

IEG ICR Review

Independent Evaluation Group

1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 06/27/2011		
PROJ ID : P035823		Appraisal	Actual	
Project Name :	Protected Areas Management Project	Project Costs (US\$M):	10.75	10.21
Country:	Pakistan	Loan/Credit (US\$M):	10.08	9.13
Sector Board :	ENV	Cofinancing (US\$M):		
Sector(s):	General agriculture fishing and forestry sector (56%) Other social services (25%) General water sanitation and flood protection sector (7%) General transportation sector (7%) General public administration sector (5%)			
Theme(s):	Participation and civic engagement (20% - P) Export development and competitiveness (20% - P) Environmental policies and institutions (20% - P) Biodiversity (20% - P) Rural policies and institutions (20% - P)			
L/C Number:				
		Board Approval Date :		04/24/2001
Partners involved :		Closing Date :	12/31/2007	12/31/2009
Evaluator :	Panel Reviewer :	Group Manager :	Group:	
Richard C. Worden	Robert Mark Lacey	IEG ICR Review 1	IEGPS1	

2. Project Objectives and Components:

a. Objectives:

This was a World Bank implemented stand-alone GEF grant. The Global Environmental Objective (GEO) as stated in the GEF Trust Fund Grant Agreement is: "The objective of the Project is to assist in achieving active sustainable conservation of globally and nationally significant habitats and species in Pakistan through a series of integrated activities aimed at engaging custodial communities in the management of the Protected Areas ." The PAD states the objective as: "To achieve the sustainable conservation of globally and nationally significant habitats and species within Pakistan through a series of integrated activities aimed at engaging local communities in the management of selected protected areas." (PAD, p.42). The PAD also specifies that it will work toward this PDO in "three Protected Areas (PAs) of Pakistan (Chitral Gol in the NWFP, Machiara in Azad Jammu and Kashmir, and Hingol in Balochistan)

encompassing mountain, arid rangeland, estuarine and marine ecosystems ." The ICR Review evaluates the project according to the PAD objective.

b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?

No

c. Components (or Key Conditions in the case of DPLs, as appropriate):

Component 1. Protected area biodiversity management (at appraisal: US \$7.05M; actual US \$6.93M). This component consisted of

six sub-components, as follows:

- 1.1 Process framework for participation of custodial communities in park management and conservation
- 1.2 Formulation of detailed park management plan and strategy
- 1.3 Improvement of park infrastructure
- 1.4 Improvement of park operations
- 1.5 Baseline resource inventory, research, habitat improvement and wildlife enrichment
- 1.6 Public environmental awareness and outreach

Component 2. Sustainability of park management (at appraisal: US \$2.13M; actual US \$2.01M). The project promoted public/private cooperation in the achievement of long-term biodiversity conservation by assisting with technical assistance and limited cost-sharing arrangements, private sector activities, income-generating activities (e.g., improved agricultural outputs, ecotourism, user entrance fees) and nonprofit fund-raising activities.

Component 3. Human resource development (at appraisal: US \$0.36M; actual US \$0.26M). The project supported a strong training program to build capacity within requisite wildlife departments to improve park mgm't .

Component 4. Project coordination and monitoring (at appraisal: US \$0.46M; actual US \$1.01M). The most important aspect of this coordination role was facilitating the development of policy and legislation relating to protected areas and ensuring that systems were established at each level . In addition, technical assistance services were available to design the Park Association and conduct a Tourism Feasibility Study & Strategy for the three parks .

d. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates:

Estimated project cost was US\$10.75 million; actual costs were slightly lower at US\$10.21 million. There was a US \$410,000 increase in the Borrower's contribution from US\$0.67 million to US\$1.08 (61%) while GEF financing decreased by US\$0.85 (9%). According to the Operations Portal, US \$9.44M was disbursed; US \$0.64M was not disbursed and the grant was not cancelled . An Independent Evaluation carried out at the end of project implementation by Dunira Strategy in association with Across Borders stated that the reasons for this were changes in foreign exchange rates, lack of borrower capacity, and onerous Bank financial management procedures . Regarding dates, the Grant Agreement was modified following the Mid-Term Review (MTR) to extend the project by two years (from Dec. 31, 2007 to Dec. 31, 2009) due to slower than expected expenditures during project start-up and delays caused by the earthquake in 2006. Funds were reallocated among project components and different sites to support the creation of community revolving loan funds and rural micro-enterprises.

