservation awareness, commitment and participation in PA management;
- Enable biodiversity conservation;
- Promoting alternative livelihood pursuits for local commodities;
- Increase efficiencies by improving collaboration between federally and regionally administered protected areas and among responsible authorities; and,
- Leverage co-funding support to ensure the attainment and sustainability of project results

While project proposal document does not list the development objectives, the PIR 2003 lists exactly the same development objectives as listed in the TE. Thus, it appears that the project’s development objectives have remained the same during the period of project implementation.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

According to the TE the project has been able to achieve following outcomes and impacts:

- Strengthening of the protected areas system has been realized through the development of management and operational plans, the creation and strengthening of field offices, guard posts and ranger patrol stations, and through increased staffing levels;

- Biodiversity information and management has been significantly improved through capture and compilation of historic and current datasets and information, and the development of a standardized database format;
- A foundation has been set in place for strengthening the legal, regulatory and policy base;
- The project has led to heightened biodiversity awareness and advocacy;
- The project has led to improvements in development of alternative livelihoods and community based conservation.

This said the TE recognizes that the project was not able to accomplish development of sustainable financing mechanism due to poor response from donors. To mitigate this, the project team is trying to attract funding from other sources.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance

Rating: S

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

The project outcomes such as strengthening of the protected area system; biodiversity information and management; strengthening of the legal, regulatory and policy base; heightened biodiversity awareness and advocacy; and, improvements in development of alternative livelihoods and community based conservation, are consistent with the biodiversity focal area's strategy. These outcomes could be expected to lead to conservation of global biodiversity in the protected areas of Kamchatka Oblast.

B Effectiveness

Rating: MS

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

According to the TE, the project has been able to achieve outcomes such as strengthening of legal, regulatory and policy base; and, heightened biodiversity awareness and advocacy as per the expectations. Further, it has strengthened the protected areas system; improved development of alternative livelihoods and community based conservation; and improved biodiversity information and management; in a substantial measure. It has, however, not been able to develop sustainable financing mechanisms – one of the key expected outcomes.

It could, therefore, be said that the projects performance was moderately satisfactory in meeting the expected outcomes.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: S

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?**

The TE informs that there were no major delays in implementation of the project. It further informs that even though allocated budget for the project was lower than what was proposed, owing to “dedication and dynamic abilities of the project team” project has been able to accomplish more than what could have been realistically expected.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

The TE rates project's performance in delivering the expected outcomes as “impressive” (≈ Satisfactory). It states that “there is strong evidence to support the fact that the project is achieving its overall aim of strengthening the protected areas administrative and management capacity; enabling the development of a more rational and supportive legal foundation; increasing stakeholder biodiversity awareness, commitment and participation in PA management; enabling

biodiversity conservation promoting alternative livelihood pursuits for local communities; increasing efficiencies by improving collaboration between federally and regionally administered protected areas and among responsible authorities; and, leveraging co-funding support to ensure the attainment and sustainability of project results.” Thus, based on the assessment of the TE it could be said that the project has achieved outcomes that will lead to the expected impact of biodiversity conservation in the protected areas of Kamchatka Oblast.

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.

A Financial resources	Rating: U
According to the TE compared to expectations very little progress was made in developing sustainable financing mechanisms. Key outputs included absorption of a substantial part of the salary of the additional staff by Kamchatka Oblast Administration and the Natural Resource Committee; designing and implementation of a system of user fees; and designing and operationalizing Kamchatka Protected Areas Conservation Fund. The TE notes that attempts are being made harness other sources of finance to meet the financial requirements. The TE assess that there is a “substantial” financial risk to project sustainability.	
B Socio political	Rating: MU
According to TE, a major reason why the project has not been able to secure financial commitments has to do with the lack of support from the regional administration. According to TE, this was not anticipated during the development of the project. The project team lobbied with the government to get additional resources and has had some success in getting it. However, the TE laments, without awareness on biodiversity issues there would always be a risk to sustainability of project outcomes.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: UA
The TE discusses the institutional framework of the project from the perspective of the institutions involved in implementing the project. It observes that the project and management teams have been proactive to the potential threats to the project. However, it does not elaborate upon whether the overall institutional and governance framework, under which the project will operate in future, poses any risk to sustainability of project outcomes.	
D Environmental	Rating: L
The TE does not discuss any environmental risk to project outcomes. Given the nature of the project, such risks are any way not anticipated.	

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

A Financial resources	Rating: U
B Socio political	Rating: U
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: NA
D Environmental	Rating: L

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good

The TE informs that many activities taken up under the project are transferable to other situations both within and outside Russia. It lists development of an effective database system on biodiversity resources under the project as an example. While the TE discusses the potential of the project activities in demonstrating efficacy of various biodiversity conservation activities and strategies, it does not discuss whether some concrete steps have been taken to facilitate replication and scaling up of the successful project activities.

2. Demonstration

3. Replication

4. Scaling up

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

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports,

and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)	Rating: MS
<p>While the TE does say that the “standard monitoring requirements for a GEF project were incorporated into the project document it does not adequately address whether M&E plan at entry was practicable and sufficient.</p> <p>The review of the project proposal document shows that despite some apparent deficiencies overall the M&E plan could be considered acceptable. On the positive side the M&E plan describes the project risks and their probability category. The responsibilities for Monitoring and Evaluation activities and the time frame for each activity have been clearly specified. However, the log frame has some salient deficiencies. Often it has not been explained how the specified indicators will be measured. Further, for many indicators target achievement has not been specified.</p>	
B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?	
Rating: S	
<p>According to the TE, the steering committee met every 6 months; the meetings were consistently attended by the senior personnel of the project team and of ministry of natural resources. According to TE, various other stakeholders were also represented in these meetings. It further informs that the PIRs submitted as part of M&E requirements were accurate and discussed concerns, risks, achievements and transferable lessons in a truthful manner. The TE credits PIRs for having correctly and timely identified relevant risks that could have affected the performance of the project.</p>	
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?	
Rating: NA	
<p>As per the description in the TE and project proposal documents the project budgeted some amount to project management activities. However, it is not clear whether monitoring and evaluation activities have been adequately budgeted. It is not clear whether the M&E activities were properly funded during implementation as this issue has not been discussed in the TE.</p>	
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?	
<p>The TE considers the PIRs produced by the project team to be a fair reflection of the actual performance of the project and challenges faced in implementation of the project. It also informs that the steering committee meetings took place at regular intervals. These parameters on which the performance of the M&E system is strong. However, the indicators for many of the outcomes have not been well specified. Thus, overall the M&E system may not be considered a good practice.</p>	

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons 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?
<p>Following lessons have been listed in the TE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A community's awareness and support is dependent more on the real actions that make difference to their life rather than words and presentations; - In addition to the indigenous people, other groups also should be targeted through the community assistance and participation initiatives so as to obviate future resentment; - Overly complex terminologies should be avoided while designing a project – during the initial phases of the project such terminologies caused confusion – the aim should be to write it in a manner so that the implementers of the project are able to understand it well; - Where partnerships are involved in actual implementation of project components, efforts should be made to coordinate and integrate requirements for reporting, monitoring and evaluation, so as to reduce demands from the project teams; and, - Where ever possible GEF project documents must use realistic and sequential indicators

that can be measured.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
--

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.

No such sources were available to the reviewer.

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?	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	S
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Institutional framework and governance not sufficiently addressed.	MS
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? No project costs included.	U
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	S

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: The TE only discusses outcomes and outputs of the project. These may not require a technical assessment.		

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

Project Proposal Document, PIR 2003, 2004, 2005.
