GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA	valuation Review For	<u> </u>			
Review date:					
GEF Project ID:	984		at endorsement	at completion (Million US\$)	
OLI TIOJECTID.	304		(Million US\$)	at completion (inilian 664)	
IA/EA Project ID:	72391	GEF financing:	0.83	0.80	
Project Name:	Dynamics of Biodiversity Loss and Permafrost Melt in Lake Hovsgol National Park	IA/EA own:			
Country:	Mongolia	Government:			
		Other*:			
		Total Cofinancing	0. 63	0.69	
Operational		Total Project	1.46	1.49	
Program:		Cost:			
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	GeoEcology		Work Program date	07/30/2001	
	Institute,		CEO Endorsement	03/02/2001	
	Mongolian Academy of	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		09/30/ 2001	
	Sciences	Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2005	Actual: October 31, 2006	
Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date	Duration between effectiveness date	Difference between original and actual closing:	
Soledad	Anna	and original closing: 51 months	and actual closing: 61 months	10 months	
Author of TE: Tony Whitten,		TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date:	
Team Leader		5/18/06	05/23/07	12 months	

^{*} Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g.	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	s	IEG) N/A	s
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	L	N/A	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	s	s	N/A	U/A
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	s

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

No. Although the document contains most of the information requested in the GEF-EO guidelines with an analysis substantiated by facts, it lacks a detailed presentation and discussion on the finances (costs disaggregated by activity)

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

No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project documents, the overall objective was to identify sustainable land use practices that will protect biodiversity, ecosystem function, and permafrost. The goal of the proposed targeted research in Lake Hovsgol National Park (HNP) is to support the OP12 on Integrated Ecosystem Management. Using Lake Hovsgol National Park as a case study, the targeted research will provide for the long-term protection of all the ecosystems by better understanding the scale and dynamics of natural and anthropogenic changes.

According to the TE, there were no changes to the environmental objectives during implementation.

What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? According to the project document, the development objectives remained largely unchanged throughout project implementation and were as follows:

- To identify the impacts of pasture use and forest cutting on the dynamics of forest, steppe, riparian zones and streams in the tributary valleys of the Lake Hovsgol National Park (LHNP).
- To define how those impacts interact and are affecting the melting of permafrost (and thus the release of carbon dioxide), soil characteristics, and plant and animal biodiversity.
- To make an inventory of climate change effects in LHNP.
- To determine sustainable resource use patterns that will also protect biodiversity, permafrost and soil sequestration of carbon.
- To calculate the costs and benefits of alternative land use practices, especially as related to pastoral nomads.

According to the TE, there were no changes to the development objectives during implementation. The only variation related to the depth of the study of forest cutting (see first objective) because there was very little cutting in the study area.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?

The main outcome of the research was an objective assessment of the physical, biological and human dynamics affecting the shifting transition zone between the taiga forest and the steppe.

According to the TE, the project is one of only two Bank-implemented 'targeted research' GEF projects and the STAP encouraged the project to do as much as possible to build capacity. In addition:

- 23 young Mongolian graduates were hired and trained in specific scientific areas for monitoring environmental change and mitigation.
- Specific scientific training included augmenting their earlier training in climate change, plant ecology, carbon budgets, forest insect assessment, forest regeneration processes, forest tree growth and age-structure analyses, soil characterization, bird, small and large mammal population assessments, water quality analysis, algae diversity, aquatic insect and fish population analyses, and socio-economic and marketing analyses and marketing.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

A Relevance Rating: 6 HS

According to the TE and the project brief document, the project was designed to respond to the Mongolian National Environmental Action Plan 2000 which identified as major environmental issues both the role of melting permafrost in generating carbon dioxide and the need to control deforestation and forest degradation especially in relation to the management of protected areas and buffer zones, such as through the effects of grazing and fire. In addition it is relevant to the GEF OP12 on Integrated Ecosystem Management.

B Effectiveness Rating: 5 S

According to the ICM, objectives were accomplished and commensurate with the expected outcomes described in the project documents. For example, the project's final report concluded that for 15 of the researchers at the training and the research of the project was highly beneficial; for the remaining eight individuals, the project had only a limited impact because of a lack of motivation on the individual's part, a lack of ability, or the inability of the International.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: 5S

Considering its achievements, the project implementation was cost-effective and most of the Trust Fund activities were carried out within budget. The project was successful at leveraging co-financing funds and in-kind contributions, notably from the institutions of the international researchers involved with the project, many of which covered staff time, loaned equipment and hosted the Mongolian researchers during international learning exchanges, providing numerous invitations to join trips and meetings.