3. Relevance of Objectives & Design:

Relevance of Objective : substantial . The relevance of the first part of the objective -- "to achieve the sustainable conservation of globally and nationally significant habitats and species within Pakistan " -- rests as much on its global environmental importance under the GEF's Operational Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation as it does on the country's own priorities/conditions and the Bank's country strategy . The project selected the protected areas (PAs) in accordance with GEF guidance that they be "representative, threatened and globally important due to their species diversity, endemism and degree of threat." The 1998 CAS Progress Report stated "the principal role that natural resources play in driving Pakistan's rural economy where the majority of the poor live "... and as such, "promote the development of the entire rural sector which is critical to a successful country-wide poverty alleviation strategy ." (p.7) Poverty alleviation and human development have consistently been pillars of the Bank's assistance strategies (CAS, 1995 and CPS, 2010-2013) throughout the entire project cycle . In terms of achieving this objective through "a series of integrated activities aimed at engaging custodial communities in the management of Protected Areas, " this is consistent with country priorities and the CAS/CPS pillars of social stability, strengthened governance, and institutional development.

Relevance of Design : modest . Design addressed critical dimensions of Pakistan's system of PA management, such as the longer-term financial needs and requirements of managing sites; the technical development needs of the PA system's human resources; and the need for consistent policies and management practices and monitoring across Pakistan's PA system. There were, however, several significant design flaws :

- The timetable for completing project tasks was overly ambitious .
- Project activities were not sequenced in order to facilitate the move from an autonomous decision-making process by government authorities to a more participatory one working with local affected communities .

- Allocating equal budgets to each of the three project sites without the possibility of inter -site transfers impeded flexibility.
- The initial size of the trust fund needed to meet the future needs of managing PAs was considerably underestimated.

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy):

The degree of attainment of the PDO -- *to achieve the sustainable conservation of globally and nationally significant habitats and species within Pakistan through a series of integrated activities aimed at engaging local communities in the management of (three) selected protected areas* - is rated as **substantial**. Progress was also made towards the GEO.

According to the PAD (pages 42-43), the project objective was to be achieved through a series of integrated activities:

- Reducing conflicts between park management and people inhabiting the parks .
- Upgrading the capacity of staff and local communities to improve park management with a view to (i) preparing and updating management plans; (ii) enhancing surveillance and enforcement; and (iii) developing park infrastructure.
- Protecting and effectively managing species, habitats and ecosystems within and near the PA to (i) enhance globally important species and habitats; (ii) control poaching, animal damage and other disruptions; and (iii) manage enterprise opportunities and visits to the parks so as to avoid environmental harm .
- Strengthening local, regional and national support for PAs through focused public environmental awareness and outreach activities.

Reducing conflicts :

- The ICR reports (page 16) that "the consultation process supporting community ownership has been effective ."
- The project made important progress in promoting sustainable PA management practices with active community support by introducing transformational changes among the relevant wildlife management agencies to open up decision-making processes about project implementation activities to input from custodial communities . Over 50 Village Conservation Committees (VCCs) in custodial communities were formed during the project as active partners in PA implementation activities . As a consequence, the ICR reports that communities have become more empowered and their preferences taken into account in park planning and management .
- Successful efforts were made in the two northern project areas to inform and obtain the consensus of affected local communities about the project's intention to curtail certain traditional practices in natural common areas in return for benefits to compensate the communities for sustainably managing those protected areas . However, initial failure to develop this consensus at Hingol National Park in Balochistan significantly slowed implementation there.

Upgrading capacity :

- Department staff were trained in park management planning and implementation practices, gathered data on wildlife numbers through field surveys, conducted research studies and socioeconomic assessments, and prepared base-maps.
- The five-year detailed Management Plan and Strategy for the three parks was updated .
- Enhanced surveillance has contributed to reductions in threats to PAs from illegal and unsustainable uses of natural resources within them, including significant reductions of uncontrolled livestock grazing in the three PAs by 45% - 90%, in illegal poaching by 60% - 100%, and of fuel wood collection by 40% - 100% (ICR, page 15).
- The project provided support to improve park infrastructure, including trails, bridges, trekking huts, camp sites with outdoor toilets, cooking facilities, wildlife observation posts, small road maintenance works and repairs, water and waste disposal facilities, and improved signage .

