

Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP-GEF Project

entitled
“Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal”
NEP/92/G31/A/1G/99

April 19, 1999

Jeffrey F. Griffin

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
Component 1: National Biodiversity Action Plan	7
I. Project Results	
A. Immediate Objective and Outputs	
B. Performance	
C. Success	
II. Lessons learned about project design, implementation, management.	
III. Recommendation for follow-up activities	
Component 2: Makalu Barun National Park and Conservation Area	12
I. Project Results	
A. Immediate Objective and Outputs	
B. Performance	
C. Success	
II. Lessons learned about project design, implementation, management.	
III. Recommendation for follow-up activities	
Component 3: Enhancement of National Capacity	29
I. Project Results	
A. Immediate Objective and Outputs	
B. Performance	
C. Success	
II. Lessons learned about project design, implementation, management.	
III. Recommendation for follow-up activities	
Annexes:	
Annex 1: Evaluator meeting agenda (including name and titles of persons met)	36
Annex 2: List of documents consulted	38
Annex 3: List of documentation produced under Component 2	40
Annex 4: Summary of the project's response to recommendations made by mid-term GEF Evaluation of March 1997	45
Annex 5: Overall project implementation-related lessons	48

Acronyms:

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CF	Community Forest
CFUGS	Community Forest User Groups
DNPWC	Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GUGs	Grazer User Groups
KMTNC	King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation
HMG	His Majesty's Government
MBNP	Makalu-Barun National Park
MBNP-BZ	Makalu-Barun National Park and Buffer Zone
MoFSC	Ministry of Forestry and Soil Conservation
NBAP	National Biodiversity Action Plan
NEX	National Execution Implementation Modality
NGO	Non-governmental Organizations
NTFP	Non-timber Forest Products
PPER	Project Performance Evaluation Report
RN	Resources Nepal
SHD	Sustainable Human Development
TMI	The Mountain Institute
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Acknowledgements:

This evaluator expresses appreciation to UNDP-Nepal for all the support provided during this evaluation. Mr. H. Karcher's active interest and support, K.Chungyalpa's guidance, BKL Joshi's insights, and Sangeeta's very able assistance and support were much appreciated.

This evaluator expresses appreciation to His Majesty's Government of Nepal, Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation, Dept. of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation for their assistance and time given to the evaluation. Mr. Charles Pradhan provided a very useful compendium of project-related reports and information. Mr. Govinda Kandel, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer of MoFSC, provided useful insight and perspective.

Megh Pandy of DNPWC and Brian Penniston of TMI, organized a terrific and enlightening trek through as much of the buffer zone and park as time would allow (although 30,000 of vertical feet of climbing and descending could be considered "evaluator abuse"). Special thanks to both of them for the fruitful conversations, helpful thoughts, and frank assessments.

Thanks to P. Yonzon of Resources Nepal for his time and frank assessments. Dr. Shrestha of IUCN-Nepal provided helpful background information on Makalu-Barun.

Thanks to Mr. Budhathoki for the brief tour of some Parks and People project highlights in the buffer zone of Chitwan. KMTNC's presentation in Chitwan and hospitality were very useful and much appreciated.

Executive Summary

What are the context and purpose of the evaluation?

The “Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal” project was developed by UNDP and approved by GEF in 1993 during GEF’s “Pilot Phase,” a term used to describe the first two years of GEF serving as the funding mechanism for the CBD. Implementation of this GEF pilot phase biodiversity project began in 1994 and is scheduled to begin closing down in July 1999, with implementation of all components coming to end in December 1999.

The project is comprised of three components executed by the MoFSC/DNPWC. Under this national execution arrangement, the project has been implemented by four entities, three of which were sub-contracted.

Component 1: Development of an NBAP (to be completed by the end of July 1999)

Component 2: Development of an Integrated Conservation and Development Management Approach for MBNP (operations to be handed over to Government by the 31st of July, 1999)

Component 3: Enhancement of National Capacity. This component was implemented as two sub-components:

- i. The KMTNC implemented a series of training courses for DNPWC field staff and private stakeholders. Work was officially completed on 31 December 1998 but two training workshops are still to be held using 1998 funds.
- ii. DNPWC itself is implementing the second sub-component, a capacity building exercise for itself, and these operations are due to wrap-up on 31st December 1999.

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the results of the project as it approaches the conclusion of its implementation phase. The evaluation seeks to highlight successes and to provide constructive criticism that yields lessons learned and recommendations that are useful in helping to improve future project design and implementation in Nepal.

This evaluation focuses on the following points:

- Project/component results based upon promised outputs and activities.
- The relevance of the project, six years after the project document was signed;
- The performance of the project (effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness);
- Lessons learned about the project design, implementation and management;
- Early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including its contribution to capacity development, and finally:

General recommendation points for possible next-steps for UNDP and HMG cooperation in the field of biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are also offered in the executive summary.

What are the main conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned?

The main conclusion of this evaluation is that the project has successfully established a substantial foundation upon which existing and future biodiversity conservation efforts in Nepal can build in the following topical areas: 1) National Biodiversity Action Planning; and 2) Makalu Barun National Park & Buffer Zone management.

This project faced difficulties as a result of a poor project design that is typical of GEF pilot phase projects. Despite these implementation difficulties, rooted in the poor design of the original project document, significant accomplishments were made during the five-year lifespan of this project.

In particular, the following achievements stand out:

- ❖ A draft NBAP in its final stages of review and revision.
(Note: A final workshop is planned to integrate remaining comments and secure endorsement by HMG in the remaining months following this evaluation.)
- ❖ A GIS database and equipment system to serve as the main tool for nationwide biodiversity monitoring by DNPWC.
- ❖ An established park management system and infrastructure for MBNP-BZ, including:
 - A headquarters building and four sector offices;
 - Baseline information on Park biodiversity, including 30 published reports and a seven volume natural resource management series, and special management areas such as community forests;
 - Infrastructure for better management of tourism (improved trails, campsites, many publications, MBNP porters association, Makalu Tourism Association);
 - The foundation of a sustainable participatory management regime for the Park (78 community forest user groups and three grazing user groups)
 - Middle to lower level staff trained in germane natural resource management/ community participation activities;
- ❖ A reservoir of goodwill among the MBNP-BZ communities towards the MBNP.
- ❖ Nepal's first national park and buffer zone established together as an integrated package and without the assistance of the Army.
- ❖ Operation of the first Nepal-based, in-service training initiative for DNPWC staff as well as for private sector partners in buffer zone activities.
- ❖ Development of capacity building strategy by DNPWC.

Lessons Learned:

- This project is one of the few GEF pilot phase projects that actually leveraged co-funding. The Dutch Government provided over US\$ 2 million in co-financing for buffer zone development-related activities around Makalu-Barun National Park. This is an excellent lesson/example/precedent for any possible future co-financed projects in Nepal.

- Poorly written project documents lead to confusion and reduced effectiveness during project implementation. The original project document should be used as a case study in how not to write a project document in order to engender a double-loop learning process and improve project development and implementation throughout UNDP-GEF.
- The immediate objectives should have been worded more clearly with specific, meaningful success indicators. The same is true for the outputs themselves.
- This project document tried to do too much, in too short of a time. The lesson here: keep project design simple and focussed on 2-3 key areas where real impact can be demonstrated. Future projects must be more specific about exactly what biodiversity impact they are promising and how this will be measured.
- It is one thing to establish a management system for a Park. It is quite another to establish a participatory, sustainable Park management system. The project document hardly even addressed the issue of how to make a park management system sustainable. This issue requires well designed, targeted outputs in order to achieve sustainability.
- Management of Nepal's high mountain parks will require a different approach from that used in the lower elevation Terai parks. MBNP-BZ provides an opportunity for HMG to test some new localized management approaches like developing partnerships for buffer zone management, increasing the cultural diversity of their warden staff and building the capacity of lower-level, locally-based staff.
- It is all too easy for these projects to become overly focussed on the task of providing "hardware" (buildings, trails, schools) especially when the need is so great. But, effective biodiversity work requires high quality "software" (information, fieldwork, programs, baselines, and target impacts).
- The work done in MBNP-BZ on CFUGs and GUGs is the essence of participatory management. This work should be officially incorporated into an overall park management participatory approach when the existing management plan is revised.

Recommendations:

- ❖ HMG and TMI should assess impact of project activities on biodiversity: changes in attitude/levels of support from local communities due to increased revenues from tourism; changes in community forest health.
- ❖ A gender impact assessment should be done for the project as a whole. This would help any future projects integrate gender needs more effectively at the design stage. This need only be a simple several page assessment of how women's issues were addressed.
- ❖ Solicit written comments on the NBAP, conduct a round-table discussion on remaining issues, and complete the NBAP to the satisfaction of all stakeholders by the end of June 1999.
- ❖ The project has invested a significant amount of international taxpayer resources into local staff training. Every effort should be made during the hand-over period to keep this investment (these staff) working at the local level in MBNP-BZ.

- ❖ MBNP-BZ work on CFUGs and GUGs should be officially incorporated into an overall park management participatory approach when the existing management plan is revised.
- ❖ In the opinion of this evaluator, there is a real opportunity to develop a strategic next phase effort here that focuses on demonstrating sustainable park and buffer zone management, building upon HMG’s developing emphasis on the integrated management of parks and buffer zones.

An element of this integrated management could involve demonstrating in the Nepali context how to create and maintain landscape-level biological corridors to meet the conservation needs of area-sensitive and seasonal altitudinal migrants species.

- ❖ The work conducted at MBNP-BZ warrants a second phase of targeted work in order to complete the task of establishing a sustainable biodiversity management and conservation system for the Park. A significant investment has been made in this Park, and now there is a real opportunity to follow it up with a project focussed on making the elevated level of activities developed by the project sustainable within the HMG context.

I. Introduction:

UNDP-Nepal arranged to have the Terminal Evaluation of this “Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal” pilot phase GEF project conducted from March 17 – April 9, 1999. This evaluation comes two years after the project’s mid-term evaluation, conducted in March of 1997.¹ Approved in 1993, the project began implementation in 1994 and has continued for five years, due to complete its implementation phase by December 31, 1999.

The total value of the project is US\$3,800,000. The project has three Immediate Objectives and three corresponding components that were implemented under sub-contracts, becoming “mini-projects” for all practical purposes during implementation.

<u>Components:</u>	<u>Budget (US\$)</u>	<u>% total budget</u>
1) Production of a National Biodiversity Action Plan:	360,000	10%
2) Establishment of management system for Makalu-Barun National Park:	2,600,000	68%
3) Capacity Building for DNPWC		
- KMTNC Training program	160,000	4%
- DNPWC Institutional Support	200,000	6%
Project Administration	<u>459,000</u>	<u>12%</u>
Total:	3,800,000	100%

¹ See Annex 4 for a summary on the project’s response to recommendations made by the mid-term evaluation.

II. The Project: its Context, Concept, and Design

A. Context

National parks and wildlife sector in Nepal:

National parks and wildlife is part of Nepal's larger forest resources sector. The Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation (DNPWC) is under the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation. Although the protected areas network incorporates approximately 18% of the country, the DNPWC is small and was only recently split off from the Forestry Department. The DNPWC manages a network of 16 protected areas. Eleven of these areas are in the rugged, inaccessible mountains of Nepal, where the population is ethnically and culturally quite diverse and where human pressure on natural resources is relatively less than in the lowlands. The remaining five of these areas are in the relatively flat lowland terrai of Nepal, a densely populated area with a high demand for park bioresources.

Political Context:

The following excerpt from the World Bank's Country Assistance Strategy for Nepal, 1999-2001 describes the HMG context of the past five years:

"In the 1994 parliamentary election, no party won an overall majority. Since then, there have been a series of shifting coalitions, with no Government able to last more than a year and half, and many much less. Political stability has been further compromised by deep splits within the major political groupings, with two of the three major parliamentary parties formally dividing earlier this year [1998]... Development has suffered as key decisions have not been made on time or not been adequately implemented, resulting in a fall in GDP per capita in FY 1998 for the first time in a decade."

GEF Context

The "Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal" project was developed by UNDP and approved by GEF during GEF's Pilot Phase, a term used to describe the first two years of GEF serving as the funding mechanism for the Convention on Biological Diversity. This is an important point to mention here for several reasons. First, the project was developed and approved before GEF had finalized its own Operational Strategy, and its more detailed operational programs. Second, the project was developed before GEF had developed what it calls its "Enabling Activity" funding window. This funding window was developed in 1996 to provide very specific guidance for the development of proposals to assist countries in developing their first National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans. Third, the project was developed before the logical framework approach was introduced by UNDP-GEF to provide a more focussed, logical and structured design to UNDP-GEF projects. And finally, the project was developed when GEF itself did not yet understand how to apply the incremental cost concept to biodiversity conservation project development. These facts provide some historical perspective for the sprawling design of the project itself.

UNDP Country Programme Context:

The Nepal Country Cooperative Framework describes four areas of focus: Gender, Governance, Employment, and Environment. The following is a list of UNDP's Environment/natural resource-related projects.

