

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW (PIR) 2001

UNDP/GEF PIR Report' 01

Purpose: To determine the status of all GEF projects under implementation, assess their performance and derive lessons to improve design and implementation of GEF projects in the future

1 Basic Project Data

1.1 Identifiers

Official Title:	Mountain Areas Conservancy Project (MACP)
UNDP Project Number:	PAK/98/G31
Bureau:	RBAP
Country/Host:	Pakistan
Focal Area:	BIODIVERSTIY
Operational Program:	Mountain Ecosystems
Date of entry in WP (MM/DD/YY):	10/20/98
ProDoc Signature date (MM/DD/YY):	6/17/99
Duration (months):	84

1.2 Brief Project Description

The MACP aims at protecting the rich biological heritage of the Karakoram, Hindu Kush and Western Himalayan Mountain ranges, advancing a comprehensive package of interventions to address threats to biological diversity. The MACP is based on the premise that in the long run, conservation interventions are unlikely to mitigate threats to biological diversity unless communities are actively involved. The project has three principle thrusts: first, to empower, organize and boost the capacity of local communities to conserve biodiversity at an ecological landscape level; second, to enhance the relative values of wild resources (as a conservation incentive) by promoting their sustainable use; and third, to create a conducive policy, legislative and financial framework for community-based conservation. The focus, therefore, is on empowering local communities to manage ecosystems and wild resources, making them accountable for the quality of their stewardship. A representative sample of biomes will be protected through the creation of four Conservancies (Managed Resource Protected Areas). Within the Conservancies, activities will engender the in-situ conservation of habitats and species and promote sustainable uses of biological resources.

1.3 Executing Agency

Type: Government

Name: Ministry of Environment, Local Government and Rural Development

1.4 Contacts

Res Rep: Mr. Onder Yucer

Country Office Focal Point: Ms. Razina Bilgrami

Project Director: Mr. Mahboob Elahi (up to June 2001)
 Tel: (92-51) 9201145
 Fax: (92-51) 9202211

Project Manager/Coordinator: Dr. Christopher C. Shank
 Tel: (92-51) 2270686-90
 Fax: (92-51) 2270688

1.6 Basic Financial Data

Funding Source	Institution Name	Acronym (if any)	Amount \$
GEF funding:			\$ 8,100,000
Co-financing			
▪ UNDP (TRAC):			\$ 1,500,000
• UN Agency:			
• Multilateral Donors			
• Others (Please specify using the list of funding sources provided in the instruction sheet):	Government of Pakistan	GoP	\$ 750,000
Total Funding for Co-financing:			\$ 2,250,000
Total Funding for project:			\$10,350,000
Associated Project Funding:			\$ 5,972,000

2. Project Performance**2.1 DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE****2.1.1 PROJECT IMPACT (Progress towards achievement of development objective)**

Please provide level of indicator achievement and kindly provide a realistic rate of the PROJECT IMPACT by comparing actual level achieved as of end of June 2001 to target values and timeframes provided in the Indicators.

Development Objective	Indicator(s) (incl. Target Value & Time Frame)	Actual level Achieved	Source of Verification	1999 Rating	2000 Rating	2001 Rating																																																														
To protect and ensure the sustainable use of biodiversity in Pakistan's Karakoram, Hindu Kush, and Western Himalayan mountain ranges through application of a community-based conservation paradigm.	<p>(1) Increase in number and distribution of keystone species observed in sample plot areas, as shown below: Baseline (1998) versus 7 years (2006) shown in parenthesis:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Species/ Site</th> <th>Khyber (Gojal)</th> <th>SKB (NP)</th> <th>Arkari (TM)</th> <th>Goleen (Qashqar)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ibex</td> <td>120(200)</td> <td>230(300)</td> <td>200(275)</td> <td>60(90)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Markhor</td> <td>-</td> <td>50(100)</td> <td>-</td> <td>30 (50)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S.Leopard</td> <td>2 (4)</td> <td>4 (7)</td> <td>5 (8)</td> <td>?</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(2) No decrease in the number of rare plant species or the number of vertebrate species currently found in the Conservancies over the life of the Project.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Species #</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Gojal</th> <th>NP</th> <th>TM</th> <th>Qashqar</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rare Plants</td> <td>109</td> <td>17</td> <td>39</td> <td>64</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mammals</td> <td>45</td> <td>18</td> <td>23</td> <td>21</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Birds (breeding)</td> <td>86</td> <td>32</td> <td>53</td> <td>48</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amphibians</td> <td>6</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reptiles</td> <td>32</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>32</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fish</td> <td>19</td> <td>16</td> <td>16</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(3) Improvement in habitat quality (increase in native species composition and biomass) for selected high pastures. Baselines and study sites will be established during the first growing season.</p>	Species/ Site	Khyber (Gojal)	SKB (NP)	Arkari (TM)	Goleen (Qashqar)	Ibex	120(200)	230(300)	200(275)	60(90)	Markhor	-	50(100)	-	30 (50)	S.Leopard	2 (4)	4 (7)	5 (8)	?	Species #	Total	Gojal	NP	TM	Qashqar	Rare Plants	109	17	39	64	20	Mammals	45	18	23	21	21	Birds (breeding)	86	32	53	48	72	Amphibians	6	1	1	6	6	Reptiles	32	5	5	32	32	Fish	19	16	16	9	9	Please see Section 2.1.3	<p>1) Standardized trend surveys from fixed observation points</p> <p>2) Nothing specified</p> <p>(3)Transect and vegetation biomass surveys Remote sensing data</p>	(Project Initiation June 17, 1999) NA	(Project funding received November, staff hired by July, 2000) NA	(Revised indicators and baselines are being established) NA
Species/ Site	Khyber (Gojal)	SKB (NP)	Arkari (TM)	Goleen (Qashqar)																																																																
Ibex	120(200)	230(300)	200(275)	60(90)																																																																
Markhor	-	50(100)	-	30 (50)																																																																
S.Leopard	2 (4)	4 (7)	5 (8)	?																																																																
Species #	Total	Gojal	NP	TM	Qashqar																																																															
Rare Plants	109	17	39	64	20																																																															
Mammals	45	18	23	21	21																																																															
Birds (breeding)	86	32	53	48	72																																																															
Amphibians	6	1	1	6	6																																																															
Reptiles	32	5	5	32	32																																																															
Fish	19	16	16	9	9																																																															