Protecting and managing species :

- The Independent Evaluation (PAMP Final Report, 2009) stated that: "Key species within the three PAs have all shown encouraging increases in populations . Awareness raising and participatory management has drastically reduced illegal activities within the park as well as increased vegetation and forest cover ." (pp. 16 - 17).
- Managing visits to the parks and enterprise development within them has been less of a material concern than anticipated. The ICR reports (page 7) that visitation levels will remain limited for the foreseeable future due to the security situation, and that the creation of jobs and micro -enterprises through the Village Development Program has been considerably below expectations .

Strengthening local and regional support :

- According to the ICR (page 7), "Awareness creation has been exemplary with policy makers, clergy, media, school children, and local communities having a good understanding of the linkages between conservation and the sustainable maintenance of local agriculture and ecological system ." Moreover, "The project has made a remarkable contribution to public awareness by targeting communities politicians, and, importantly, religious leaders" (page 25). However, little concrete evidence is provided in support of these statements .
- Village Conservation Committee members have "emphasized that they have learnt about the importance of conservation through the project . They seem to now have a strong sense of ownership and pride in the uniqueness of their natural resources . Signboards are widespread around the surroundings of the parks,

newsletters in local language and leaflets are available, information about study and exposure visit and training workshops for staff and communities are widely circulated and a number of nature clubs for children are functioning" (ICR, page 25).

- However, high level interest and ownership by the national government remains weak (see Sections 7 and 9 below), with success in engaging the Federal Ministry of the Environment described as "mixed" (ICR, page 16).

5. Efficiency (not applicable to DPLs):

An incremental cost analysis was prepared during project preparation . At project closure, actual project costs were estimated to match proposed costs and a cost-effectiveness analysis showed that annual operating costs of managing the three project PAs had been roughly US \$ 185 / hectare / year, which is 18% above the mean cost for other PA management projects in the developing world during the 1990s (US \$157 / ha / yr.). (WPCA, Global Review of Protected Area Budgets and Staffs, p. 4, 1999).

The project had to be extended for two years following the MTR to "ensure the sustainability of project investments," (PAMP, p. 10, 2009) through the establishment of the US \$2 million endowment trust fund that was supposed to have been set up by the third year of the project.

Project efficiency is rated as **modest** mainly due to insufficient evidence.

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR)/Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation :

	Rate Available?	Point Value	Coverage/Scope*
Appraisal	No		
ICR estimate	No		

* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

6. Outcome:

Efficacy was substantial, as was the relevance of the objectives . Efficiency and design relevance were modest . Outcome is assessed as **moderately satisfactory** .

a. Outcome Rating : Moderately Satisfactory

7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating:

Risk to development outcome is significant for three principal reasons . First, there is a lack of ownership, leadership, and commitment to the project's objectives and requirements by the Ministry of Environment (originally called MELGRD, now MOE). In the face of so many other competing and compelling priorities and needs (e.g., recovery from the devastating earthquake of 2006 and massive flooding of 2010 as well as the aftershocks of the financial crisis and the deteriorating security situation), it has been difficult for the Pakistani government to make PAs a priority and follow through with the legal and regulatory changes needed as well as the financial support and staff required to manage the system of PAs without continued external assistance and support . The independent third-party evaluation (PAMP Final Report, 2009) stated, "The absence of active political support is evident and poses a major risk to the sustainability of any of the outcomes ." Second, the failure to operationalize fully the endowment fund by matching donor contributions with government commitments undermines the promise made to poor local communities to compensate them for restricting their use of natural resources in the PAs and provide them with other income-generating opportunities and benefits . Third, although both park management capacity and threat reduction targets have been achieved, the third leg of effective biodiversity conservation, which requires a long -term, stable funding source, is not yet in place .