4.1.2 Impacts

- An outcome indicator was not established specifically for capacity building. However, the project is one of only
 two Bank-implemented 'targeted research' GEF projects and the STAP encouraged the project to do as much
 as possible to build capacity.
- Twenty-three young Mongolian graduates were hired and trained in specific scientific areas for monitoring
 environmental change and mitigation. Three researchers dropped out of the program after the first year.
 Specific scientific training included augmenting their earlier training in climate change, plant ecology, carbon
 budgets, forest insect assessment, forest regeneration processes, forest tree growth and age structure
 analyses, soil characterization, bird, small and large mammal population assessments, water quality analysis,
 algae diversity, aquatic insect and fish population analyses, and socioeconomic and marketing analyses and
 marketing.
- The integration of the results into an Ecosystem Model at an extended workshop was facilitated by visiting international scientists and a Mongolian doctoral student from the University of Pennsylvania. This workshop was possible through additional funding from the Trust for Mutual Understanding, NY, and the Bank-executed Netherlands-Mongolia Trust Fund for Environmental Reform which also supported the project researchers to visit the laboratories and field study sites of the above and other international scientists.
- These exchange opportunities have encouraged collaborative research and co publication of the findings of the targeted research. Many of these collaborations are continuing largely because of the efforts of the researchers to excel in their respective scientific fields.

In addition, the evaluator states: "There is a significant or high likelihood that the impact of all the capacity building will be sustained. The researchers of the Hovsgol GEF project are developing scientific papers for publication, many of which will be published in international scientific journals." Several papers will also be published internally in Mongolia and postgraduate degrees obtained.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of <u>risks</u> to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources Rating: L

The project was successful at leveraging co-financing funds and in-kind contributions, notably from the institutions of the international researchers involved with the project, many of which covered staff time, loaned equipment and hosted the Mongolian researchers during international learning exchanges, providing numerous invitations to join trips and meetings. There is no indication that there won't be any more financing.

B Socio political Rating: L

The political sustainability is high because the project was designed to respond to the Mongolian National Environmental Action Plan 2000 which identified as major environmental issues both the role of melting permafrost in generating carbon dioxide and the need to control deforestation and forest degradation especially in relation to the management of protected areas and buffer zones, such as through the effects of grazing and fire. It is expected that the government will continue supporting this.

C Institutional framework and governance

Rating: L

The establishment of a Turag Herder NGO was facilitated by the social science researcher, and for the first time this group of nomads found benefits from working and acting as a group. They were the focus of the work of one student in 2005 and two in 2006 from the Wharton Business School who helped determine ways to improve their markets. This NGO was active during the course of the project, but realistically it is unlikely to be sustainable after project closing because of the lack of capacity and organizational skills of the members.

In addition, the terminal evaluation informs that because of (a) entrenched ideas and habits among some of the senior academics in the country, (b) the commonly uncritical ways of teaching and working with young scientists in Mongolia, and (c) the 'threat' perceived by older academics from the well-trained project researchers, it is possible that the capacity building may not show as a broad gain for Mongolian science in the short term but should prove to be very effective in improving science standards in Mongolia over the medium and long term. The Institute of GeoEcology had promised to hire as many as ten of the project researchers at the end of the project, but this did not materialize.

D Environmental Rating: L

All research studies aim at providing new knowledge on techniques to improve the environment. The project does not face any environmental risks.

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good

An Eastern Shore Hovsgol newspaper was published each year of the project and disseminated throughout the Hovsgol watershed. Two videos were developed on the project and shown a number of times on Mongolian television. Posters of the research were prepared and given to herders as well as being displayed in the Turag Visitor Center for the Sub-District. Materials and project information have been made available through the website www.hovsgolecology.org. The researchers and the international consultant are publishing papers on the results of the studies of the Hovsgol GEF project, many of them in international peer-reviewed journals.