Kindly accompany a brief explanation in case the project is rated (HS) Highly satisfactory or (U) Unsatisfactory.

2.1.2 Assumptions identified in relation to the Achievement of the Development Objective

- a) Please review the major Assumptions identified **in project design** and list any new ones identified **later during implementation**
- b) Assess the probability that the Assumption will hold: high (H), substantial (S), modest (M), low (L).

Assumptions identified in project design	Probability that it WILL hold
Communities have both material and moral reasons to protect wildlife.	H
Species populations are able to recover from past over-exploitation and Conservancies provide for minimum species survival needs (i.e., are ecologically viable in the long-term). Probability is from H to L depending upon species. Average is Substantial.	S
Established checks and balances can hold communities accountable for management, and ensuring sustainable use.	S
The project enhances the existing baseline of conservation effort by expanding the geographic scope and buffering adjacent PAs from excessive threats.	M
New assumptions identified during implementation:	
The communities have skills to manage internal conflicts over the use and access of local natural resources.	S
The Federal and Provincial governments are capable (and have genuine interest) to enforce conservation policies in NWFP and Northern Areas.	M
Religious elements will allow women to participate in conservation activities.	L

2.1.3 Descriptive Assessment of Project Impact (achievement of development objective)

- c) In the light of: (i) the level of indicator achievement; (ii) rating assigned; and (iii) assumptions listed in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, please provide a brief narrative assessment of the progress made since last year towards the achievement of the development objective and more specifically, the contribution to the respective GEF operational programme (for example, conservation and sustainable use of mountain ecosystems, promoting the adoption of renewable energy, etc.).

Revising the Impact Indicators

MACP is currently in the process of revising its Impact Indicators in the recognition that those defined in the Project Document (page # 39) are not operational. Some of the problems noted are:

- The number of individual ibex, markhor, and snow leopard noted as baseline were informed guesses or sample results. To accurately determine large mammal numbers is not feasible, so it will not be possible to determine if the goal is achieved.
- To determine that there is no decrease in the number of rare species is not possible. It is a well-know philosophical tenet that it is not possible to empirically demonstrate an entity's non-existence. As well, to search for each of the 863 species noted as rare is beyond the scope of this project.
- Improvement of habitat quality is not clearly defined.

The project has proposed the following revised set of Impact Indicators with associated methodology:

1. *At the end of 7 years, a statistically significant increase in the number of markhor, ibex, blue sheep, and urial will be shown in selected valleys: [Methodology: linear regression analysis from standardised point count data aggregated by nullah]*
2. *At the end of 7 years, there will be a perceived increase in the number of snow leopards in selected valleys. [Methodology: Reliable local people will be interviewed for their perception of trend in snow leopard populations and/or Snow Leopard Information Management System (SLIMS) data .]*
3. *At the end of 7 years, there will be no more than a 5% decline in the aerial extent of high quality (tentatively defined as >50% crown closure) natural forest in each Conservancy. [Methodology: Ecological classification of Landsat 7 imagery at project start and close will be analysed for aerial extent of the high quality forest type.]*
4. *At the end of 7 years, the aerial extent of delineated high quality alpine pastureland (tentatively >70% ground cover in late summer) will not have declined in any Conservancy. [Methodology: Ecological classification of Landsat 7 imagery at project start and close will be analysed for the aerial proportion of alpine pastures of high quality.]*
5. *At the end of 7 years, there will be a statistically significant increase in mid-summer vegetative biomass of selected high pastures. [Methodology: Plots will be clipped along random transects and the vegetation dried and weighed. Local people will be trained to undertake this task. Linear regression analysis.]*

The Project is currently testing these indicators. For example, ground truthing will determine whether crown closure of <>50% is detectable.