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Value (US\$)</u>
--------------	---------------	---------------------

Parks and People Project	ongoing	1,300,000
Capacity 21	ongoing	833,850
GEF Small Grants Programme	entering second phase	272,600
Quality Tourism III	ongoing	702,160
Sericulture for Rural Dev.	ongoing	2,272,979
Hill Agriculture Development	ongoing	2,896,236

These projects are all working in subject areas that are germane to areas of concern that invariably come under a GEF co-financed projects, which almost always have “sustainable development” related components that seek to enable communities to develop sustainable, alternative livelihoods in areas surrounding globally significant biological diversity.

B. Concept:

Concern over Nepal’s diminishing natural resources led project proponents to develop this project with the over-riding emphasis on community participation and community involvement. This emphasis can be seen in nearly every one of the project’s outputs includes the phrase “with the involvement of local people.” The largest component of the project deals with Makalu Barun National Park and one of its primary outputs was to produce an innovative and effective management system with the involvement of local people. Training programs implemented under the project emphasized community participation. In addition, this project concept represented the first time in Nepal when a Park and its conservation area (buffer zone) were legally established simultaneously.

This project is one of the few GEF pilot phase projects that actually leveraged co-funding. The Dutch Government provided over US\$ 2 million in co-financing for buffer zone development-related activities around Makalu-Barun National Park. This is an excellent precedent for any possible future co-financed projects in Nepal.

C. Design:

Although the concept of the project is laudable, the design of the project, specifically the project document, exhibits weaknesses found in many other GEF pilot phase projects. Although the project was thought to be of good quality when GEF approved it in 1993, after two years, it became apparent that these pilot phase projects suffered from a lack of specific, GEF programmatic criteria at the time of their development.

The mid-term evaluation covered this topic at length, so this evaluator will not go into the same issues again. In the project document design there is lack of consistency among Immediate Objectives, Outputs, and Activities. Outputs don’t always contribute to the immediate objective; and activities are not always designed to produce the outputs; and success criteria do not enable an easy evaluation of success.

In addition, the project document did not adequately consider how the project would be managed in a proper and effective manner. The project design assumed that DNPWC, with its weak capacity, would be able to bring together the different components, own them and manage them, through one or several Committees. This was very wrong. The design allowed for each component to be managed separately under sub-contract and this gradually

led to each component developing itself as a separate sub-project. UNDP eventually began holding meetings of all four sub-contractors to try and create linkages. But by the time this took place in year three of the project, it was too late. The meetings took place, but the linkages did not form.

Despite good faith and competent efforts by UNDP in managing this project, the poor design of the project document, in the opinion of this evaluator, has hampered the effective, efficient, and timely implementation of the project and reduced its overall impact from what it could otherwise have been. This statement is not meant to be a damning indictment. GEF has changed considerably since this document was approved in 1993 and this project document is not unlike many others from GEF's pilot phase.

Component 1: National Biodiversity Action Plan

Note: This component comprises 10% of the overall project budget.

I. Project Results

A. Immediate Objectives and Outputs:

Immediate Objective: *To provide a systematic and strategic approach to biodiversity protection in Nepal by formulation of a National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) in accordance with the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), taking into account existing initiatives and responsibilities, and to implement selected priority activities of the NBAP which will contribute to the protection of globally significant biodiversity values*

Output 1: NBAP that identifies the needs and constraints for biodiversity protection and provides a specific programme of priorities and actions to meet biodiversity protection objectives.

A first draft of this output was produced in May of 1998. Five regional consultations were held throughout Nepal. Dozens of Nepali experts were involved in the preparation of the NBAP. Since the first draft was produced in May 1998, the NBAP development process has broken down amid finger pointing and recrimination, resulting in an eight month delay in producing the second draft (January of 1999), which still hasn't even been seen by key officials in Government.

This evaluator is not familiar enough with Nepal to adequately determine whether the current draft has included all the information it could or whether it is consistent with other existing strategies and action plans. It should be. The draft NBAP is of a reasonable overall quality, in the opinion of this evaluator. This is not to say that the NBAP is without deficiencies. As one would expect in a draft document of this size, there are many. One, which particularly stands out, is the lack of a readily understandable strategic approach or framework. Output 1 calls for "a specific programme... to meet biodiversity protection objectives." The objective tree of this NBAP could be more clearly enunciated.

It is important that this NBAP be as complete and comprehensive as possible. Being Nepal's first NBAP, however, it is even more important for the NBAP to be endorsed and "owned" by the key stakeholder groups in Nepal's civil society.

Output 1.2: Protection, sustainable management and enhancement of key areas of biodiversity value as required to meet GEF objectives

This output displays the illogic and weakness of the project's design. "Hindsight is 20/20" and in hindsight this output should not have been included in this component. This output is a kind of "mini-project," for if one is to take it seriously, it calls for the same actions as those undertaken by the Makalu Barun component! Clearly this is not possible to do under one output as a side activity to production of the NBAP.

However the output was included in the approved project document and RN had a duty to produce it to the extent possible. The product produced by RN was included as an annex in an NBAP progress report from September 1998. The three-page report summarizes a rural socio-economic appraisal and flora and fauna survey were conducted in the Badimalika and Rama Roshan Region in western Nepal. The District Forest Office and Khaptad National Park supported the effort. The report declares the area to be of high biodiversity value, containing five forest types not represented in the protected area system of Nepal. Given the kind of financial resources at RN's disposal, this evaluator would expect a more substantial output and recognizes that more work is planned with the remaining US\$75,000 under this output.

B. Relevance

Relevance is the degree to which the objectives of the project remain valid and pertinent as originally planned or as subsequently modified owing to changing circumstances within the immediate context and external environment of the project.

The NBAP is highly relevant to Nepal for two reasons:

- 1) producing an NBAP is an obligation Nepal accepted when ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity
- 2) Under GEF's programmatic criteria, any GEF-supported projects must be drawn from the country's NBAP. Of all future Nepali requests for GEF financing, GEF will ask, "How does this project relate to and support the NBAP?"

The NBAP, in calling for the sustainable conservation and utilization of biological diversity, is particularly relevant to UNDP's overall mission of promoting SHD. In Nepal, sustainable development is not possible without the conservation and sustainable use of its biological resources.

C. Performance

UNDP uses three criteria for evaluating performance: effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness.

This evaluator uses a scale of Unsatisfactory – Satisfactory – Good – Very Good

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is defined as the extent to which the project has achieved its immediate objectives and produced its promised outputs and outcomes.

This evaluator rates the effectiveness of this component in as “Satisfactory” for the period from 1996 – 1998, when the first draft was submitted in May. A draft NBAP was produced essentially on schedule. The component worked to understand the priorities of experts throughout Nepal through a series of five regional consultations. RN did a great deal of work on developing the GIS database and getting the necessary information to include maps of all the protected areas of Nepal. The GIS database represents a real opportunity for DNPWC to build its capacity for biodiversity monitoring and informed management.

However, a rating of “Un-satisfactory” is given to the effectiveness of the collaboration process between HMG and RN from May 1998 to present. A second draft was produced, but without the involvement of key stakeholders (for whatever reason) and, despite efforts by UNDP to the contrary, the process degenerated.

Efficiency

The efficiency of the project in transforming inputs into outputs, based upon initial expectations, is rated “Satisfactory” by this evaluator up until May 1998 and “Un-satisfactory” from May 1998 - present.

Once the component finally began operations in 1996 (this delay is addressed in the “timeliness” section), management of this component was conducted in an effective, manner, with the component moving steadily forward with the preparatory activities for the NBAP until May 1998.

There was some uncertainty within UNDP about how to manage sub-contractors under UNDP rules and this was aggravated by the fact that UNDP was also at the time revising its NEX guidelines, adding some confusion to the uncertainty. This was settled in due course, but it appears that communication was less than effective about these matters during the transition period.

Since 1998, efficiency of this component is rated as “un-satisfactory.” One aspect that seems to have hampered the NBAP effort was the poor communication between Government and RN. Under existing GEF requirements, a steering committee representing of a cross section of Government, NGO and private sector business is formed. This Steering committee meets regularly throughout the process to assess progress **and ensure a continuous buy-in to what is being produced.** The Steering Committee under this component does not appear to have played this role. No buy-in from key stakeholders has been ensured as the process moved along, resulting in long delays since the production of the first draft of the NBAP.

When managing for efficiency, UNDP walks a fine line between facilitating and doing. By all accounts UNDP did walk this line and even strayed across it on occasion by requiring dialogue between the main players in this drama and when this failed to move things, by providing substantial input for the revision of the first NBAP draft, suggesting concrete ways to improve the technical quality of the document. This evaluator recognizes the difficulty involved with breaking this particular “logjam” as well as the

active monitoring of this component's work conducted by UNDP. Most recently, a "neutral" international consultant has been recruited by UNDP to facilitate the finalization of the NBAP and endorsement by HMG.

Timeliness

The timeliness of the provision of inputs and outputs is rated overall under this component as "Un-satisfactory." The initiating of activities under this component was delayed for two years after the project document was signed. This issue was addressed frankly by the mid-term evaluators. Once the component began operations however, it did produce at least a draft of the promised primary output under the original two-year schedule. However, since then the process has been stagnant with little productive exchange of professional insights in a collegial manner on how to improve the document and reach official consensus on Nepal's NBAP.

D. Success

UNDP uses three criteria to measure a project's success: impact, sustainability, and contribution to capacity development. This component will be completed by the end of May 1999. Given that this is the terminal evaluation (held at the end of the project rather than 1-2 years after completion), the assessment of project success will focus on early signs of impact and sustainability of results, including a contribution to capacity development.

Impact

Impact represents changes in a situation, planned or unplanned, positive or negative that a project brings about.

At the writing of this evaluation, the impact of this component is minimal compared to what it should be. Hopefully this will change during the remaining months of the project.

Lasting power

Sustainability is not so much a question here as lasting power of the actual NBAP. To maximize the lasting power of the document, the project should make every effort to ensure that the NBAP has adequately incorporated all legitimate, existing strategic thinking/priority-setting exercises related to Nepal's biodiversity. Lasting power will also depend upon the support and use the NBAP receives from the main stakeholders in Nepal's biodiversity arena – namely Government and NGOs.

Capacity Building

UNDP considers capacity development to have four dimensions: individual learning, organizations, organizational inter-relationships and enabling environment. Certainly the process of developing such a large document has been a very valuable capacity building exercise for RN, the private Nepali organization sub-contracted to carry out all activities under this component.

The NBAP development process must have yielded some positive, new inter-relationships that did not exist before. However, it is difficult to discern this, given the dysfunctional state of affairs that exists in this component at the time of this evaluation. In fact, this evaluator is concerned that rather than building organizational inter-relationships, the conflict arising from this component has actually harmed organizational

inter-relationships! Certainly learning how to avoid this kind of a situation must be a key lesson learned from this component.

IV. Lessons learned about project design, implementation, management.

Design: A lesson GEF has learned and applied to its programmatic criteria.

Any future NBAP initiative would focus on producing a strategy and action plan. The project would not be allowed implement any kind of activity – simply those required to complete the strategy and action plan using existing information.

Perhaps the problems of this component also highlights the weakness of the project design itself. There were too many “sideline” activities to the main focus: NBAP.

Implementation:

The importance of good, specific implementation requirements are highlighted by project’s the experience under this component . There was no effective stakeholder buy-in mechanism. An effective, representative steering committee, with its membership established and agreed upon under the project document, could perhaps have kept this NBAP process on-track and ensured continuous buy-in.

Experience under this component also illustrates the importance of key stakeholder participation, professionalism, and mutual respect.

Management:

The importance of patience on all sides with a multi-stakeholder process and of maintaining a professional approach was highlighted by the project’s experience under this component.

V. Recommendation for follow-up activities

- ❖ Move from the realm of personal recrimination and disagreement to official consensus.
- ❖ Enlist the help of an outside, neutral international expert to facilitate the final revision work needed on the draft NBAP. To do this more specifically:
 - Solicit written comments from stakeholders early on during the international expert’s time in Nepal.
 - These comments would form the basis of the expert’s consultations with stakeholders. Towards the end of the 2nd week of the expert’s visit, organize a final round-table discussion among the key stakeholders. Written comments on the NBAP should be solicited in advance of the round-table so everyone can ready them and be prepared for productive discussions. A specific agenda should be set for the meeting with specific time constraints on each specific topic of discussion.
- ❖ There is no need to be concerned about trying to calculate incremental costs in the actual NBAP document. This is Nepal’s NBAP, not the GEF’s NBAP.

- ❖ The NBAP would benefit from a “strategic framework” or “strategic approach to provide context for the existing action programmes.
- ❖ This component highlights the importance of making any project document crystal clear about the implementation arrangements.
- ❖ Understanding the time constraints on finalizing the NBAP, a summary of the NBAP should be translated and a mini-media campaign conducted to inform the wider public that there is a NBAP.

Component 2: Makalu Barun National Park and Conservation Area

Note: This component comprises 68% of the overall project budget.

I. Project Results

A. Immediate Objectives and Outputs:

Immediate Objective: *To protect the biodiversity of the MBNPCA as a vanguard project within a long-term strategy for biodiversity protection in Nepal, through a management approach which recognizes the interdependence of development and biodiversity conservation, and which provides a model for replication inside and outside of Nepal.*

This evaluation would echo the assessment of the mid-term evaluators: “The project has made substantial progress towards this immediate objective...” This evaluator believes that a protected area management system has been established in MBNP. While this system and all of its programmatic activities are not sustainable at this time apart from project financing, it is the opinion of this evaluator that with a well-designed, targeted approach to developing this sustainability (through a final GEF project for MBNP) that this component’s overall approach would indeed serve as a useful model for other mountain parks in Nepal.