Knowledge generated that has potential for replication: This project is one of only two GEF 'targeted research' projects implemented by the Bank. The capacity building aspect of the project worked very well and is replicable, demonstrating that: (a) it is possible to draw on scientists from more developed countries and top scientists in the home country to help train young scientists from developing countries, and (b) these efforts can result in considerable co-financing and good will. The research results will contribute substantially to the overall understanding of the impacts of climate change on the environment of central/NE Asia.

b. Demonstration

The project was associated with two soums – Hanh in the north and Hatgal in the south. One workshop was held in the former and two in the latter on a range of subjects, and they were well attended by public officials and approximately 50 local residents. The researchers and the International Consultant made presentations to the small Turag NGO herder group whose establishment was facilitated by the project, and gave talks at the Hovsgol National Park Conference in 2006 representing 20 years since the founding of the park. This was attended by a number of National Park Staff, plus two individuals from the Ministry of Nature and the Environment and 50 local residents. Several workshops were presented and Open Houses were hosted in Ulaanbaatar for the academic community and for the press corps. A major regional workshop on Nomadic Pastoralism and Climate Change was held in May, 2006 to which GEF Operational Focal Points for north-central Asia were invited (the OFP for China attended). These workshops were highly successful in terms of participation, engagement of other academics, dissemination of knowledge and press coverage.

c. Replication.

d. Scaling up

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

A. M&E design at Entry

Rating (six point scale): 4 MS

According to the project document brief, prior to beginning annual operations, a proposed plan with benchmarks and indicators for the year will be prepared, discussed with the scientists, presented to the national/international Scientific Advisory Group (to ensure quality), and to the World Bank. The year's activities will also be discussed with the local herders so they are aware of, and can have input to, all activities in their valleys.

According to the ICM, indicators were developed for the overall project objectives, and also for the implementation of the four project components It is recognized that these indicators, although considered sufficient at the time of project approval, are not ideal in that they are not specific, time-bound and measurable. Their utility is hence somewhat limited.

B. M&E plan Implementation

Rating (six point scale): U/A

M&E implementation plan does not appear in the TE, nor does it include a discussion. However, it should be noted that the discussion of M&E appears – to a certain extent—implied all throughout the report, especially during the implementation/ outcome verification phase.

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

Yes

C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Yes. Part of the project budget has been allocated to annual Steering Committee meetings and to the costs of the Scientific Review Committee

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

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?

A key element was the quality of the International Consultant hired who was wholly committed to the project and its aims and likely used more than the time allotted to find and make connections with potential mentors and to raise significant sums of co-financing both as cash and in kind (equipment, books, volunteers and foreign students). The

outcomes would likely have been very different without all the value-added provided.

In an environment where funds for research are extremely limited, conflicts over the control and use of funds will readily develop and did, though they were limited overall due to the help from the administration of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences. This may limit the success of some of the young individuals trained in the Hovsgol GEF Project within some institutions; but the scientific community as a whole has been and should continue to be supportive of the young researchers. A critical mass of bright young scientists is now beginning to form in Mongolia's universities. This project contributed to this critical mass and in that respect, the project was indeed "Highly Satisfactory" for the future of Mongolia. Emphasis should continue to be placed upon capacity building in Mongolia.

The success of this targeted research project has resulted from the involvement of distinguished international scientists who are interested in working in Mongolia and want to help train young people. In general, targeted research in a developing country, where science is not necessarily high level, can best be promoted if projects have a strong capacity building component.

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

No specific recommendations are mentioned in the report.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report		Ratings
	pes the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of e project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
	the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and e the IA ratings substantiated?	5
	pes the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit rategy?	4
	e the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they imprehensive?	5
	pes the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and tual co-financing used?	4
Althou	bes the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? gh the report does not have a section on assessment of the project M&E system, contain a discussion about it.	3

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?

The project did well in attracting more co financing resources than expected at the moment of the project proposal. **Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?

A delay in project start-up was caused by problems in the transfer of GEF funds to the project bank account, and hence project activities were begun in early 2002 rather than in late 2001. The project was designed as a five-year monitoring and experimental study of watershed conditions, which, in this cold mountainous region, could largely be accomplished only during the summer months. Therefore, it was not possible to hire and develop the field research crew for 2001, and researchers were instead hired and trained from April 2002, beginning field study in June, 2002. Equipment was purchased during the first months of 2002. For this reason, project closing was extended to 2006 to meet the original design of five field seasons.

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in	Yes:	No:
the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box		x
and explain below.		

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

Last PIR (2006)

Project Document Brief

ICM