The implications of these indicators are that there will almost certainly be no firm conclusions regarding the impact of the project prior to the project end. In the case of indicators one and five, there is considerable between year experimental error resulting in the necessity of a number of years of data to establish trend. In the case of indicators three and four, there will be only two measures done; at project start and project end. If it proves feasible to use SLIMS data, trend will be determined. If local perceptions are to be used, a single study will be done at project end.

Based on these indicators, it will be difficult to quantitatively track MACP's approach to achievement of impact indicators on a year-to-year basis. However, some quantitative and anecdotal data can be provided.

SUMMARY OF MARKHOR POPULATION SURVEYS

Project Valley	Survey Time	Total No. Observed
<u>NORTHERN AREAS</u>		
Skoyo-Karabathang-Basingo	Dec. 1995	58
	Jan. 1996	82
	Feb. 1997	42
	Dec. 1998	37
Skoyo-Karabathang-Basingo/ Baghicha-Khumara	May 1999	71
	Nov. 2000	45
	Dec. 2000	34
	Jan. 2001	71
Mushtkin-Dashkin-Turbelin	April 2001	22
Bunji	May 1997	15
	Dec. 1997	28
	Dec. 1998	21
	Nov. 2000	45
<u>NWFP</u>		
Goleen Gol	Dec. 1997	6
	Dec. 2000	0
	Dec. 2001	3
Madaklasht	Dec. 1997	10
Mahudand	Dec. 1997	28
	Mar. 1998	68
	Dec. 2000	12
Koghuzi	Dec. 2001	19
	Dec. 2001	13

These data illustrate the considerable variability in between-year observations arising from the vagaries of weather, differences in survey methodology, idiosyncratic animal movements, observer skill, and so on. To detect trend in such variable data entails either very large changes or many data points. Every effort is being made to standardize the surveys to reduce the amount of variability.

SUMMARY OF IBEX POPULATION SURVEYS

Project Valley	Survey Time	Total No. Observed
Northern Areas		
KHYBER	Nov.1995	43
	Feb.1996	63
	Jun.1996	76
	Dec.1996	37
	Feb.1997	150
	May 1997	26
	Dec.1997	95
	Feb.1998	128
	Dec.1998	152
	Dec.1999	287
Skoyo-Karabathang Basingo	Dec.1995	28
	Jan.1996	218
	Sep.1996	37
	Feb.1997	64
	Dec.1998	170
	May 1999	225
	Dec.2000	64
Dashkin-Mushkin	Feb.1997	09
Shagrathang Kachura	Dec.1996	37
	Feb.1997	78
	Nov.1998	234
	May 1999	225
	Dec.1999	226
Basho	May 1998	45
	Dec.1999	55
Boiber	Nov. 2000	48
Sokhtarabad	Nov. 2000	84
NWFP		
Arkari	Dec.1997	198
	Dec.2000	295
Madaklasht	Dec.1997	57
Mahodand	Dec.1997	13
	Dec.2000	19
Tirich	Dec.2000	146
Lut Uvir	Dec.2000	18
Laspur	Dec.2000	218
Goleen	Dec.2000	50
Bhab	Dec.2000	9
Gabral	Dec.2000	9

Both Khyber and Shagarthang-Kachura show statistically significant and positive regression coefficients ($p = .008$ and 0.02 respectively). This suggests that PRIF/MACP has been successful in increasing ibex numbers over a period of 6 years. It also indicates that the survey methodology is sensitive enough to establish trend. It might also be noted that the ibex target noted in the Project Document for Khyber was achieved before the Project began fieldwork and for Arkari only 6 months after field work was initiated. Trend analysis over the life of the project is a more robust indicator of project impact..

In summer 2001, the project partially funded a joint expedition of the Pakistan Museum of Natural History and Oxford University to Gojal to quantify components of biodiversity; primarily insects. The areas found to be entomologically the richest of any surveyed were those pastures that the Khyber community had set aside for ibex range. This demonstrates that trophy hunting programs have cascading effects that ultimately benefit biodiversity right down to the invertebrate level.

In winter, local people often overnight their sheep and goats in rock huts that have an opening in the roof. Snow leopards sometimes jump through this hole and into the hut to kill livestock. They commonly cannot jump out and become trapped. Not unreasonably, local people generally kill the snow leopard. But, in the past 3 years, there have been at least two cases in which project staff have been called and snow leopards have been released. This indicates a growing awareness of environmental issues in the communities.

- d) If there has been a change in ratings since 2000 please briefly discuss the reasons.
-Not Applicable-

2.2 IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES

2.2.1 Implementation Progress

Please provide a realistic level of indicator achievement and kindly rate the progress towards the achievement of the Immediate Objectives by comparing actual level achieved as of end of June 2001 to target values and timeframes provided in the Indicators.