No success criteria for this immediate objective were given in the project document, making it difficult to evaluate based upon the original intentions.

- **Output 1:** A sustainable, innovative and effective management system for protecting the biodiversity of the MBNPCA, with involvement of local people and NGOs.

Success criteria: participatory mechanisms for forest and biodiversity protection in the national park are established and operational.

⇒ Has the component produced a sustainable, innovative, effective, and participatory biodiversity management system for MBNP and Buffer Zone?

Sustainable? No. The project-inspired level of programmatic activity has not been put on a sustainable footing. Early signs are that HMG will be able to support enough staff to maintain the standard level of park management activity as HMG maintains across the country. Clearly more work remains to be done on developing long-term partnerships and funding mechanisms to assist HMG in managing this important area. Really achieving sustainability was never a focus of the activities described under this output.

Innovative? A great deal of progressive work has been done in establishing community forest user groups in the buffer zone and grazing user groups and helping these groups achieve legal title to their forests and the development of sustainable grazing regimes for Park grasslands. While the forestry work may not be innovative in and of itself (CF is national policy in Nepal), the objective of the project here is to gradually involve and integrate CFUGs into the overall management regime for MBNP-BZ biodiversity. This is innovative. The establishment of GUGs (see Output #2) by the project is innovative and the first GUGs in Nepal. MBNP is the first park in Nepal to be divided up into sectors for management purposes. This is an innovative approach to better manage such a large, ruggedly inaccessible area and has been well received by DNPWC.

And finally, the project has undertaken a pioneering effort in that 100% of the staff at senior scout and below are local people. The project is supporting six local young women by providing them with a two-year scholarship to attend Nepal's Institute of Forestry. These locally recruited and trained staff represent one of the most important investments UNDP/GEF and HMG can make in sustainability. HMG has promised to build upon what has been accomplished to date by transferring as many of these staff as possible into Government-funded positions for MBNP-BZ. This is an important concern for GEF because of the initial investment made by the project in these people.

Effective? Establishing a sustainable, participatory and innovative management system for a remote, culturally diverse place like MBNP-BZ takes time and sustained effort – more than has been allowed under this project. TMI and HMG have been effective in making progress towards producing this output. A management system has been developed with innovative aspects to it. Making it sustainable and truly participatory will take more time and attention.

Participatory?

Sector, community-level planning meetings have been held once a year for the past three years. Four were held last October. This is a tradition that should certainly be continued. In addition, the work done on CFUGs and GUGs is the essence of participatory management. This work should be incorporated into an overall park management participatory approach under the new management plan, when that is written.

Biodiversity management? The project document calls for biodiversity and natural resource management zones to be established; the project has still not identified areas within the Park and buffer zone of special biodiversity interest. This is a big gap, as a targeted management and monitoring program cannot very well begin until this has been done. This issue is addressed in detail under Output # 6.

The mid-term evaluation stressed the importance of an applied biodiversity research and data management program to support park management. Since then, TMI and HMG have strengthened the Park's program of applied research on biodiversity-related issues

by focussing on establishing the baseline of information required to support an active ecosystem (grasslands and forest) management program. No active management of these ecosystems has begun yet, but rather a great deal of work has been done to establish the baseline of information to support such a management program. The database structure is in place for the most part, but there is no integrated data management, monitoring and evaluation program.

MBNPCA regulations were recently changed, turning the conservation area into a buffer zone.

- **Output 2:** A sustainable grazing management system developed in consultation with local people which ensures biodiversity protection

⇒ Has the project created a sustainable grazing management system in consultation with local people that ensures biodiversity protection?

Sustainable? Once again, it is too early to adequately judge sustainability. This kind of judgement should be rendered by a Final evaluation 1-2 years after project implementation is finished. Early indications are that the project has not yet achieved sustainability for a grazing management partnership between the Park and GUGs.

Grazing management system? A “system” not established. A system is in the process of being established in this extraordinarily rugged and inaccessible landscape. The project wisely decided to focus first on establishing an information baseline on grasslands, grazing areas, domestic animals and grazing users themselves. Livestock inventories are being conducted in two sectors (one inventory was done in 1988, providing a good baseline for comparison) and 20 grazing areas have been identified along with 12 major transhumance grazing routes. A “Grazing Area Management Working Plan 1997-2000” was produced and a “Grazing Area Management Orientation Training Manual” produced and a translation of the GUG manual from English to Nepali is underway.

Several Karkha’s (pastures) are usually located together, forming a seasonal grazing area used by transhumance herders who bring their animals up from lower elevations to graze during the summer months. The project has surveyed and mapped these Karkha’s as the first step in managing them on a proactive, targeted basis. Policies on grazer compensation in exchange for not grazing have not been developed.

Local people? Three GUGs have been formed with local people and are operating in the key areas where grazing pressure is the highest. Five more are planned. Fodder grass nurseries and veterinary training provided to GUGs and park discussions with GUGs are ongoing in order to understand the traditional grasslands management system and build upon this indigenous knowledge in order to start weaving in biodiversity management criteria in addition to livestock and pasture management.

Biodiversity conservation ensured? MBNP’s fragile, high-altitude grasslands occur above 4,000 meters inside the Park. Occupying 15% of the park, they lie just below the 60% of the Park that is snow, rock and ice. Does the project’s work to date ensure biodiversity conservation in these grasslands? No. However, even in the scientific discipline of rangeland management, there is no agreement on what makes a reliable

indicator of biodiversity health in grasslands. There are some promising new conceptual tools and these should be reduced to their simplest elements in order to make a workable, participatory biodiversity management system for the Park's grasslands.

- **Output 3:** An effective and sustainable ecotourism programme that maximizes benefits to local people and minimizes negative environmental and cultural impacts.

⇒ Has the project produced and effective and sustainable ecotourism programme that maximizes benefits to local people and minimizes negative environmental and cultural impacts?

Effective and sustainable? This evaluator interprets “effective” to mean a tourism program that meets the objective of serving as a source of sustainable financing for MBNP and BZ management. “Sustainable” means that the program be capable of sustaining itself.

Currently, the tourism work conducted by TMI and HMG cannot be called sustainable. To be sure, much of the hard, physical work to improve tourism and the tourism experience in MBNP and BZ has been done. This evaluator believes that the project has excellent work under this output, having developed a significant amount of the basic infrastructure required to support and promote an effective, sustainable ecotourism presence in MBNP-BZ. The project has produced:

- Three tourism management plans for the popular destinations within the Park: Mt. Makalu (500 tourists/year) Base Camp; Mera Peak (700/year); and the Salpa-Arun trail.
- Significantly improved seven kilometers of Makalu Base Camp trail;
- Viewing tower on Mera Peak trail;
- Four shelter/rest houses along the trail, two camping sites, and three wooden bridges;
- Kerosene depot services (private) along the Mera Peak and Makalu trails to facilitate the use of kerosene in the buffer zone and Park.
- Porter association established
- One tourist information center at each of the two Park gateway villages;
- Trekking guides, maps, newsletters, advisories, and trekking routes published in Lonely Planet travel guide, to promote and manage tourism impact on the park.

Maximizes benefits?: Tourism information centers sell handicrafts produced by local craftspeople; kerosene depots are owned and operated by local merchants; a 400-member porter association helps porters make a fairer wage for their labor. Improved trails always benefit local people and all improvements were done using local contractors.

Minimizes negative impacts? This has been the purpose of the kerosene program – to minimize use of firewood by tourists and subsequent impact on forest resources. Tourism information, in all its forms produced by the project, stresses how to minimize impact on the Park's natural environment. Camping sites concentrate and minimize impacts associated with camping.

This evaluator finds the project's work to date on this output to be impressive and of high quality. It is also one of the more clearly written outputs in the whole project document

(the link between clear design language and effective implementation). The work has focussed on establishing the needed infrastructure to facilitate and manage tourism in Makalu-Barun.

Opportunities remaining:

- 1) Tourism strategy. The project has done an excellent job of building an infrastructure (management plans, information, and physical infrastructure) to support sustainable, low-impact tourism in MBNP-BZ. A tourism strategy for Makalu Barun should be developed. What does the Park need to be financially sustainable and how can Tourism specifically contribute to that need?
- 2) Conceive of and develop consensus for a tourism strategy for Makalu Barun. This evaluator thinks that MBNP could be developed as an exclusive, high-value tourism destination: the Bhutan of Nepal, so-to-speak. Why not develop a program in MBNP that brings in 100 tourists who spend US\$400/day rather than 10,000 tourists who spend \$4/day?
- 3) The project has made an excellent start and some good and necessary initial investments. The key now is to ensure that this continues. Ensure that the revenue recycling mechanisms are in place whereby the tourism management program is supported by tourism revenues.
- 4) New international projects are requiring co-financing. HMG should allow the Park to have access to 50% of the Makalu mountaineering revenues (estimated at US\$260,000/year) for an agreed upon number of years as a way of providing matching funds for park management and a long-term funding mechanism.
- 5) Mera peak visitation management is something that could be improved and make Mera peak an even more exciting destination. A loop could be made out of the Mera peak trek with a minimal \$50,000 investment.

- **Output 4:** An effective long-term management strategy for the two small settlement enclaves inside the Park boundaries.

⇒ Has the project produced an effective long-term management strategy for the two small settlement enclaves within the Park?

Once again, rather than developing a strategy or active program per say, the project has focussed on strengthening the infrastructure of these communities. To date, the Saisima enclave has received a new bridge, a water system, and a new Gumpa and requisite religious musical instruments. The Tragnag enclave, located on the Mera peak route, was recently almost wiped out by a flood and so project work has been set-back there, but similar infrastructure-oriented efforts were planned there as well.

In its 1998 annual report, the project claims that these improvements help the communities to better manage their natural resources. It is true that the good will engendered by the project has certainly made anti-poaching deputies out of the villagers. Apart from this (which is important) the link between a new water system and communities being better able to manage local biodiversity seems weak.

Need more holistic and targeted management plan that focuses on how the Park can most effectively work with these enclaves in minimizing the threats to biodiversity posed by

activities emanating from these enclaves (i.e. slash and burn). Now that good will has been engendered by the project in Saisima, for example, it is important to work with the communities to find alternatives to slash and burn practices now in use. High income tourism is one option here. More of an enabling partnership for local biodiversity management should be developed between the Park and villages like Saisima.

- **Output 5:** An effective conservation education program developed in consultation with the local people

⇒ Did the project develop an effective conservation education program?

No. However, once again the project has done a commendable amount of work, conducting myriad training programs, providing tens of scholarships, providing equipment and new roofs and toilets to schools throughout the Buffer zone. All of this was very much needed, no doubt about that. But once again, the project focussed on hardware-oriented work rather than spending time developing more enabling “software” (i.e. programs, and teaching materials, and so on).

- Local NGOs were enlisted in developing two-day camps for primary school children;
- a Makalu Barun board game was developed.
- Khembalung newsletter was established and has published 12 issues. The newsletter was distributed to schools and government offices.
- Natural history materials have been purchased and distributed. Curricula for teacher was produced and distributed to all schools in the buffer zone.
- 44 local people -- full scholarships for undergraduate programs in Nepal ranging from 10 months for teacher training to 2 years for a Forestry Degree.
- 33 local students -- partial scholarships for technical and vocational training ranging from three years for engineering to 15 months for community medical assistance?
- Local NGO provided advance literacy classes for 500 local people (3 or 6 months).

The investment highlighted above is worthwhile and can be used productively by the Park to support the sustainable management of biodiversity, especially the training in forestry and engineering. The Park is already getting a partial return on its investment in local capacity: one local young man received ranger training and is back in the MBNP-BZ working as a volunteer. Six local young women are enrolled in a two-year Ranger program at the Institute of Forestry. Upon completion of their degrees, they will provide four months of volunteer service to the Park, and will hopefully become DNPWC staff.

What makes this a program? In its current form, it is not a program. It has been somewhat ad-hoc, and not guided by a strategy designed to bring maximum support to the new Park. There is a seed for a promising program in all of these activities. The project has focussed recently on raising awareness of local people by identifying local customs, traditions and indigenous knowledge systems that support conservation and providing training opportunities to enable local people to be the long-term stewards of conservation.

Certainly many lives have been changed as a result. But while these efforts strengthen community capacity as a whole, they didn't directly support what the project is doing in a focussed way. The scholarship activity, for example, needs a cleaner, clearer focus on what its purpose is and how this can most effectively support the Park.

- **Output 6:** Generation and utilisation of information on critical biodiversity conservation areas, key indicator species, and ecosystem dynamics.

⇒ Did the project generate and utilize information on critical biodiversity conservation areas, key indicator species, and ecosystem dynamic?

This output is so poorly worded that it is difficult to evaluate. Yes, the project did generate and utilize information on biodiversity. Did it generate enough and information and sufficiently utilize it for management of biodiversity? No, it did not.