a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating : Significant

8. Assessment of Bank Performance:

Quality-of-Entry: **moderately unsatisfactory** . The project team introduced the innovative (for Pakistan) and time-demanding approach of involving local communities in the decision-making, priority-setting and monitoring activities of PA management, along with enhancing the capabilities and coordination of national and provincial implementing authorities, under very difficult and resistant circumstances . This empowerment of custodial communities and decentralization of top-down government agencies "has been a very positive outcome of the project and will no doubt contribute to future conservation efforts " (PAMP, p. 23, 2009). Nevertheless, insufficient

attention was paid during preparation to resolving several difficult issues, such as commercial logging in one PA, land rights issues in another, and a proposed dam project in the third . In addition, the legal basis for community empowerment in PA management was not clarified early enough, and initial community resistance and distrust of government promises were underestimated . Delays in conducting a comprehensive biodiversity baseline study undermined the credibility of subsequent wildlife surveys . The Independent Evaluation pointed to what it described as the Bank's failure to assess adequately the capabilities and limitations of FM skills among implementing agency staff given the "burdensome and complex WB financial systems and reporting requirements." Most importantly, the difficulty of establishing a viable endowment fund mechanism (the FPA) was underestimated; it was also considerably under-capitalized to derive sufficient revenue streams over time to fund PA activities while retaining or growing the original endowment . Inadequate attention was paid to results indicators and the M & E program, which created lingering problems for the project throughout its life .

Quality-of-Supervision: moderately satisfactory . IEG partially concurs with the ICR statement that, "Actions taken by the Bank during supervision were mostly appropriate, timely and adequate, with some areas of notable achievement." (ICR, p. 19) This was particularly true in terms of the learning and empowerment of local communities that took place as a direct result of the Bank's efforts . The project team focused on development outcomes, ensured safeguard compliance, provided frank supervision reports and detailed plans of corrective action in cases of unsatisfactory performance . It also attempted, albeit belatedly, to make adequate transition arrangements to ensure continued funding of PA staff by the government . However, Bank supervision could have provided more assistance to implementing agency staff in understanding and complying with the Bank's FM systems and requirements, and as stated before, it should have paid greater attention to the establishment and implementation of the endowment fund .

a. Ensuring Quality -at-Entry:Moderately Unsatisfactory

b. Quality of Supervision :Moderately Satisfactory

c. Overall Bank Performance :Moderately Satisfactory

9. Assessment of Borrower Performance:

Government: The Ministry of Environment (MOE) was the "coordinating agency" at the federal level of the project. Within that ministry, the office of the Inspector General of Forests in the Ministry conducted all policy and coordination and liaison matters related to forests, rangeland and wildlife management . (PAD, p. 4) There were significant shortcomings in the government's performance . Initial inter-agency coordination at MOE was "very weak" (ICR, page 20), and high staff turnover was detrimental to project performance . MOE's weaknesses in handling the Bank's complex financial management and accounting procedures led to persistent problems throughout implementation. Most importantly, high level interest and ownership by the government is "still missing" according to the independent evaluation conducted near the close of the project as evidenced by continued uncertainty over the endowment fund .

Implementing Agencies : Performance varied between the three provinces and protected areas . While buy-in and performance were excellent in two of the three project areas, in the third (the Hingol National Park in the province of Balochistan) key regional stakeholders initially lacked commitment to the project's participatory modality. "Successive supervision missions had to exert substantial pressure for change " (ICR, page 21). As a result of equal allocations of project funds to all three protected areas, combined with weak MOE engagement, there was considerable underspending of project funding allocated to Hingol NP, which was transferred to other project activities. An independent review of the project at closure raised concerns about the regularization of project staffing in one project-supported PA (Hingol NP). The other two national parks (Chitrol Gol and Machiari) performed well in involving local communities in the project's decision -making and operational processes, resolved contentious issues in a timely manner, diligently carried out M & E activities as community watchdogs, and have continued to use the organizational skills and cohesion and social capital to attract significant amounts of non-project donor funds to help pay for other community -driven initiatives and priority needs . Furthermore, financial management was cited in the ICR as a serious and continuing problem throughout project implementation: "The project mostly failed to comply with financial management requirements ." (ICR p. 13)

Regional comments state that "The "under-spending" of project funding allocated to Hingol (Balochistan) was on account of a flaw in project design affixing equal resources to the three protected areas and to startup delays that consequently reduced the duration of the technical assistance component of the project, and not on account of weak MOE engagement...The Third Party Evaluation Report (paragraph 2.10) mentions that funding allocation to the parks was not commensurate with institutional capacity of each park, resulting in the under -spending at Hingol. This was later rectified by reallocating funds to the other two sites ."