Immediate Objective	Indicator(s)	Actual level achieved	Source of Verification	1999 Rating	2000 Rating	2001 Rating
Establishment and effective long-term management of four community-based Conservancies covering wide ecological landscapes, zoned for multiple uses, and backstopped by an enabling institutional, policy regulatory, and financial framework.	(1) Government approval of legal establishment of 4 Conservancies (2) Reduction in livestock numbers (3) Evidence of application of hunting regulations (4) Evidence of application of forest management regulations (5) Evidence of application of zoning strategies (6) Harvest quotas applied for wild resource use	(1) Thirteen VCCs were formed during the PRIF. New VCCs are at the formation stage. Once the VCCs have been formed, work can be initiated for the legal establishment of Conservancies. (2) MACP initiated 20 livestock surveys to establish livestock numbers in sample pastures. The figures in Project Document are rough estimates. There is no clear direction on how to reduce livestock. (3) Assistant Commissioner (Astore) sentenced two men for two years imprisonment and fined Rs. 4,000 under the Wildlife Conservation Act (1975) on June 9, 2001. In NWFP, the Wildlife Department fined a poacher in Mahodand Valley. (4) We have no evidence that forest management regulations are being applied in the Conservancies. We will be implementing two forest management plans starting in fall 2001, which hopes of filling this void. (5) The only evidence of zoning is the home grown approach taken by Shimshal without project assistance. Once MACP's ecological classification and mapping is completed, we will be in a position to undertake zoning. (6) Harvest quotas for ibex and markhor are being effectively applied in Northern Areas and NWFP.	(1) PC-1, Notifications (2) AKRSP reports, village records, Sample surveys (3) VCC records, Police reports (4) Government records, DCC records (5) DCC, VCC records (6) DCC, VCC records	NA	NA	S
Project as a whole:				NA	NA	S

Assumptions identified in relation to the Achievement of the Immediate Objectives

- e) Please list/ review the major Assumptions identified in project design or later during implementation
 f) Assess the probability that the assumption will hold: high (H), substantial (S), modest (M), low (L).

Immediate Objective Number	Assumptions	Probability that it WILL hold
1	(1) The communities are willing to adapt their land-use practices in order to facilitate biodiversity conservation.	S
1	(2) Current Government commitment to decentralize systems of conservation management and support community- based conservation will be maintained. The transfer to communities of usufruct rights over wild resources will provide a utilitarian incentive for better long-term management.	H
1	(3) Sufficient and high-quality human resources can be mobilized in order to implement the project.	S
	New assumptions identified during implementation	
1	(4) The communities are willing to voluntarily reduce size of livestock.	M
1	(5) The government in NWFP and Northern Areas is willing to reform wildlife policies.	S
1	(6) The federal government is willing to allow MACP to use GPS and satellite imagery maps in the field areas.	S
1	(7) The valley level committees will be willing to work with each other at the Conservancy level.	S
1	(8) The communities have some opportunities of economic benefit from the conservation initiatives.	M

2.2.3 Descriptive Assessment of Implementation Progress and Achievement Ratings

- a) In the light of: (i) the level of indicator achievement; (ii) ratings assigned; and (iii) assumptions listed in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, please provide a brief narrative assessment of implementation progress since July 2000 and project risks.

Indicator No. 1

Legally establishing the Conservancies is a long-term goal entailing considerable foundation-building including establishment of active and knowledgeable VCCs, development of effective VCPs, and well-established civil society/governmental linkages through such institutions as the DCCs. MACP is working slowly but effectively at providing such a foundation

MACP held 294 community meetings since July 2000 with local communities. The objective was to mobilize communities for the formation of Valley Conservation Committees (VCCs) and to revitalize PRIF VCCs. As a result of these meetings, MACP has received 95 initial resolutions from new communities indicating their willingness to work with MACP. The Social Mobilization Strategy and Spatial Plan were

reviewed and discussed with the partner agencies. The PRIF VCCs were reactivated and meetings were held regularly during the last year. The VCC formation process slowed down during the First Quarter 2001 when long-established conflicts over use of and access to natural resources surfaced. Emphasis is being placed on establishing viable VCCs rather than on speed of VCC formation. Once the Valley level committees are formed and notified at the District level, it will be appropriate to initiate the process of obtaining government's approval of the Conservancies. Eight District Conservation Committee (DCC) meetings were held during the last year to build momentum towards this notification.

Indicator No. 2

The Project Document provides baseline livestock numbers and target reduction levels. These numbers are estimates and it will be difficult to empirically document a decline in numbers though time based on such an approach. To address this problem, MACP initiated a livestock census methodology in 2001 in which numbers of animals moving to specific high pastures are enumerated.

The livestock surveys were difficult to conduct for a variety of reasons. In Qashqar and Tirichmir Conservancies, most of the communities consider it a sign of the "evil eye" to count their herds. In Nanga Parbat and Gojal Conservancies, some communities were apprehensive about MACP's intentions in counting livestock in the fear that the Project might restrict their numbers. Nevertheless, MACP has been successful in establishing livestock numbers in sample pastures.

Currently, MACP has no clear model for how to reduce livestock numbers. Trophy hunting provides the incentive to set aside a few high pastures, but this is limited in spatial scope. Altering temporal and spatial use patterns that have evolved over the centuries would be an arrogant and probably an ineffective approach. The fact that people value number of livestock more than livestock production (money, meat, or milk) represents a major hurdle that forecloses many management options.