Generate information? Since the mid-term evaluation, the project has strengthened its work in specific biodiversity conservation-related activities. Database development work was re-oriented to focus more on supporting park management and biodiversity conservation activities. Biodiversity information was consolidated. The project has worked to develop baseline information on the key threats to biodiversity in the Park:

- More systematic inventories have been conducted.
- Slash and burn is one of those threats. Data has been collected on grazing areas and slash and burn plots and the information put in a format that will enhance the scientific management of the MBNP-BZ. 146 slash and burn clearings have been registered and mapped for half of the Park and a report produced. Some species-specific/habitat information is in the database, but there is much progress to be made.
- Flagship species habitat data mapped for snow leopard, Himalayan tar, and red panda.
- Reports have been produced on NTFPs (Bamboo, medicinal plants) as well as a list of endangered and endemic plants in Makalu Barun.
- Over 15 vegetation and habitat maps have been produced. Some updated maps have been produced on specific forest localities within the MBNP-BZ.
- A database on all 78 CF boundaries and CFUG and membership has been established using Dutch co-funding. TMI has strengthened this since the mid-term evaluation.
- A natural history field guide and training manual is under preparation.

Utilize? Before staff can utilize the information, they must be trained in how to utilize it. The project has trained 50 staff in improved techniques to monitor and assess community forest standing timber stock using a relascope. Staff have also been trained in delineating the community forest boundaries using GPS.

Sustainability questions are uppermost here. Will HMG management ever be able to afford satellite photos and/or aerial photos? Can they keep the skill around to do this? How can one best combine high tech and low-tech methods? Is it possible to make it participatory by getting local people to monitor the area using aerial photos?

Information should be gathered in a comprehensive way based upon the management objectives: If management is going to remove the root causes of the major threats to the Park's biodiversity resources, then the monitoring program will need to be designed to get the information on the threats, the root causes, and so on. Additionally, the project needs to identify (as recommended in the Mid-term Evaluation) special areas of biodiversity interest, both within the buffer zone and the Park, in order to help focus the work. Need Specific technical expertise is needed to help the component in doing this.

TMI, using non-GEF funds, conducted a people-wildlife study on people and bears. Bear attacks in certain parts of the park are a problem and future work should be conducted on how to minimize this problem: perhaps a victim compensation fund?

A Nepali student's PhD study on human impacts on forest ecosystems in MBNP's upper Hinku and Hongu rivers should be included in the Park's information base and referenced by people working to find alternative to slash and burn.

- **Output 7:** Appropriate field equipment and supporting facilities for MBNPCA management

⇒ Has the project provided appropriate field equipment and supporting facilities for MBNPA management? For the most part, yes.

Exerting impressive effort in such remote, inaccessible terrain, the project built supporting facilities for park management and provided the necessary field equipment:

- One headquarter building and four sector offices have been remodeled or constructed.
- Three of offices are solar powered and all four have had radio communication equipment installed.
- A significant amount of basic field equipment has also been purchased (tents, sleeping bags, etc...). Binoculars, bear immobilization drugs, collars, and stuff are all there. Thirty-three laptop computers were purchased by the project.
- The Khadbari also has a remote radio telephone base that provides telephone service to HQ in Sedua.
- Vehicle provided to DNPWC.

Although plans have been made for ranger stations, none will be built under this project. Ranger stations could play a valuable role in the high traffic areas of the Park.

Once again, the project did a good job of providing hardware, but the software (an equipment plan for the Park) wasn't developed prior to the supply effort, and HMG/TMI have realized that some purchases (the laptops) perhaps didn't support the Park directly as much as originally intended.

- **Output 8:** Increased human capacity for managing the conservation of biodiversity with the involvement of local people

⇒ Has the project increased human capacity for managing the conservation of biodiversity with the involvement of local people?

Yes, the project has certainly put a great deal of effort and resources into capacity building under this project. Capacity has been increased. How has it been increased specifically? This evaluator found no specific answers to that question. How has the training provided/how will the training provided benefit MBNP-BZ? Certain, staff receiving training at Pokhara, and through other short-term training programs around Nepal are required to give back to the Park in the form of two months of volunteer work for each year of training. Additionally, it is the very important for the staff who are receiving training to somehow be kept working at MBNP-BZ. They represent a real investment on the part of the international community in MBNP-BZ and everything should be done to keep them there after hand-over to Government.

Under this component, local people at the Park level were given many different opportunities for short and long-term training. Staff also received training and this training is summarized under this component:

- 11 rangers received BS scholarships at Nepal's Institute of Forestry
- 2 Game scouts got scholarships for training in engineering
- 1 Junior Technical Advisor got a scholarship for applied technology course.
- In addition, approximately 75 DNPWC and project staff have received short-term training on issues ranging from the ZOP approach to First Aid, to GPS applications.

Int'l training/study tours/travel:

- 2 DNPWC officers given MS scholarships for study in USA. NOTE: They have completed their study and have refused to return to Nepal with their newly developed skills to benefit the MBNP effort, in violation of their agreement under the project.
- One officer attended a culture exchange program in West Virginia
- Two staff underwent two weeks of "training management" in Thailand at the Asian Institute of Technology
- 6 week women's north-south study tour in Europe
- 5 staff for 10 days to Agha Khan Rural Support program in Pakistan
- 4 staff to Tibet for talks on transboundary conservation collaboration.
- At least 15 foreign trips (study tours, presentations, conferences, etc..) were taken by Government staff under this component budget.

Was there a capacity building strategy or a program for MBNP-BZ? No, not quite. It was more what could be described as being somewhat ad-hoc. This is a lesson that has been learned under this particular output.

How has the capacity increased? In general, of course "capacity" has been increased, but not in a measurable way – not as part of a capacity building framework or strategy.

Overshadowing the modest gains is one high-profile failure. The project funded masters scholarships in the USA for two young, promising DNPWC staff. The two students have remained in the USA and refused to return to Nepal to honor their commitments. This is disturbing waste of international taxpayer money and proof why UNDP or GEF does not fund these scholarships any longer.

Regarding the capacity that has been built under this component, this evaluator wonders, How can we work with it in the future? Where is this investment now and how can it benefit MBNP-BZ? Where are the people and what obligation do they have to the Park?

Training programs have for too long lacked any kind of grading program or evaluation component. This is a requirement now. Study tours are de-emphasized and if they are allowed, must be directly related to what the project is trying to accomplish, with the participants providing some substantial feedback of information gained from the trip to further goals of the project.

This evaluator recommends that a basic assessment be carried out by TMI and HMG as to just how the capacity has been built and what can be done between now and the end of project implementation to secure as much of that capacity for future work at MBNP-BZ.

- **Output 9:** Documentation and dissemination of information on new strategies for biodiversity conservation

⇒ Has the project documented and disseminated any information on new strategies for biodiversity conservation?

Yes, partly. The project has documented and disseminated a great deal of information. Presentations have been made by staff to international fora on the database design and preliminary results of data management efforts. Very little of the information specifically covers “new strategies for biodiversity conservation.” But much of it relates to developing new approaches to grazing management, and developing new approaches to CF management.

The project has produced:

- 30 project reports
- a seven volume community natural resource management series
- a series of brochures, publications, and maps on eco-tourism at MBNP-BZ
- a natural history field guide is under preparation

The project will make this information (over 8,000 pages) available on CD ROM.

But again, these reports have, up until now, been produced in somewhat of a haphazard way and as a result have had far less impact than they could have had they been produced in a more targeted manner. Currently, the information is not consolidated so it’s useable and it makes sense. This evaluator recommends that TMI spend some time doing this as part of its CD ROM production effort. Perhaps a student can be recruited to help consolidate the information and organize it into a MBNP-BZ information library of sorts, with chapters and highlighted studies and experiences.

There are some new approaches that have been tried under this project and they should not disappear into a pile of un-marked, un-bound reports.

B. Relevance

Relevance is the degree to which the objectives of the project remain valid and pertinent as originally planned or as subsequently modified. This evaluator finds that the MBNP-BZ component’s work is more relevant to Nepal (both at the village and national level) than it was at the beginning of project implementation. Of course, given the global

significance of the biological diversity occurring in Makalu Barun, the component is still quite relevant to the global community.

Relevance to local communities:

After five years of project implementation, the project is more relevant than ever to its primary target groups, as identified in the project document: people living in and around MBNP-BZ and the staff of the DPNWC. During the past five years, this project, as well as another project implemented by TMI and funded by the Dutch Government, has become even more involved in the lives of the people than ever.

A visit to the project area will quickly press this fact upon this evaluator. It is possible to stand on a mountain ridge in the buffer zone of the Makalu Barun and look out across the valleys and down the mountainsides and see the physical evidence of the project's relevance to the communities in the buffer zone: bridges, school buildings, roofing, Gompas, water systems, community forest user groups. It is not uncommon to walk down the trail in the buffer zone and meet someone who has benefited in some way from project activities – training, alternative livelihoods, trail improvement. The sustainability of this impact is a question considered under the “Success” sub-heading.

HMG and TMI have worked hard under this component to understand the needs and constraints of the local communities with respect to their gender, socio-economic status, and geographical location.

Relevance to GEF's Mission:

GEF's overall objective under its Biodiversity program is the conservation and sustainable utilization of globally significant biological resources. Makalu Barun is widely recognized to harbor globally significant biodiversity. From this perspective the area is unquestionably relevant to GEF.

During the past six years, this component has certainly spent more effort and funds on building the foundation with local communities in the buffer zone necessary to achieve the sustainable utilization of biodiversity in the Park. More emphasis has been placed on the D in Integrated Conservation and Development (ICDP). However, the project has made significant progress during the last two years in strengthening biodiversity conservation in the Park and buffer zone (the C in ICDP). Note: this topic discussed in detail under outputs above.

The Makalu Barun component is particularly relevant to UNDP's mission to promote Sustainable Human Development (SHD) by assisting countries in building their capacities in UNDP's four focus areas:

- Poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods
- Gender considerations in development
- Sustainable environment and sound management of natural resources
- Sound governance

UNDP's experience with these components gives it a comparative advantage vis-à-vis other UN agencies in supporting a project component like Makalu Barun.

E. Performance

UNDP uses three criteria for evaluating performance: effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is defined as the extent to which the project has achieved its immediate objectives and produced its promised outputs and outcomes.

The immediate objective of this component is: *“To protect the biodiversity of the MBNP-CA... through a management approach which recognizes the interdependence of development and biodiversity conservation, and which provides a model for replication inside and outside of Nepal.”*

The manner in which this immediate objective is written is not conducive to evaluating easily. Biodiversity is never fully protected – it is an ongoing effort that is never done. The same critique can be made of the project document as a whole – poorly written and not conducive to clear and efficient implementation or evaluation. Despite these design problems, the project is responsible for establishing on-the-ground protection staff, facilities, and programs for biodiversity in the MBNP-BZ and the management approach clearly recognizes the “interdependence of development and biodiversity conservation.”

This evaluator rates the effectiveness of this component at “Good – Very Good,” especially if the difficulties of working in such a rugged, remote and inaccessible area are factored in (a remoteness allowance so-to-speak).

UNDP staff, having developed a specialization in these kinds of projects, provided constructive and helpful input in assisting HMG/TMI in re-orienting activities to be more sustainable and more oriented towards biodiversity conservation.

HMG/TMI reported on a systematic basis (PPERs, Quarterly reports, and Annual Workplans). During the last three years of the project, the responsible UNDP staff person visited the Makalu Barun project area every eight months -- a respectable number, but this could be improved. It was unclear how frequent these visits were during the first three years.

For the last three years of the project, UNDP had a good team in place monitoring this project. This helped to improve the effectiveness (both members, however, have moved on and it is hoped that the same kind of team can be recruited again). Depending upon the skill base of the new team, UNDP should consider how it might strengthen its monitoring capabilities in the biodiversity-specific activities (especially as more UNDP-GEF projects are submitted and approved for Nepal). If needed, this could take the form of UNDP asking a “neutral,” biodiversity expert based in Nepal to review their biodiversity conservation related actions of its biodiversity projects. This should be done on a less formal level than a mid-term evaluation and should be done bi-annually.

Project effectiveness was hampered by the turnover in project staff as well, both at TMI (3 project managers) and within Government at various levels.

Efficiency

Project efficiency has been adequate. It appears to have been lacking during the first two years of the project, but increased markedly since as UNDP, DNPWC, and TMI gathered more experience working together, especially during the past 2.5 years. It appears that it improved with the move of project management people to Khanbari and into the Park itself, as the mid-term evaluation recommended. Disbursements are approaching 90%, with five months of implementation remaining.

Day-to-day management of this component has been conducted in a competent, professional manner. HMG and UNDP chose well when they selected TMI to be subcontracted by the project (based upon a 12 year management agreement with DNPWC) to implement this component. There is consensus from both written reports and interviews that this arrangement has worked well for Makalu Barun.

Efficiency was fairly good overall, but suffered slightly from two administrative-related problems (now solved): uncertainty at UNDP about how to administer private sub-contractors and the fact that UNDP-HQ was revising NEX guidelines and procedures, which added some confusion to the situation in Nepal. These issues have been sorted out.

Intra-project communication should avoid bottlenecks. Communication should be open and transparent; memos should be copied to all concerned, rather than relying on one focal point to distribute communications to others. On one occasion as the result of a bottleneck, TMI was not informed of a budget revision a number of months. This hampers efficiency and effectiveness.

Timeliness

The whole project was delayed for two years prior to beginning of implementation. Once begun, however, the project was implemented in a relatively timely manner.