They further state that "While, there were significant delays at the initiation of activities in the Hingol National Park in Balochistan, its performance improved over time. At the closing of the project, ten Village Conservation Committees had been registered [out of a total of 51 VCCs in all three Parks], and were effectively implementing conservation related activities and microplans for village investments through cluster community organizations and village accounts. The Park Management Plan for Hingol and the Provincial Wildlife Act of 1974 were revised, the latter to recognize the role of the communities in management and decision making " processes.

And that "The Government of Balochistan showed significant commitment to the Hingol National Park, demonstrated by the fact that it was able (with support from the MOE) to convince other agencies of the national government to drop activities that would have been highly destructive to the integrity of the national park. This included, the Water and Power Development Authority to reverse its plans to construct a dam within the park, as well as to reverse the Pakistan Air Force's plan to conduct bombing test operations (the latter was not specifically mentioned in the ICR due to the sensitive nature of the topic) within the park. The Government of Balochistan has retained all staff positions (30) created under the project at Hingol to continue with conservation activities during the post-project period. Similarly, the Governments of NWFP and AJK have retained all key technical staff positions created during the project (with the exception of a few non-technical posts such as night watchmen, a few administrative clerks and drivers)."

Regarding financial management, Regional comments state that "While, there is no disagreement that financial management was a serious issue during project implementation (largely due to capacity constraints), FM operations improved during the later part of the project. The final audit reports (undertaken by Government auditors) for all but one of the four implementing agencies have been accepted by the Bank. In the case of the Balochistan, there were some presentation discrepancies in the final audit report. The Bank has requested that these be corrected and the report re-submitted."

a. Government Performance :Moderately Unsatisfactory

b. Implementing Agency Performance :Moderately Satisfactory

c. Overall Borrower Performance :Moderately Satisfactory

10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization:

M&E Design:

- The key outcome indicators in the results framework of the PAD were reductions in the loss of species and vegetative cover in the three project sites, and improvement of the implementation capacity of Pakistan's PA system management while working with local participatory community institutions.
- The outcome indicators in the PAD's main text differed from those in Annex 1. The main text identified three "areas of significance for monitoring: ecological aspects of field activities, community participation, and the legal and regulatory frameworks impacting on project activities." Annex 1 (Project Design Summary) organized outcome/impact indicators for each project component.
- Only two out of 16 impact indicators had numerical values and target dates for achievement.
- Changes in vegetative cover had to be dropped during implementation since monitoring this indicator would have required technically sophisticated and expensive surveillance methods (e.g., satellite imagery and GIS software packages).
- The comprehensive biodiversity baseline studies were delayed at the start of the project by the realization that dependence on international expert NGOs to conduct the studies was required since local sources of such expertise were lacking.
- Design weaknesses and internal inconsistencies in the PAD led to the need to "adapt the monitoring indicators ... to compensate for the weak monitoring framework at design" (ICR, page 19).

M&E Implementation:

- Most internal and external monitoring activities took place at regular intervals as planned and reports were prepared on all three areas of monitoring significance.
- Local implementing agency staff and community representatives required more field training than anticipated to ensure accurate detection, identification, and estimation of species variety and abundance.
- Monitoring of project performance was tracked and recorded in detailed supervision mission aide memoires and ISRs that identified follow-up activities to remedy outstanding issues.
- The MTR also addressed several key issues, such as the lag in implementing the FPA and delays in project implementation at Hingol National Park.

M&E Utilization:

The 2009 independent third party evaluation of the project mentioned that the M&E program was used to inform project management decision-making and to make mid-course adjustments (e.g., after supervision missions and the MTR). However, the M&E program was “too narrowly focused on a few key animal and plant species”, and that there was room for “expanding the scope to include other species to reflect the true health of the parks' ecosystems.” (PAMP Final Report, p. 25) It also noted the importance of having credible information on tourism profiles and trends and revenue generating potential, which was never done, in order to make convincing arguments to custodial communities about the need to refrain from damaging the PAs and preserve their ecological integrity and beauty.