Indicator No. 3

MACP has decided to place major emphasis on implementing two forest management plans in the Nanga Parbat Conservancy. Two expatriate foresters have been recruited through the British agency "Volunteer Services Overseas" and will begin work in October. Northern Areas Administration has agreed to pair these experts with counterpart officers. Together, this MACP/government team will live in the target communities and work closely with the local people to help them institute sustainable forest practices, to assist them in regaining control of their forests, and to put into place supportive government policy and procedures.

In the Qashqar Conservancy, efforts are being made to liaise with the forestry component of the Malakand Rural Development Program (MRDP) by involving the VCCs in joint forest management initiatives.

Indicator No. 4

Land use zoning will be undertaken as part of valley conservation planning once functioning VCCs are in place and once MACP has useful map products to be used in the zoning process. The development of land cover and GIS maps is proceeding but is hampered by Government's refusal to allow MACP access to government maps.

Indicator No. 5

Several lines of evidence suggest that government and communities are now beginning to apply existing wildlife regulations. In Northern Areas, two men were sentenced for poaching in Astore, Nanga Parbat Conservancy. They were charged under the section 10 of the Wildlife Conservation Act 1975 on June 9, 2001. The court awarded them two years of imprisonment and a fine of Rs2,000 each. If the accused cannot pay the fine, they will undergo a further two-month imprisonment. In NWFP, a poacher was charged under the Wildlife laws and was fined for hunting ibex in the Mahodand Valley.

It was reported that a high level government official was heard to complain that he has been unable to hunt recently in the Nanga Parbat Conservancy because MACP had raised the local consciousness about poaching to a level that the community would not allow him to hunt.

A recent incident of poaching in Chitral Gol National Park, adjacent to the Tirichmir Conservancy, is being raised at the very highest levels of government because of the allegations of political influence exercised.

Assumption No. 1

Adopting land-use practices that facilitate biodiversity conservation is a complex process. The success depends on the mutual relationships of communities in any valley. Those valleys in which communities belong to the same faith and have fewer conflicts over the natural resources are more certain of success. It is difficult to develop land use plans in valleys in which internal conflicts are abundant or in which people are of different sects. MACP staff have received training in conflict resolution and are expecting to be more effective in addressing local conflicts in future.

Assumption No. 2

The present government is committed to decentralization of powers and there is a reasonable probability that the government will transfer commons rights over wild resources to the communities.

Assumption No. 3

The project is hampered by lack of capacity and training in several key staff members. Considerable training will be required to transfer the necessary skills to team members.

Assumption No. 4

MACP has no clear idea of how to reduce livestock numbers in a manner that would be palatable to communities. Moreover, the project has no influence on the presence of livestock owned by nomadic *Gujjars* because these people cannot be included in the conservation committees due to their seasonal presence in the Conservancies and the complex system of users' rights.

Assumption No. 5

The policy reform process with the governments of NWFP and Northern Areas has been initiated but it is still too early to determine if concerned governments are genuinely interested in policy reform.

Assumption No. 6

There have been rumors that the intelligence agencies do not allow use of GPS devices in the field and have confiscated field equipment from other organizations. The project has recently started using GPS in the field and reaction of the government agencies still has to be seen. It is also unclear whether Government will allow possession of detailed GIS maps in the field.

Assumption No. 7

The Project has found that village level conservation committees are easy to form. However, it takes much time and effort to move from the village to the valley level. In some cases, the local communities have old feuds and are unable to even attend the same meeting. How reasonable the assumption is that valley level committees will cooperate at the Conservancy level is unknown. An added layer of complexity is that the Nanga Parbat and Qashqar Conservancies are spread over two government Districts.

Assumption No. 8

The communities have varying opportunities to benefit from the sustainable-use of natural resources. For example, a large number of communities have no opportunity for trophy hunting, the main conservation attraction during the past years. It is hoped that the project will find meaningful alternative incentives in the near future for conserving local biodiversity.

b) If there has been a change in ratings since 2000 please briefly discuss the reasons.

-Not Applicable-

2.3 Challenges

Please mention any significant policy, institutional, managerial, scientific and technical challenges/ issues that have arisen during project implementation, including changes in project assumptions.

MACP faced the following major challenges during the last year:

- (1) MACP discovered that the geographic definition of a valley is often different from the local perception of a valley. Local people do not think in terms of geography and perceive valleys in terms of historical and social relationships. There are two manners in which the local concept of a valley differs from the geographic definition. The first type, typified by Manur and Begusht, are situated geographically in one valley, but the people have separate pastures and historical relationships and consider themselves as separate valleys. In the second type, there are a number of geographic valleys but the people have shared pastures and natural resources and therefore must form one valley level committee. An example of such a valley is Arkari (Tirichmir Conservancy) where people of three valleys have one VCC. The practical result is that MACP has several very small and several very large valleys.

In small valleys like Begusht and Manur, the project has few opportunities for initiating demo projects and other conservation initiatives. In the case of larger valleys, it is not possible to hold valley level meetings and ensure formation of broad-based conservation committees.