F. Success

UNDP uses three criteria to measure a project's success: impact, sustainability, and contribution to capacity development. The project will be completed by the end of July 1999. Given that this is the terminal evaluation (held at the end of the project rather than 1-2 years after completion), the assessment of project success will focus on early signs of impact and sustainability of results, including a contribution to capacity development.

Of course, the success of this implementation arrangement is also significantly dependent upon how successful the hand-over period is. It is hoped that HMG and TMI are able to collaborate well and make the hand-over as "seamless" as possible. More specifically, This evaluator defines a successful hand-over period as the following:

- TMI and HMG develop a new collaboration agreement based upon the new relationship between the two in the Makalu-Barun area and to further institutionalize park management and buffer zone management
- TMI to ensure that baseline monitoring information collected in the initial GEF phase are input into systems that are accessible and can be regularly upgraded. (There is a lot of loose information that needs to be organized and put under one umbrella. Once this is done, the quality of data can also be refined);

- Building on project investments, HMG recruits and posts 75% of the 63 approved staff positions by the 16th of July 1999 (approximately 45 persons in place by July, including one Chief Warden).
- HMG retains at least 25% of the higher project-trained staff (Warden to Ranger level), building on staff investments.
- HMG is able to keep on all the women hired by the project in their current positions
- HMG hand over all CF for community management ASAP in ways that are consistent with CF hand over procedures already completed during the project phase;
- TMI to advise HMG on Buffer Zone regulations and preparation of management plans using operational units consistent with the units and zones used during the GEF project. The idea here is to build on the work of the last 5 years, not start with new management units under the Buffer zone law.
- HMG make a firm written commitment that Army will not be posted to MBNPBZ.

If the hand-over period is successful, this evaluator would judge the implementation arrangements to have yielded a product worthy of a phase II GEF-supported effort. Although the effort is not at the “model” level yet, continued positive developments could make the approach taken with Makalu-Barun a model for other unique mountain parks.

Impact

Impact represents changes in a situation, planned or unplanned, positive or negative, that a project brings about.

The mid-term evaluation asked a very pertinent question with regards to impact of this component: *“What has been the impact of this project on the biodiversity of MBNP-BZ to date? What will be the impact of this project on the biodiversity of MBNP-BZ at the END of the project? And, how will we know?”*

It is difficult to assess the full impact of a project until at least a year or two after the completion of the project –even longer when it comes to assessing impact on biodiversity. However, there are some secondary indicators of the kind of impact the project is having on the conservation of biodiversity in the MBNP-BZ.

To measure impact, one must have a baseline to compare against. The project is now much closer after the mid-term evaluation, to having a real baseline of information from which to monitor impacts in the future.

- 1) The project has established the park management system and enabled rangers to be in the field, conducting joint patrols with communities;
- 2) Effectiveness of joint community-park patrols in the last year: Four illegal actions were detected and stopped by joint community-park patrols: an unauthorized scientific expedition collecting plant material; an organized gang poaching river otters; organized Tibetan group poaching musk deer; Four wildlife poachers.
- 3) Designated campsites on trek routes have stopped the opening of new sites and contained the impact on the surrounding areas. Old sites are re-generating.

- 4) More than 40% increase in forest area under community management, resulting in a shift from a forest property regime that was virtually open access to a common-property situation, with community members themselves enforcing forest use rules.
- 5) CFUG members who have been trained in forest thinning and cutting are getting more yield, reducing the impact on overall CFs and retaining a healthier forest understory.
- 6) Establishment of GUGs represents first step towards community management of biodiversity and demonstrating positive impact on grassland diversity.

This evaluator recommends that TMI do some creative thinking to develop a simple approach to monitor impact of project activities on biodiversity (changes in attitude/levels of support from local communities due to increased revenues from tourism; changes in community forest health; and so on) during the remaining four months of the project.

Sustainability

- 1) There has still been no sustainability analysis of what will be required to sustain crucial project-inspired programs and activities. This should be done.
- 2) The sustainability of this effort will be determined in large part by the success of the hand-over from TMI/HMG project-supported management phase to “normal” HMG management.
- 3) The project document did not consider sustainability issues sufficiently and as a result, this component dedicated very little effort to the development of real sustainability for MBNP-BZ. This would require another phase with specifically designed outputs and activities for this purpose.
- 4) During the past three years, the DNPWC’s Director General post has changed hands five times. This fact presents an opportunity for UNDP and DNPWC to discuss how international taxpayer funds can be most effectively utilized to build sustainability into their future joint initiatives.
- 5) There have been three Chief Wardens in the past three years. This rate of turnover also points-out the difficulty of keeping senior level people in a remote place like MBNP. This evaluator recommends that this issue be addressed by DNPWC/UNDP during preparation of a next phase project.

Capacity Building

To what extent has the project enabled target groups to be self-reliant and to make it possible for stakeholder groups to utilize positive project-related experiences in order to continue their work in sustainable development and conservation? Certainly, there is a tremendous amount of good will among the buffer zone communities toward the Park itself, and this is crucial to building a sustainable, participatory management regime.

During the past two years, the component has done a great deal of work in building community-level capacity, through the strengthening of CFUGs, GUGs, adult education and training programs. If HMG can hand-over legal title to remaining CFUGs in the time remaining under the project, this will be a notable achievement and something that a future project could build upon.

TMI and DNPWC have created the basis for HMG to take over the Park. Park infrastructure and offices have been constructed in the field. The component has also

generated a lot of information that can be used for park management. HMG is committed to sustaining park management in MBNP, albeit at a reduced programmatic level.

II. Lessons learned about project design, implementation, management.

- Poorly written project documents lead to confusion and ambiguity during project implementation. This project is a case study in how not to write a project document. This evaluator states this in all seriousness and with the intent of engendering a double-loop learning process. We must recognize good and bad examples in order to really learn and improve project development and implementation.
- This project document tried to do too much in too little time.
- Developing programmes that are self-sustaining requires well designed, focused work. It is one thing to establish a management system. It is quite another to establish a participatory, sustainable management system. HMG/UNDP Parks and People project is gaining valuable experience in building-in sustainability to helping people in buffer zones develop sustainable, alternative livelihoods.
- Biodiversity impact: For example future projects must be realistic about how much baseline information is required, and the effort required to gather it, in order to manage for and measure biodiversity impact. Future projects must be more specific about what biodiversity impact they are promising and how this will be measured.
- Management of mountain parks will require a different approach from what is used in the lower elevation Terrai parks due to the remoteness, different cultural milieu, and the inaccessibility. As a mountain park, MBNP-BZ provides an opportunity for HMG to test some new “localized” management approaches like increasing the cultural diversity of their warden staff and building the capacity of local, lower-level staff.
- It is all too easy for projects to become overly focussed on providing “hardware” (buildings, trails), especially when the need is great. But effective biodiversity work requires high quality “software” (information baselines, indicators, target impacts).
- Co-management can work as long as management authority (roles and responsibilities) have specific guidelines. Specific lessons learned: Finance requires one, sole responsible entity in-charge. Daily management/implementation works well through NEX guidelines. Programme management/planning works well and indeed was crucial under this component.
- The work done in MBNP-BZ on CFUGs and GUGs is holds promise for building a sustainable, participatory park management structure. This work should be officially incorporated into an overall park management participatory approach when the existing management plan is revised.
- Sustainability: It is recognized that UNDP played an important role after the mid-term in re-orienting this component’s activities to strengthen their sustainability. It is

hoped that this UNDP strength will not be lost with the transfer of key staff. It should be institutionalized somehow.

Sustainability: Any future investment in tourism as a long-term funding mechanism for the Park (new trails and other infrastructure) needs to be tied to a commitment to dedicate a substantial portion of the resulting tourism revenues as long-term funding for the Park. This connection has not been altogether made yet under the project.

Effective capacity building (training) requires guidance from a strategic framework/program and a built-in continuous evaluation component.

III. Recommendation for follow-up activities

- ❖ HMG and TMI should conduct some creative assessments during the next four months of the project to gauge impact of project activities on biodiversity: changes in attitude/levels of support from local communities due to increased revenues from tourism; changes in community forest health; and so on.
- ❖ The project has invested a significant amount of international taxpayer resources into local staff training. Every effort should be made during the hand-over period to keep this investment (these staff) working at the local level in MBNP-BZ.
- ❖ Currently, the component-produced reports and information are not consolidated so it's useable and it makes sense to an outsider. This evaluator recommends that TMI spend some time doing this as part of its CD ROM production effort. Perhaps a student can be recruited to work with TMI and HMG to consolidate the information and organize it into a MBNP-BZ information library of sorts, with chapters and highlighted studies and experiences.
- ❖ There are some promising new conceptual tools for developing biodiversity health indicators for grasslands. These should be reduced to their simplest elements in order to make a workable, participatory biodiversity management system for the Park's grasslands
- ❖ Ensure that the revenue re-cycling mechanisms are in place whereby the tourism management program is supported by tourism revenues. Why not allow the Park to have access to 50% of the Makalu mountaineering revenues (approx. US\$260,000/year) for an agreed upon number of years as a way of providing matching funds for park management and a long-term funding mechanism?
- ❖ In the opinion of this evaluator, the work conducted at MBNP-BZ warrants a second phase of targeted, GEF co-financing. A significant investment has been made in this Park, and now there is a real opportunity to follow it up with a project focussed on making the project-inspired programs sustainable within the HMG context, proving real biodiversity impact, and further expanding and testing a participatory management approach through the integration of CFUGs, GUGs, and so on.

- ❖ The Experience gained in managing these biodiversity-related projects should be kept – perhaps by bringing the previous staff back for two weeks to train in their replacements, once they are found.

Component 3: Enhancement of National Capacity

II. Project Results

Note: This component comprises 10% of the overall project budget.

A. Immediate Objective and Outputs

Immediate Objective: To enhance Nepal’s national capacity to protect, manage and enhance its unique biodiversity through institutional support and the building of greater collaboration and consensus on biodiversity protection needs.

Under this objective there are three outputs. They are listed below. The project document calls for the King Mahendra Trust to implement this component, but after the project was approved, implementation responsibilities under this component were also given to the DNPWC.

Output 1 was split into two parts for purposes of implementation:

1. KMTNC was given a sub-contract for implementing a training program designed to reach over 800 staff from DNPWC from throughout Nepal.
2. Some activities (3.1.7 – 3.1.9) were given to DNPWC to implement with UNOPS on international procurement. In addition, WITHOUT a specific activity in the project document, some informal in-service training was included here as well.

Neither one of the two implementors under this Immediate objective seem to have been responsible for Output 3.

Output 1: Adequately trained and equipped field management staff in the DNPWC

⇒ Did the project adequately train and equip field management staff in the DNPWC?

This is a difficult question to answer because of the lack of specificity. The success criterion was about volume – 700 staff trained.

KMTNC’s was subcontracted by the component to train the 700 staff of DNPWC, (Park officers and game scouts, Park army officers) and two groups of non-governmental stakeholders (hotel owners, nature guides) from buffer zone: the staff in community participation and wildlife management and the private people in environmentally friendly development and guiding skills respectively.

From March 1995 up to this date, 576 staff and others have participated in project-sponsored, KMTNC training, most of them for two weeks. The remaining 124 staff are scheduled to participate in training during the remaining course of 1999. Quantity targets seem to have been met. The project document does not include quality indicators and this question was not considered in advance when the project budget lines were established.

While KMTNC appears to be on track to meet the original project document's success criterion of 700 staff trained. However, the quality of the training is something that still needs to be improved (this was identified as a need by the mid-term evaluation). To be sure, KMTNC did implement some changes to the training program with UNDP's help based upon the recommendations of the mid-term, but what really needs to happen is for KMTNC to recruit an individual with world-class credentials in natural resource management/ biodiversity training. Training is a skill, even if a person is an expert in a topic, that does not mean that this person necessarily knows how to train people. Even experts need training in order to be good trainers. No independent evaluation of the training's efficacy has been done. There was no funding provided for such an evaluation.

DNPWC's Equipment and Capacity Building:

This evaluator notes that still now at the time of the Terminal evaluation there is no formal output or re-organization of activities to accommodate this DNPWC work. Still no specific activity or formal output! Without this, there is no baseline of "promised output or activities" for this evaluator to consider. The result of this lack of formal direction is a well intentioned with some bright spots, but ad-hoc.

Since the mid-term evaluation, DNPWC has done some promising work under this section of the component. The following documents/outputs have been produced by DNPWC during the past year and a half:

- Capacity Building of the DNPWC: A Strategy Paper
- Concept Paper on Research Policy
- Concept Paper on Education Strategy
- Concept Paper for Establishment of the Research and Training Centre for Protected Areas (RTCPA) at Royal Bardia National Park.

There are many laudable objectives in "Capacity Building of the DNPWC: A Strategy Paper" and the DNPWC should be commended for preparing such a document. This evaluator would like to see much more of this kind of in-house effort. But what DNPWC could still use is a DNPWC-wide training needs assessment. From this a formal training program could be implemented. Instead the following list of activities have been implemented:

- RTCPA established (existing buildings in Bardia National Park were re-modeled)
- International grassland workshop was conducted using RTCPA facilities
- Previous Director General attended wildlife conservation seminar in India
- Current Director General attended CBD meeting on Biosafety in Cartagena, Colombia and then traveled to Washington, D.C. for meetings with WWF
- 10 participants made a study tour of Agha Khan Rural Support Program in Pakistan
- Langtang National Park management plan workshop, draft plan produced.
- Partial support for a Warden conference at Parsa Wildlife Reserve

- Planned documentary film on 25 years of rhino conservation
- Printed material
- Training for various staff in GIS and other skills.
- 13 New Computers purchased for DNPWC headquarters

Output 2: Greater consensus and collaboration within the traditional conservation management sector and between the private and public sectors for biodiversity conservation

⇒ Did the project achieve greater consensus and collaboration within the conservation management sector and between the private and public biodiversity sectors?