a. M&E Quality Rating : Modest

11. Other Issues (Safeguards, Fiduciary, Unintended Positive and Negative Impacts):

Safeguards

The project triggered three safeguard policies : Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01), Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12), and Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10). The ICR reports (page 12) that the project complied with Bank policies in all three areas; indeed, it was expected that the project's impact would be mostly positive in terms of improving biodiversity conservation and environmental management of PAs. According to the ICR (page 12), "the participatory framework for custodial communities in park management and conservationensured that park investments adequately identified and addressed [environmental impacts]." The Forestry (OP 4.12) and Natural Habitats (OP 4.04) policies were not triggered at the time of approval, but their principles were nonetheless applied. Although there were no plans to physically relocate or economically disadvantage any communities or persons inside and around the PAs, their access to the natural resources they contained was restricted. The ICR reports (page 6) that "a Process Framework to mitigate against restricted access to resourceswas....prepared and implemented in each of the three parks." Indigenous peoples were empowered by the project to participate actively in decisions and activities affecting them and their environs.

Fiduciary

Financial management (FM) was cited in the ICR as a serious and continuing problem throughout project implementation. Issues included: (a) weak FM capacity with lack of qualified accounting staff; (b) poor maintenance of books of accounts/records; (c) delays in release of counterpart funds; and (d) failure to submit acceptable audited financial statements on time. "These issues generally continued till the end of the project" (ICR, p. 13). The Dunira independent evaluation also pointed to what it described as the Bank's failure to assess adequately the capabilities and limitations of FM skills among implementing agency staff given the "burdensome and complex WB financial systems and reporting requirements." It suggested (PAMP Final Report, p. 21) that "For future projects, a thorough review, training and harmonizing of accounting procedures, as well as an analysis of borrower capacity, should be carried out pre-inception" (i.e., during preparation).

Regional comments provided on the draft ICR Review state that "While, there is no disagreement that financial management was a serious issue during project implementation (largely due to capacity constraints), FM operations improved during the later part of the project. The final audit reports (undertaken by Government auditors) for all but one of the four implementing agencies have been accepted by the Bank. In the case of the Balochistan, there were some presentation discrepancies in the final audit report. The Bank has requested that these be corrected and the report re-submitted."

12. Ratings:	ICR	IEG Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	
Risk to Development Outcome:	Moderate	Significant	Important uncertainties persist regarding whether sustained funding and staffing levels will be maintained by the government following project closure.
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	The Bank overestimated community receptivity and government commitment at the outset, and delayed making transitional arrangements for continued staffing. The Bank should have provided more assistance to the

			implementing agency on financial management issues and paid greater attention to the endowment fund (FPA).
Borrower Performance :	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR :		Satisfactory	

NOTES:

- When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006.
- The "Reason for Disagreement/Comments" column could cross-reference other sections of the ICR Review, as appropriate .

13. Lessons:

The experience of this project suggests the following lessons :

- The time required for innovative and transformational projects should be properly reflected at the design stage. In this case, a five-year stand-alone project provided insufficient time to allow the social learning and institutional cultural changes to occur to cement the operation's conservation goals and their sustainability . The Borrower's comments in the ICR stated that: "The process of community organization for participatory natural resource management is highly sensitive, complex and lengthy " (pages 34 - 35).
- Sustained commitment at all levels of Government and among all stakeholders is needed to realize the full potential of initial gains made in terms of community involvement and the development of social capital .
- The need to ensure the realization of sustained PA management requires secure, long -term financial resources in order to be dependable and realistic . The establishment of an operational endowment fund should have been given a higher priority from the beginning of the project . This would have allowed time for the endowment fund to grow and thereby honor the promises made to local communities that, if they refrain from unsustainable, destructive activities (e.g., hunting and fuelwood collection) within PAs, they would receive other economic benefits in exchange .
- Adequate attention to M&E design and implementation is especially important for projects testing new methods or modalities that may serve as models for replication in other locations, such as this project did with its co-management approach to PA management. It is imperative to have a robust and sound basis for data analysis on measured outcomes and impacts in order to make a compelling case for (or against) using that innovative method elsewhere .

14. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

15. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR is well-researched and supported by a third-party independent evaluation conducted one month prior to the project's closing. It is logically presented and organized in a clear and concise manner . Shortcomings of the project are discussed frankly and balanced against successful outcomes . Lessons learned are clearly laid-out, insightful and consistent with the independent evaluation . Drawbacks are the failure to note the non-disbursement of project funds, and the unsystematic discussion of M&E activities and the reasons for changing them in mid -project.

a. Quality of ICR Rating : Satisfactory