- (2) MACP has discovered that different villages in a single valley may have rights over only specific resources in certain areas leading to considerable local complexity. Moreover, there are some valleys on which villages have been in litigation for years over access to natural resources. Conflicts appeared when the project tried to form valley level committees. Managing local conflicts proved to be a slower process than expected and project staff needed to hold many more community meetings than they had anticipated. In general, the process of VCC formation is taking much longer than anticipated.
- (3) The PRIF VCCs in NWFP were formed hastily without broad community participation. In some cases, they appear to have never existed in functional form. The project staff in NWFP have found it necessary to start from the village level even in PRIF areas.
- (4) Local people have little knowledge of conservation plans in the PRIF communities now included in the Qashqar and Tirichmir Conservancies. It was discovered that the conservation plans were written during the PRIF phase without consulting the communities and in some instances, the signatures of community members were falsified. After the formation of VCCs, the project will ensure that the conservation plans are drafted with broad community participation.
- (5) The requisite number of Social Organizers (SOs) was determined during project planning on the basis of valleys identified. However, project staff must address social mobilization at the village level, especially with women and in the areas where AKRSP is absent. MACP is currently using the services of motivators on daily wage basis to assist SOs in social mobilization at the village level.
- (6) Organizing women sub-committees at the valley level has proven to be difficult everywhere except for the Gojal Conservancy. The main obstacles are the long distances that women need to travel within the valleys and the reluctance of men and the Muslim clergy to allow women organizations. Even in areas where clergy and the male populace are supportive of women's participation, it is hard for the local women to organize themselves at the valley level because women cannot travel on their own to hold meetings. To attract women in Gojal Conservancy, the project provided fuel-efficient stoves on demonstration basis. The small-scale intervention proved successful in organizing women and the Project is considering replicating its approach in other valleys.
- (7) Because women are usually illiterate (especially in Qashqar and Tirichmir Conservancies), Women Organizations (WOs) need to depend upon men for the maintenance of the organizational record. This has resulted in greater male influence over the WOs.
- (8) Traditional Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) resulted in increasing expectations for productive infrastructure in some areas. Moreover, the information obtained from PRA exercises was of little use for the project. MACP quickly realized the limitations of traditional PRA approach and came up with the concept of "Participatory Conservation Planning". A tailored "Need Resource Management" tool was developed. The tool proved helpful in reducing unnecessary community expectations and generated relevant information for the Conservation Plans.
- (9) Interacting with the "Environmental Education Program in Support of MACP" (funded by European Union and implemented by WWF) was a challenge for MACP management. WWF has the MACP sub-contract for Output 2 (Education and Awareness), as well as the EU Project. The major considerations were to keep activities of both projects separate for audit purposes, but at the same time, to workout mechanisms for their integration in complementary manner. The objective was achieved by modification in the activities of both the projects. These changes were communicated to the UNDP-Pakistan and the European Union.
- (10) Integration of WWF staff into the IUCN implemented Project has proven challenging because of the different organizational and staff procedures and the confused lines of authority. Sub-contracts should be kept distinct from the main project.
- (11) Developing a common understanding of survey methodology was another challenge for MACP during the past year. Field teams have different levels of understanding about the methodological issues of baseline surveys. The need for shared survey

methodology was identified at an early stage. Shared survey methodology will result in compatible data and it would be possible for MACP to replicate methodology at the later stage for impact assessment.

- (12) The local people have expectations that MACP will take a strong stand on poaching, even outside the Conservancy areas. MACP has been providing legal and technical support to the local communities. However, there is a fine line between helping the communities and becoming a party in poaching cases. To maintain a balance was a great challenge for the regional teams during the last years.
- (13) District Conservation Committees (DCCs) were established under the PRIF for the sole purpose of serving project needs. MACP has expanded the scope of the committees to address all district-level conservation issues and to involve all stakeholders. Setting the roles, responsibilities and membership of self-sustaining DCCs has proven difficult.
- (14) A lot of confusion surrounded the concept of GEF co-financing. Initial attempts by field staff to explain it to partners led to some misunderstandings that required significant damage control. Somehow, co-financing should be made more intuitive.
- (15) During the PRIF phase, the communities in Qashqar and Tirichmir Conservancies were told that MACP would address all the infrastructure needs of local communities. Despite clarifications, the people still have hopes and expectations that MACP will deliver major infrastructure projects. This misunderstanding has the potential to undermine social mobilization initiatives.
- (16) Strategy guidelines for demonstration projects were developed during the last year. The project is facing difficulties in identifying demonstration projects that will simultaneously enhance local incomes and lead to sustainable harvest. Developing shared understanding with field teams about the objectives and structure of demo projects has been a challenge.
- (17) MACP learnt that the foreign hunters and outfitters are unaware of the legal requirements of trophy hunting in Pakistan. This has led to some unfortunate instances. MACP contracted out a trophy hunting web site to provide authentic information to the potential hunters. The web site will be up by the end of September 2001.
- (18) The Project Document states that MACP will develop Model Wildlife Law for Pakistan. This approach failed catastrophically during the PRIF. MACP has decided to replace this approach with that of enabling legal change through development of wildlife and biodiversity policy.
- (19) Pakistani law does not allow development of a Trust Fund in such a manner as to meet UNDP requirements. At least four exemptions from the federal law are required. These can be acquired, but there is a difference of legal opinion on how secure such exemptions are in the long-term. If they were to be revoked, the GEF monies would be recovered by UNDP thereby terminating the Fund. The decision as to whether to incorporate the Fund in Pakistan or outside the country is delaying progress.