The mid-term evaluation noted that there had been no progress on this output specifically. The answer to this question is hard to discern, given that no specific activities were conducted to try and produce this output. As a result this evaluator notes that there is still no progress on this output specifically. The representatives of the private and public sectors in this project (DNPWC, KMTNC, RN) do not seem to have developed greater consensus and collaboration as a result of this project's efforts.

In addition, this output has been changed without a formal project document revision to: "Promote Conservation" (Work Plan for 1999). This change was done in a transparent manner, with the approval of all parties. But changing an approved project document needs to be made more formally. "Promoting conservation" is a very different output from "achieving greater consensus and collaboration between public and private sectors for biodiversity conservation."

Output 3: Greater political support for conservation activities in Nepal

⇒ Did the project generate greater political support for conservation activities in Nepal?

The mid-term evaluation noted no progress at that time with respect to this output. This terminal evaluation notes the same situation. No specific activities have been conducted to produce this output. The mid-term evaluation recommended that this output be formally transferred under Immediate Objective 1, but this was not done.

Creating greater political support for biodiversity conservation is important – critical – to raising the profile of the link between sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. These activities are crucial to maximizing the level of acceptance of the NBAP (if and when it is ultimately completed and endorsed).

B. Relevance

Relevance is the degree to which the objectives of the project remain valid and pertinent as originally planned or as subsequently modified owing to changing circumstances within the immediate context and external environment of the project.

Capacity building is still highly relevant to conservation and sustainable development in Nepal. In fact, the development of a solid training program based upon a comprehensive

needs assessment and rooted in the Nepali context is needed more than ever. As was pointed out under the mid-term evaluation, this project has missed the opportunity to develop and implement such a training program.

There were problems with the relevance of the training conducted by KMTNC to the training needs of DNPWC staff. Collaboration among KMTNC, DNPWC, and others could have more effectively ensured the relevance of the training provided to the training needs of stakeholders (DNPWC staff, local hoteliers). This understanding is developed through good communication – good questions and thoughtful answers – and is crucial to developing a solid and effective training program.

The two outputs that received no attention at all from the project are especially relevant and important to developing a strong biodiversity conservation effort in Nepal.

C. Performance

UNDP uses three criteria for evaluating performance: effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness.

Effectiveness

This evaluator uses a scale of Unsatisfactory – Satisfactory – Good – Very Good

Effectiveness is defined as the extent to which the project has achieved its immediate objectives and produced its promised outputs. An effectiveness rating of “Satisfactory” is given on the scale described above.

The project document’s shortcomings are apparent in this component as well. Because no adequate and/or specific management arrangements were given in the project document for managing all of the different components, the project’s effectiveness suffered. Management of DNPWC work also suffered as a result under this component until UNDP hired a project officer last Spring to coordinate all project activities as well as those of this component. Management improved after this, but this has partially involved the management of work that was not sanctioned by the project document.

The workplans produced by DNPWC, while thorough and well prepared, change the wording of Output 2 under this component from achieving greater consensus and collaboration within government and between government and NGOs to promoting biodiversity conservation. From a project management and evaluation perspective, this is not acceptable without a formal process of re-writing and re-approving the revised project document. The result is a whole list of activities being planned and budgeted which were never called for under the original project document.

Efficiency. How optimally did the project transform inputs into outputs?

The efficiency of this output is mixed. The amount of money dedicated to this component is small – 10% of the overall budget. An efficiency rating of “Satisfactory” is given.

KMTNC’s training sub-component did indeed build a building, but there was much emphasis on the building (rather than the training) and there were problems with the

provision of matching funds from KMTNC. These problems have been solved, but that took time, harming efficiency. The quality of training was sub-standard (by basic international standards) and could have been better. To be sure, there were budget constraints placed upon KMTNC that precluded them from hiring the level of expertise that they had wanted. Sometimes, efficiency suffers because not enough funding was provided to adequately undertake the task at hand. This could have been the situation here.

As for the DNPWC Institution Building sub-component, comprised of activities and outputs that were never part of the original project document, the efficiency was minimal. Budget revisions were made by UNDP to try and improve efficiency, but these changes could not ameliorate the influence of the project document design.

Timeliness

KMTNC has produced its volume output of trained staff in a timely manner. The quality not quantity issues has already been addressed.

DNPWC has expressed concern with significant delays caused by ineffective communication between DNPWC and UNDP. UNDP maintained a continuous monitoring presence with this component. In the opinion of this evaluator, much of this can be attributed to the lack of workable implementation arrangements in the original project document. Even so, to minimize these kind of difficulties, DNPWC and UNDP should have a very specific agreement on communication, monitoring and support procedures and there should be a follow-up procedure that is followed so that problems are solved and things move on.

D. Success

Impact

Impact represents changes in a situation, planned or unplanned, positive or negative, that a project brings about. The impact of this component's activities is difficult to measure, but is minimal – a rating of “Satisfactory” is given based on the scale described above.

Certainly 576 people were trained by KMTNC at the project funded training center. While this training was criticized for quality and other (daily allowance) reasons, the training was indeed provided and the people who received the training almost certainly learned some new, useful skills and information.

However, the long-term impact of this activity is blunted by the fact that the project is currently funding a second competing training facility under this component, diminishing the impact of both. The KMTNC training facility was intended to be the training facility for Nepal's wildlife and park needs, according to the project document and DNPWC's own written statements (project document Annex 6). DNPWC's development of a training center in addition to the KMTNC's Chitwan complex, has reduced the impact and value of the Chitwan center as it was originally envisioned in the project document.

This evaluator recognizes that now, six years later, this new training center may well be a reasonable idea, but wonders why KMTNC and DNPWC could not discuss how to improve the training program being given at Chitwan and successfully work together in

order to meet all of the needs of DNPWC through this training center? In addition, this evaluator sees no evidence of recent discussions having been held between the two parties to discuss how these two training centers can be complementary to one another. This should be done. This lack of effective communication and lack of an inclination to cooperate and come to mutual understandings on the part of various actors are issues that have appeared to this evaluator throughout the evaluation.

This evaluator wonders what the impact is of having a senior staff person from DNPWC attend a CBD meeting held on Biosafety. Biosafety is about how to best manage the international trade of genetically-altered organisms (crops and livestock).

The mid-term evaluation gave a “no impact” rating to this component. It is recognized that since the mid-term evaluation, UNDP has worked with DNPWC to establish more of a strategic framework for the capacity building activities under this component and re-work the budget to focus resources on more strategic activities. This has certainly improved the overall impact of activities here.

This evaluator raises the impact rating to “Satisfactory,” but notes that this is still low on the scale and there is a good deal of room for learning from this experience and subsequent improvement in the future.

Sustainability

This component’s activities are not sustainable in a self-supporting way and could not continue in the absence of project funding. There have been some infrastructure improvements and equipment upgrades that have increased capacity. DNPWC is hoping to be able to sustain its 2nd training center with user fees, but this evaluator saw no analysis showing this to be actually feasible.

Capacity Building

UNDP considers capacity development to have four dimensions: individual learning, organizations, organizational inter-relationships and enabling environment.

This component has perhaps enabled Park game scouts, offices and army officials to carry out their jobs with more skill and awareness. Training programs were held for nearly 600 people and so some knowledge was transferred. But what knowledge and how much is difficult to know because the project made no provisions for evaluation of training results, something that was not common six years ago when the project was written.

This evaluator believes, however, that the results of this component have not enabled target groups to be self-reliant. Government institutions and the private sector (KMTNC) will hopefully be able to utilize some positive project-related experiences in order to continue their work in sustainable development and conservation. But there is no way for this evaluator to adequately judge how much capacity has been built here.

II. Lessons learned about project design, implementation, management.

- ❖ This implementation of this component started out wrong from the beginning. If HMG was to be given an implementation role under this component, UNDP should have moved

to revise the project document to develop some specific activities and outputs to guide this effort. Or, at least some specific activities and both outputs should have been officially designated DNPWC's responsibility.

- ❖ The Immediate Objective should have been worded more specifically with a specific, meaningful indicators of success. The same is true for the Outputs themselves, although the three under this objective are some of the better phrased in the document.
- ❖ If training is worth doing, it is worth doing properly. Budgets need to be carefully prepared to be sure that there are enough funds budgeted for the task required. In this component, there were complaints of lack of sufficient allocated funds under the project document to the training activity.
- ❖ UNDP's monitoring of this component was persistent, proactive, and in the opinion of this evaluator, helpful in making a difficult implementation situation better. There is always room for improvement. Perhaps monitoring of this component could have been more quality control-oriented.
- ❖ Capacity building, in order to be measurably successful, needs to stem from a clear and specific needs assessment that is related to a specific, overall objective.
- ❖ While DNPWC may have good justification to use the very nice facilities in Bardia for the training center for DNPWC, it is a pity that over US\$ 50,000 has been spent on a training center in Chitwan. The lesson: ensure buy-in from both parties through a specific, comprehensive agreement before agreeing to invest in one's infrastructure for the benefit of another.

III. Recommendation for follow-up activities

- ❖ Both implementing parties should conduct an assessment, in the time remaining, of how much capacity has been built and how institutions have been strengthened. Perhaps a KMTNC staff person could interview former trainees, seeking feedback and input to a "lessons learned" paper.
- ❖ A discussion should be held among DNPWC, UNDP, and KMTNC and agreement reached regarding how best to develop a complementary approach to utilizing the two training centers.
- ❖ Donor coordination needs to improve to avoid exceeding absorptive capacity.
- ❖ The GIS database produced under Component 1 represents a real opportunity for DNPWC to build its capacity for biodiversity monitoring and informed management.
- ❖ The change in Output #3.2 as evidenced by the 1999 workplan changes the course of the original project document. UNDP should: 1) either work with HMG to officially sanction this change and revise the document, or 2) steer the Output to its original wording.

Annex 1: Itinerary for the Evaluation Mission

Duration: Three Weeks (17 March-6 April 1999)

Evaluation Team: Mr. Jeffery Griffin (Team Leader)

Mr. Govinda Kandel (Representative of MoFSC)

Wednesday, 17 March 1999		Arrival/ Accommodation at Himalaya Hotel
Thursday, 18 March 1999	09:00-11:00hrs	Meeting with DRR,PO at UNDP office.
Thursday, 18 March 1999	11:00-11:45	Meeting with RR
	12:00-13:00hrs	Meeting with Mr.Narayan Poudyal (Ecologist) National Project Co-ordinator, Mr. Shyam Bajimaya, Programme Officer at DNPWC office, Briefing about the Biodiversity Conservation Project/ and meet NPM/PPP, Mr. Prabhu Budhathoki
	13:00-14:00hrs	Lunch
	14:00-16:00hrs	Meet with Mr. Arup Rajouria, Member Secretary(KMTNC) and Consultants Dr. Pralhad Yonzon and Prasanna Yonzon, Resources Nepal
	16:00-18:00 hrs	Meet with Mr. Brian Peniston, CTA, TMI Makalu-Barun Project
Friday, 19 March 1999	10:15-11:00hrs	Meet with Mr. H.S. Tripathi, Member, National Planning Commission at NPC office (228394)
	11:10-12:00hrs	Meet with Mr.N.R Tiwari, Secretary at MoFSC 220067)
	13:00-14:00hrs	Lunch
	14:15-15:15hrs	Meet with Mr. Anil Manandhar, Project Officer, WWF Nepal Programme along with the Task Force Member(NBAP)
	15:30-16:30	Meet with Dr. Tirtha B. Shrestha ,Coordinator, along with the Task Force, IUCN(528781)/528761/536784
Saturday, 20 March 1999		Field visit to Chitwan
Sunday, 21 March 1999	12:00	Arrive Kathmandu from the field visit by air
	16:00-17:00	Meeting with DRR, P. Yonzon, Resource Neepal
From 22 – 28 March		Field Visit in Makalu-Barun Project Area, a detailed field visit schedule will be arranged by CTA Mr. Brian Peniston, Makalu-Barun Project (TMI), an air ticket has been booked
Sunday 29 March, 1999		Arrive Kathmandu by air from the field visit
Tuesday, 30 March 1999	9:00-10:00	Meet with Mr. Dick Van Blitterswijk, Liaison Officer, and Ms. Rianne Knipples, Rural Development Specialist, NEDA Tell no. 523444

	10:30-11:30	Meet with Mr Leif Christensen, Counsellor/Minister,DANIDA- 413010
	01:00-02:00	Lunch
	2:15-3:15	Mr. Anil Chitrakar, TMI
	3:30-4:30	Meet with Mr. Madhav Ghimire, Joint secretary at FACD/MOF
Wednesday, 31 March 1999	11:00 – 12:00	Meet with Mr. Hans M. Rothenbuhler, Country Director, World Bank- 226792
Thursday, 01 April 1999	12:00 – 01:00	Dr. Pralhad Yonzon, Team Leader, Resource Nepal 537502
Friday, 02 April 1999	9:30 - 10:30	Meet with Dr. T.M. Maskey, Director General/ NPD, DNPWC(to be confirmed)
	10:30 –11:30	Meet Mr. Rabi Bista, Special Secretary in MOFSC (to be confirmed)
3 – 4 April 1999, Saturday-Sunday		Preparation of the draft mission report, including a concept paper for future GEF assistance
Monday, 5 April 1999		Distribution of the draft report
Tuesday, 6 April 1999	2:30	Presentation by the Mission to key stakeholders(MOF/FACD, NPC, MOFSC, DNPWC, KMTNC, Resource Nepal TMI, UNDP
Wednesday, 8 April 1999		Finalization of the mission report Departure

Note:

UNDP FO, in cooperation with NPC/PO, Biodiversity Project, will provide logistic support to the mission and also arrange visits/appointments as scheduled.

Annex 2: List of documents consulted by Immediate Objective

Immediate Objective 1:

1. NEP/92/G31: Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal Project Minutes of the Tripartite Review Meeting 912 December 1999.
2. Quarterly Progress Report
3. Project Performance Evaluation Report
4. National Biodiversity Action Plan Project Global Environment facility (NEP/92/G31)(First Quarterly Report)
5. National Biodiversity Action Plan Project Global Environment facility (NEP/92/G31)(Fourth Quarterly Report)
6. National Biodiversity Action Plan Global Environment Facility draft May, 1998
7. Biodiversity Profiles of Nepal with special reference to Protected Areas
8. National Biodiversity Action Plan Publications, Participants, and Contributing experts
9. Result-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation
10. Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP-GEF Project entitled “Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal” with project code NEP/92/G31/A/1G/99

Immediate Objective #2 Makalu Barun

1. Biodiversity of Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area Tamku and Mangtewa VDCx (Tamku Sector)
2. Submission of 1998 Annual Progress Report for Makalu Barun Component of GEF/NEP/92/G31
3. Annual Report 1996
4. Submission of 4th Quarter 1998 report for Makalu Barun Component of GEF Project
5. Integrated Database System for Biodiversity Conservation in Makalu-Barun National Park & Conservation Area
6. Biodiversity Conservation Project in Nepal agreement Signed 1993 (May) Actual Project activities started 1994 Project period 5 years
7. Second and Third Quarter report
8. Plan of Operation, 1997
9. Annual Progress Report
10. Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP-GEF Project Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal Project”
11. Terms of Reference Independent Evaluation Mission of GEF Project YEM/92/G31
12. Mongolia Biodiversity Project Pre-Investment Facility and MON/93/G31
13. Technical Evaluation of the GEF Funded Project on Protection of the Marine Ecosystems of the Red Sea Coast UNOPS YEM/92/G31
14. Third quarter progress report NEP/UNEP/Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal
15. Annual Progress Report MNEP UNDP Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal
16. 1997 MBCP/GEF Annual Report/Jan-June 1998 Progress Report and July-Dec 1998 Revised Work Plan
17. Annual Progress Report January –December 1996
18. Grazing Area Management Working Plan 1997-2000
19. 1998 Annual Progress Report NEP/UNDP/Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal
20. Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area Project the Mountain Institute Progress Report 1998
21. Makalu-Barun Conservation Project, Nepal
22. Scholarship Support on Training & Education Opportunity Provided to C People & MBCP Personnel 1993-1999-04-08
23. List of the Training Provided to the People of Conservation Area Since Inception to date – Makalu-Barun National Park & Conservation Area Project 1993-1999-04-08
24. The Makalu-Barun National Park and Conservation Area Management Plan November 1990
25. Scope of the Project Activities
26. Natural History Handbook and Staff Training Manual

Immediate Objective # 3 – Capacity Building

1. KMTNC/NCRTC: Technical Report
2. Accomplished Training under GEF Program from March, 1995 to date

3. Annual Progress Report of 1998
4. Annual Report 1996 of Training Component under Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal (NEP/92/G31)
5. First Quarter Progress Report (1 January to 31 March 1998)
6. Second Quarter Progress Report (1 April to 30 June 1998)
7. Third Quarter Progress Report (1st July to 30 September 1998)
8. Progress Report (June-Nov 1998)
9. Biodiversity Conservation Project in Nepal 9GEF/UNDP, NEP/92/G31) National Capacity Enhancement (DNPWC component) Overview of the Project Progress
10. Second Quarter Progress Report (1 April to 30 June 1998)
11. Third Quarter Progress Report (1 July to 30 September 1998)
12. Fourth Quarter Progress report (1 October to 31 December 1998)
13. Project Progress report (January-December 1996)
14. Contract between Mr. Avanindra K. Shrestha, ZOPP Consultant/Facilitation and DNPWC/Biodiversity Conservation Project, NEP/92/G31 Terms of Reference
15. Proposal for Langtang Park Management Strategy Framework Planning Workshop
16. Biodiversity Conservation Project in Nepal Workplan for 1999
17. Biodiversity Conservation Workplan 1998

Annex 3: Summary of GEF Publications by Output under Component 2, 1994 - 1999

Output 1: Sustainable management system involving local people

Activity 1.1 Management zones and management plans

- MBNPCA Management Plan (published, unnumbered report, Nov. 1990)
- Tourism Management Plan for Upper Barun Valley (published, report # 24, 1995)
- Salpa Arun Management Plan (unpublished, grey literature, 1997)
- Draft Mera Peak baseline inventory and management recommendations (in press, 1999)

Activity 1.2 Establish Publicize and enforce park regulations

- Draft MBNPCA regulations (Drafts prepared 1995 and 1997, not approved by HMG)
- MBNPBZ regulations (published and approved by HMG in gazette, 1999)
- Community Resource Management Component (published, unnumbered report)
- Park Management Component (published, unnumbered report)
- Scientific Research Component (published, unnumbered report)
- Tourism Management Component (published, unnumbered report)

Activity 1.3 Establish and enforce prohibition on hunting

- No publications prepared (included in Himalayan National Park Regulations)

Activity 1.4 Recruit and train local people as game scouts

- No publications prepared

Activity 1.5 Applied Research on indicators species and key ecosystems, (especially forests and pastures)

- Ph D. thesis completed on Human impacts on Forest ecosystems in Hongu and Hinku valleys (Complementary TMI funding, completed in 1999, unpublished)
- Field trip report and paper on Conservation and Management of Makalu Barun area (published, Report # 5, April 1990)
- Scientific Report on 1989 Field Survey: General Phyto-Ecology (published, Report # 8, April 1990)
- The Effects of Browsing and Other Disturbances on Forest and Shrub Vegetation of the Hongu, Inkhu and Dudh Kosi Valleys, (Published, Report #9, Arpil 1990)
- Aspects of Wildlife Protection and Utilization in Makalu Barun Conservation Area (published, Report # 11, April 1990)
- Threatened Wildlife, Crop and Livestock Depredation and Grazing in the Makalu Barun Conservation Area, (published, Report # 12, April 1990)
- Grassland Ecology and Preliminary Studies of Bamboos in Apsuwa valley, (published, Report # 13, 1991)
- Study of Geo Hydrology, Land Use and Population of the Makalu Barun Conservation Area, (published, Report # 14, 1991)
- Geo-Ecological Study of the Apsuwa Watershed, (Published, Report # 15, 1992)
- Nettle Fibre Exploitation in Makalu Barun Conservation Area (Published, Report # 22, 1994)
- A Preliminary Study of Medicinal Plants in Bhotkhola and Tamku Regions of Sankhuwasabha District for Commercial Scale Cultivation, (Published, Report # 25, 1995)
- Estimation of Growing Stock and Sustainable Yield of Lokta Bark in Makalu Barun Conservation Area, (Published, Report # 26, 1995)
- Grazing and Pasture Conditions of the Barun and Saldima Valleys, (Published, Report # 29, 1996)
- Epidemiological Investigation of Common Diseases and Parasites of Livestock in the Lower Belt of MBCP. (published, Report # 30, 1996)
- Check List of Birds of Makalu Barun National Park and Conservation Area (in preparation, 1999)

Activity 1.6: Assistance in Park and Conservation Area Management

- Tourism Management Component, (published, unnumbered Report, 1990)
- Community Needs, Resources and Development Component (published, unnumbered Report, 1990)
- Community Resource Management (published, unnumbered report, 1990)
- Park Management Component, (published, unnumbered report, 1990)
- Scientific Research Management (published, unnumbered report, 1990)

Activity 1.7: Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation for Biodiversity and Socio-Economic Issues

- See publications listed under Activity 1.5 research on indicators for key species and ecosystems,

Output 2: Sustainable Grazing Management System**Activity 2.1: Livestock Inventories and Rangeland Condition Surveys**

- Report on Field Trip to Grazing Area between Apsuwa and Ipsuwa Kholas, (unpublished, 1997)
- General Profile of Transhumant households in Makalu VDC and analysis of the grazing system in Upper Barun Valley (2 versions, unpublished, Jan. 1999)
- Survey of Wildlife Grasslands and Pastural systems of Upper Hinku and Hongu (unpublished, May 1988)

**Activity 2.2 Coordinate with Northern Area Pasture Development Project
(Project closed prior to start of GEF)****Activity 2.3 Establish Grazing Permit System**

- Grazing Area Management Working Plan - 1997-2000 (published, Volume 6, Natural Resource Management Series, Jan. 1998)
- Grazing Area Management Orientation Training (published, Volume 7, Natural Resource Management Series, Jan 98)
- Grazing User Group Constitution (in Nepali, unpublished, 1997)
- Livestock and Grazing in Makalu Barun Conservation Area (Published, Report # 23, 1994)
- Grazing and Pasture Conditions of Barun and Saldima Valleys, (published, report # 29, 1996)

Activity 2.4 Compensation of herders and pasture users

- No publications

Output 3: Effective, sustainable Eco-Tourism program**Activity 3.1 Management Plan for Upper Barun**

- A Report on the Survey of Trekking and Mountaineering Agencies of Makalu Barun Area, (published, report # 16, 1991)
- Impact of Rural Tourism on the Environment, income and Employment in the Makalu Barun Area, (published, report # 17, 1991)
- Rural Tourism and Environment in Nepal; A Compilation of Some Selected Literature, (published, report # 18, 1991)
- Tourism Management Plan for the Upper Barun Valley, (published, report #26, 1995)
- Tourism Development in Makalu Base Camp and Makalu Tourism Association, (unpublished, Dec. 1998)
- Survey of Trekkers to Makalu Base Camp (unpublished, 1998)
- Porter Association in Tashigaon (unpublished, 1998)

- Implementation of Upper Barun Tourism Management Plan, (unpublished, 1998)
- Effects of Mountain Tourism along the Trail to Makalu Base Camp, (unpublished, 1996)

Activity 3.2 Improve Trails to Mumbuk, Ratmate and Tamku, Deorali and Saisima

- See publications described under in Activity 3.1)

Activity 3.3 Designated Campsites

- Report on Apsuwa Bridge (unpublished, Sept 1995)

Activity 3.4 Information Materials on Regulations, natural history, appropriate environmental and cultural behaviour

- Scientific Research Program brochure, (published, Nepali and English, 1993,1994)
- Walk on the Wild Side trekking brochure, (published, 1995)
- Wilderness Guidelines for the Makalu Base Camp Trek brochure, (published, 1994)
- Sign boards, etc.
- Posters and descriptive pages, (laminated and posted at District line agencies, local lodges, etc, 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998)
- Partial support Snow Leopard Food Chain Poster, (published in English, Nepali, Sikkimese and Tibetan, 1998)
- Makalu Barun Conservation Project Poster by Tashi Lama, (published, 1994)
- Trekking the Salpa Pass/Arun River Route (published, 1998)
- Trekking to Makalu Base Camp (published, 1998)
- Trekking Advisory (published, 1998)
- Natural History Field Guide to Makalu Barun National Park and Conservation Area (in preparation, 1998)
- Laminated materials for lodges describing natural and cultural highlights along the Salpa-Arun route, (unpublished, 1997, updated 98)
- Living with the Forest brochure (published, 1995)

Activity 3.5 Kerosene Sales outlets

- Project reports - Tashigaon Depot and Bung Depot, (unpublished)
- Laminated Posters on Kerosene Depots at Tumlingtar, Lukla, Bung, Seduwa, Tashigaon and Along Makalu Base Camp route, (unpublished)

Activity 3.6 Increase Park control over mountaineering and tourism revenues

- no publications
- Mera Peak Ecotourism Project (unpublished, June 1997)

Output 4: Long term management strategies for Settlement Enclaves

Activity 4.1: Management Plans

- Saisima Settlement Enclave Management Plan, (published, in English and Tibetan, 1994)
- Mera Peak Eco Tourism and Clean up Project (unpublished, 1997)
- An Assessment of Habitats and Human Interactions in the Hinku, Hongu, Kasuwa and Upper Barun Kholas of Maklau Barun National Park and Peripheral Areas, with Management Recommendations, 1995 and 1996, (in preparation, 1999)

Activity 4.2 Provide concessions, training and assistance to obtain credit

Activity 4.3 Provide other inputs

- No publications

Output 5: Conservation Education Programme

Activity 5.1 Prepare materials and programs for local residents

- Training Manual on Participatory Village Development , (unpublished, 1996)
- Planning and Management (unpublished, 1995)
- Using APA as Village Planning Tool (unpublished in English and Nepali, 1997)
- Draft Training Manual, Himalayan First Aid Course (unpublished, 1995)
- Short Term Training on Conservation Education for Teacher (unpublished, 1999, English and Nepali),
- Educational Games including MBCP specific Environmental Board games for schools, (unpublished, 1997)
- Khempalung Newsletter (published in Nepali, 8 issues, various dates)
- Planning of Conservation Education Program, (unpublished)
- Conservation Education and Interpretation, (unpublished)
- Report on Conservation Education Workshop, (unpublished)
- Tamku Conservation Sector Office (unpublished, 1995)
- Guidelines for Environment Education Program of MBNPCA, (unpublished, May 1995)
- Introduction to MBCA (in Nepali, unpublished, 1997)

Activity 5.2 Prepare audio, visual and printed materials in local languages

- See details listed under Activity 5.1
- Video: Folk Music and Dances of MBCP (video, 1994)
- Video: The search for Shangri-la (PBS documentary video, 1997)
- 20 hours of video tape in culture, relationships in nature, (unedited video tape)

Activity 5.3: Stationary and Mobile Conservation Education Exhibitions

- Living with the Forest exhibition materials (unpublished, Summit Hotel presentation, 1996)
- Lodge Displays on Makalu Base Camp and Salpa-Arun Routes (unpublished, various dates)

Activity 5.4 Workshops and special programs for Teachers

Output 6: Information on Critical Biodiversity Conservation Areas, indications species and ecosystems dynamics.