2.4 Remedial Action

For all projects rated "unsatisfactory" on either measure (impact or implementation progress), for projects where ratings have declined since 1999 and for specific challenges identified in section 2.3, please include here a description of actions being taken to address implementation problems. Please specify who should be responsible for such actions and tentative time frame.

-Not Applicable-

2.5 Biodiversity Projects Only

Projects dealing with sustainable uses of protected areas, species and land races are an important component of the portfolio and pose some special challenges of long-term sustainability, maximum permissible resource uses, participation/governance, compatibility with maintenance of overall ecosystem-level biodiversity, etc. Please describe the most important difficulties found in the implementation of this project, and suggest some alternatives to be considered in future project designs.

MACP found the following main difficulties in the implementation of project activities:

Long-term sustainability

1. It is becoming increasingly apparent that most communities will require the continued presence and encouragement of project staff to maintain project initiatives. A frequent complaint is that project staff do not spend enough time in the community. During the hiatus between the close of the PRIF and the onset of MACP field activities, much of the momentum was lost in PRIF valleys. For example, a village conservation centre constructed during the PRIF became a goat shed. As the project mobilizes more and more valleys, an increasing amount of time will be required on "community maintenance". With the small MACP staff and the huge geographical scope of the project, it will clearly not be possible to provide the necessary level of continuing support.
2. The Project Document makes the tacit assumption that many activities (social mobilization, partner involvement in conservation planning, demonstration projects, etc) can take place simultaneously and rapidly. The project is finding that developing the VCCs is the key activity and that it takes a great amount of time to do it correctly. Experience from the PRIF in NWFP demonstrates the long-term consequences of cutting corners in community organization. MACP must allow communities to develop trust in MACP, to understand conservation issues, and to resolve rivalries and conflicts between communities. This takes time but until it is completed, it is very difficult to initiate the other Project components. Project design should take into account the sequential nature of project activities and should respect communities' fears of being coerced into taking part in a project that they do not fully understand.
3. MACP staff discovered that the conservation message is effective for those communities having some remaining natural resources that are being rapidly depleted. The communities having an abundance of, or very few, resources are not particularly interested in the conservation issues. Extra efforts are needed to mobilize people in such areas.
4. MACP is currently co-signatory to the conservation funds. Experience shows that without this oversight, the Fund resources are generally misused. The Project has not yet worked out an effective exit strategy that will allow community control over their Funds while ensuring that the monies are used for the intended purposes.
5. MACP learned that compliance to existing conservation plans is greater in those areas in which AKRSP is active. While analyzing the possible reasons, it was discovered that those communities having established organizational structures were much better equipped to undertake conservation. In communities in which formal organization was weakly rooted in the community, conservation plans were usually ignored. Future projects must ensure that sufficient time is allowed for developing strong social structures upon which to build conservation initiatives.
6. The capacity of Wildlife and Forest Departments in community based conservation planning and implementation is essential for the long-term sustainability of conservation initiatives. Once the project ends, government must maintain the momentum. Community-based conservation requires many field visits and continuous contact with the communities. To enhance the capacity of the government officials, MACP staff is taking them on almost all field visits so that they develop an understanding of community-based conservation. At the current levels at which the Wildlife Department is funded, these field visits cannot be continued following the close of the project.

Maximum permissible resource uses

1. Sustainable use implies a harvestable surplus. In most situations, community needs exceed sustainable levels. Moving to sustainability can be achieved only by a) harvesting in a manner that life needs are met at lower harvest levels, or b) offsetting losses to life needs from lower harvests by inputs from outside resources (paying people not to harvest). MACP is premised entirely on the former solution. Rather than shoot several markhor unsustainably for meat, it makes more sense to sell one unproductive animal to a foreign hunter and to buy meat from the market with the \$20,000 realized. But, it is difficult to see how fuelwood or livestock can be managed more effectively without compensating people directly for the losses entailed in reducing harvest. The conservation community should consider developing models for directly compensating communities for reducing harvest until stocks have returned to levels at which production exceeds required harvest levels. This will likely be a more efficient use of donor monies in terms of conservation results.
2. Much of the enthusiasm for MACP arises from the success of trophy hunting programmes. However, trophy hunting is a viable option in only a few MACP valleys. Demonstration projects are being undertaken on ecotourism, medicinal plants, and forest management in other valleys. Project staff had different levels of understanding regarding demo projects. It took two workshops and numerous informal meetings with the field teams to clarify confusion regarding the objective and structure of demo projects. It is unclear how effective these programmes will be relative to trophy hunting.
3. Because both government and communities benefit monetarily from trophy hunts, it is in the interests of both parties to ensure high population counts during the ibex and markhor surveys. Low counts put the allocation of a quota in jeopardy. There have been instances in which counts have been inflated. The project plays a role of ensuring the validity of the figures. It has not yet been worked out how to ensure the reliability of surveys after the phasing out of MACP.