Activity 6.1 Vegetation/Habitat and land use maps

- MBNCPA Trekking map (published, 1997, updated 1998)
- The Orchids (unpublished, 1993)
- Patterns of Bird Species Diversity, (unpublished 1994)
- The Relationship between Population Density and Species Diversity in MBNPCA (unpublished, 1998)
- Community Ecology of Tropical Moist Forests and MBCA of Eastern Nepal (unpublished, 1999)
- Landscape Ecology of the Makalu Barun National Park and Conservation Area, (unpublished Ph D dissertation, Dec 1998, 3 article excerpts in press)
- Nepal's Rare, endemic and endangered flowering plants distributed in MBNPCA (unpublished, 1998)
- Implementation of Geographic Information Systems in TMI programs. A concept paper using Makalu-Barun as a model (unpublished, 1996)
- GPS Appraisal, Current Management practices of CFs and Commercially harvested NTFPs in MBCP Area (unpublished, 1998)

- To access biodiversity and evaluate the Wildlife Human Interactions in Yaphu VDC of MBCA (unpublished, 1996)
- Applied and Integrated Biodiversity Database Systems, Users Manual, (unpublished, 1993)
- Report on Biodiversity Database Workshop (unpublished, 1994)
- Makalu-Barun Biodiversity Database System: including:
 - A Database for National Parks and Conservation Areas in Nepal, (unpublished, 1993).
 - Biodiversity of Makalu-Barun NP and CA: Sisuwa and Sankuwa Valley (unpublished, 1994)
 - Forest/Biodiversity Monitoring: MBNPCA (unpublished, 1996)
- Approximately 60 digitized maps key habitats, indicator species, etc, (unpublished 1993-99)

Activity 6.2 Enter Species Data into Database

- See description listed under Article 6.1

Activity 6.3 Conduct Applied Research in indicated species and people – wildlife interactions

- See above and Article 6.1
- Man and Makalu Project, 2nd Progress Report (unpublished, 1993)
- A preliminary Survey of Black Bear Status and Wildlife Crop Damage - MBNPCA (unpublished, 1993)
- Report on an Assessment in Livestock Degradation Through Wild Animals at Ball Tamku Area, MBNPCA (unpublished, 1995)
- Livestock Degradation in the Makalu Barun Conservation Project, A Case Study of Yaphu VDC (unpublished, May 1995)
- Yak and Chauri Distribution Breeding and Management Practices and their Conservation Strategies in MBCP Area, (unpublished, 1995)
- People Wildlife Project, Crop Production and Damage Survey in Select Villages of Makalu Barun Conservation Area (unpublished, 1993)
- Wildlife Degradation of Crop and Livestock (unpublished, July 1997)

Activity 6.4 Develop Management Plans for Specific Ecosystems

- Ph.D dissertation on Impacts of Human Disturbance on forest ecosystems of Hongu and Hinku river valleys (unpublished, 1999)

Output 7 Field Equipment and facilities for MBNPCA

- no publications

Output 8 Increase human capacity for management

- no publication

Output 9 Documentation and information dissemination

- See publications listed under outputs 1-8

Annex 4: Summary of the project's response to recommendations made by mid-term GEF Evaluation of March 1997.

Component 1: NBAP preparation:

Recommendation	Follow-up
1. Steering Committee should be broadened to ensure adequate representation. Need for Ministries of Finance, Industry, Water Resources, Pop. & Env., Ag, and NPC	This was done, though the Committee did not play the intended active role
2. The new Steering Committee re-draft activities and outputs for this action plan.	This was considered unrealistic in the Nepali institutional context (MOFSC).
3. Resources Nepal sub-contract should be amended to reflect new realities.	Sub-contract was not amended although a consultant from east-west center investigated the prospect.
4. Economic assessment activities within Output 3.3 should be transferred to NBAP component	Not done. MOFSC/DNPWC was not in favor of this suggestion.
5. Separate implementation activities from planning activities – do the planning activities first	This was done. Implementation has not proceeded until NBAP is finalised.
6. NBAP should develop plan for implementation of monitoring activities for PA.	Plan was not developed but the basis for monitoring by having a GIS database was done.
7. Monitoring could be implemented by DNPWC in cooperation with MBNP-BZ component	The suggestion was not taken by the DNPWC.
8. NBAP should re-visit the initial planning stages and decide in a written strategy paper exactly what sort of plan is expected, what are the critical components, and what are the approaches to be used.	An int'l consultant from East-West Center did this as part of an assignment. Strategy paper not readily apparent in latest draft of NBAP.
9. NBAP should re-visit the BPP written outputs and decide what can be incorporated into the Action Plan. Consider including summary of BPP documents in NBAP.	RN studied the BPP. No summary of BPP documents in NBAP.

Component 2: Makalu Barun National Park and Buffer Zone

Recommendation	Follow-up
1. Re-examine the whole array of present outputs and activities and seek to reduce them to four or five key outputs	Was not done – deemed unrealistic to have project document re-approved later.
2. Review wording of outputs and activities and re-word in line with above recommendations. Seek UNDP approval.	Changing the project document proved to be unrealistic. This was attempted, but not successful.
3. Develop key indicators to assess sustainable use of biodiversity in the Park and in the Buffer zone	Baseline information strengthened. Getting closer, but no indicators to date.
4. Develop strategy paper to direct conservation planning	Note done. Some confusion over

(zoning for management purposes of high-interest areas for biodiversity).	legality of instituting zoning within Park – never really followed-up.
5. Initiate review of management plan for MBNP-BZ.	Deemed unnecessary given that fieldwork was focussing on village-level planning.
6. Project should consider a no-cost extension to ensure that goals are met in a sustainable manner	Done.
7. The project should therefore seek a new budget breakdown with proper costing against the revised activity and output schedules called for above.	Again, changing the project document proved to be unrealistic, despite efforts by TMI and follow-up by UNDP.
8. Stronger success and impact indicators, milestones etc must be seen as a priority.	Emphasis was shifted to focus on these.
9. Work plan activities should be streamlined and have adequate reporting to allow follow-up	This was done very well. TMI reporting improved and publications were made.
10. A major gap in project activity is internal M&E. This must be strengthened.	Again, overcoming a project-design shortcoming like this proved to be too difficult.
11. Simple cost effective baseline data must be developed.	Much more baseline data has been developed and mapped, perhaps more than the government can use.
12. Project manager should have greater day-to-day staff control, as in other PA in Nepal.	The reorientation of organisational structure led by UNDP was directed at this. TMI took positive steps and what could be achieved has been done.
13. Salaries of HMG staff should be re-evaluated to give sufficient incentive to work in remote areas	The suggestion was made but was something out of the control of any agency involved.
14. Need to increase efforts to recruit senior-level staff with biodiversity expertise.	A major staff shift was made – a change from a clerk to a biodiversity expert.
15. Staff should be handed over/regularized to HMG on a phased basis.	This is being done, though not as originally hoped.
16. For Buffer zone management, HMG should consider recruiting people with social/development skills	Done somewhat – new Buffer zone policy approved. This process is being facilitated by UNDP's PPP.
17. Senior management should be moved to the field – into the Park.	Senior management moved to the field to occupy newly constructed field offices and housing.
18. Training should take place under detailed training policy	No provision made for this in project document. Difficult to implement in "mid-stream"
19. Game scouts should develop some specialization	Game scouts given special training
20. Training manuals in Nepali.	Training manuals developed in Nepali.

21. Training responsibilities under MBNP for DNPWC should be transferred to DNPWC	Done.
22. Savings and credit schemes should be developed in BZ.	Not done.
23. Reduce emphasis on giving VIP to communities – re-emphasize links to conservation	Done somewhat, though still tenuous link.
24. Separate women’s training groups.	Done.
25. More women should be recruited to project team.	Done. 15 women recruited.
26. Actively promote tourism to MBNP-BZ	Done
27. Education should transfer greater responsibility to schools and also focus on adult education.	Adult education done, but project still stuck in “hardware” rather than “software” mode
28. Link cultural conservation to indigenous knowledge of biodiversity conservation-related issues.	Project still stuck in “hardware” infrastructure mode.
29. DNPWC absorb research activities into hits HQ as nucleus of National Wildlife Monitoring Center	Done, but with unintended results
30. MBNP/PCA develop an applied studies facility in Khandbari to support management.	Not done.
31. Give greater attention to producing good technical output.	Papers being consolidated/organized. Requirements strengthened
32. PEC and PCC meetings should be improved. UNDP should participate in PEC meetings.	The meetings were restructured. UNDP did participate and was crucial in making the project perform better.
33. TPR should be strengthened, with definitive recommendations emerging from them.	The TPR process was strengthened, with discussions focusing on critical issues.
34. Donor coordination should be improved.	Improved slightly
35. A hand-over plan needs to be developed with DNPWC in a consultative manner – a phased approach	This was a topic of discussion in each TPR meeting. A task force was established and recommendations prepared.
36. Conduct sustainability analysis.	Not done

Component 3: Capacity Building for DNPWC (Training and Institutional Strengthening)

Recommendation	Follow-up
1. An extra activity be placed within Output 3.1 to accommodate the in-service training carried out by DNPWC.	Was considered unrealistic.
2. Study-tour training under MBNP should be transferred to DNPWC.	Done.
3. Special TPR be convened to re-word the outputs and	Was considered unrealistic.

activities, with a view to incorporating them within the NBAP.	
4. Political and cross-sectoral economic activities should be transferred to NBAP's component.	Was considered unrealistic and was not acceptable to government.
5. DNPWC and RN find a way to include a cross-sectoral biodiversity conservation ethic embodied in the approach to the Development Plan Process and Long Term Vision.	This was investigated, but did not materialise as MOFSC considered it unrealistic.
6. KMTNC should overhaul the curriculum to meet certain needs.	A task force was established for UNDP, DNPWC and KMTNC. The curriculum was reviewed.
7. Training guidelines should be established to improve quality of training. Instructors should be requested to prepare handouts for trainees.	No guidelines (no budget); Handouts produced (this evaluator did not see)
8. To really improve the training, KMTNC needs to hire a world-class trainer. An expert trainer.	KMTNC did not consider this recommendation valuable.
9. KMTNC should make great effort to seek feedback and develop participatory/collaborative training programs.	Done, but without satisfactory result. Participants not wanting to be critical.

Annex 5: Overall project implementation-related lessons drawn from experiences under this project

1. Implementation arrangements, if they are to work well, require specific, detailed discussions with stakeholders during the project design stage to ensure that the arrangements are compatible with the capacity and willingness of key stakeholders to participate.
2. Be aware of potential management and ownership contradictions when designing project implementation arrangements. In this project, NEX was adopted to increase ownership by the Government. On the other hand, nearly all project resources were provided to independent entities under sub-contract for each of the components; the components became sub-projects with no real owner; and UNDP had to step in where it should not have had to step-in.
3. Never design a project which takes away accountability and responsibility of ownership from the institutions that need to carry on the initiatives on their own after assistance ends.
4. Implementation should emphasize institutional strengthening right from the beginning so that beneficiaries or clients can own, manage and sustain the initiatives on their own later. Under this project, the institutional approach was emphasized at the end of the project, but this should be the basis for implementation. A partnership approach to implementation with institutions should be stressed. In addition to the institutional approach, there should be more clarity on what the end results are to be.
5. The implementation process (sequence of activities) should be as logical as possible.
6. Make sure that there is transparency in the use of budgets to all parties and, primarily, to the clients. Most of the investment should be made at local costs and to the benefit of the local people and high operating costs avoided.
7. Be careful to venture into a situation where there are too many actors and the absorptive capacity of key institutions is strained as a result. This can result in international organizations promoting their own agendas and not allowing for ownership by the clients, and thereby creating an environment where capacity building measures can become redundant and “crypto-diplomacy” the norm.

□□□□□□□□