Participation/Governance

1. MACP faced difficulties in reorganizing the PRIF VCCs. The PRIF VCCs have not held internal elections since their formation. When MACP staff talked about revitalizing the VCCs, the old members felt threatened. In some VCCs, the old members insisted upon withdrawal of their share of the Fund if the project requires a broad representative base for the VCC.
2. Groups with vested interest in natural resources, (among them, reputedly the "Timber Mafia") propagated rumours that the project is introducing snakes and snow leopards into pasturelands. This negative propaganda slowed down project activities and required that extra care be taken in discussing the demo projects with the communities.
3. The national government has not undertaken detailed revenue surveys to fix ownership of the lands in most of the areas of the Conservancies. The legal rights are ambiguous and different communities have conflicting claims over the use and ownership of pastures, forests, wildlife and other natural resources. Even within the communities, different families have differing claims to resource use rights. Many families lack ownership rights but have traditional claims over the use of natural resources. The conflicts are sharpened when people perceive opportunities for benefit from external sources such as MACP. Others see the Project as posing a threat of to their traditional claims. MACP has tried to assure people that it will work only to strengthen resource ownership and control issues.
4. Government control over land is getting weaker in many areas. In Qashqar Conservancy, people are clearing Government land and distributing it for agriculture. Forestland is being distributed on the basis of number of men in each family. Government is unable to stop the people from encroaching on collective forest.

5. Broad community participation is difficult in areas in which land is owned by a small number of often absentee landlords. This is most common in Chitral where the former royal family owns much land and is currently living out of the villages. Absentee owners often have little interest in conservation. One contentious issue is that owners commonly sell grazing rights to *Gujjars* (nomadic herds) despite strong opposition from local people. The local people expect MACP to reform the laws concerning control and use of natural resources.

Others

1. The Spatial Plan of NWFP region developed during the PRIF contained serious mistakes. The information was misleading and the project staff faced difficulties in following the plan. It took three Quarters to completely review the plan and establish factual targets for the conservation efforts in Qashqar and Tirichmir Conservancies.

3. Lessons Learned/Good Practice

Please describe briefly the “lessons learned” and examples of good practice that have resulted from project implementation to date.

- (1) An overall Social Mobilization Strategy provided a framework for organizing communities but was not specific enough for local situations. MACP is devising valley-specific Social Mobilization Strategies consistent with the overall strategy. Social organization must be tailor-made for specific conditions.
- (2) PRIF site activists from the neighboring valleys explained the MACP approach based on their experiences from the PRIF phase. The activists explained biodiversity conservation in local languages, using local examples and idioms. Judicious use of key local people as project proponents is a useful approach to obtaining community buy-in.
- (3) Translation of conservation and biodiversity terms into local languages proved difficult. In most cases, project staff used English terms and explained meanings in Urdu or in local languages. The motivators helped in finding the appropriate metaphors from the local traditions. Using locals as the Project spokespersons is often effective.
- (4) MACP discovered that compliance to the PRIF Conservation Plans is better among communities in which social organization was sound and where contact was maintained during the bridging period between PRIF and MACP. Long-term sustainability depends upon ensuring that the social foundations are solid and upon continual follow-up by Project personnel.
- (5) Because a community submits a resolution indicating a willingness to work with MACP does not mean that they are willing to take part in conservation activities. Often the resolution is made only in the expectation of some benefit. Follow-up meetings are needed to ensure full understanding of the implications of the resolution.
- (6) A written project message was carefully developed to avoid misunderstandings with communities. The message was in Urdu and project teams distributed it after the community meetings. The approach proved helpful in reducing the initial misunderstandings.
- (7) MACP held a gender strategy workshop addressing participation of men and women in conservation planning and implementation activities. Based on the workshop report, a Gender Action Plan was devised to integrate strategic considerations into project activities. This systematic approach has proven to be beneficial to an effective integration of gender issues.
- (8) MACP held training workshops to gender sensitize both its professional and support staff. Including support staff proved helpful in enhancing gender relations within the project teams.
- (9) Involving women in conservation activities had three major constraints.
 - a) local men do not see “value” of women’s participation in conservation activities and are not genuinely interested to include them,
 - b) religious clergy oppose women’s participation on theological grounds, and
 - c) women’s mobility is quite restricted and the large size of valleys makes it impossible for them to be organized at the valley scale. Practically speaking, it will only be possible to engage women in conservation activities in a few areas and usually at a very localized scale.

- (10) MACP tailored PRA methodology to suit conservation planning needs. The tool proved helpful in data collection and its analysis without creating too many expectations among the local communities.
- (11) The MACP Communication and Awareness Strategy was finalized after wide range of consultations with the primary and secondary stakeholders. The structured consultation process was helpful in devising a realistic and relevant strategy.
- (12) MACP established Result Based Management during the last year. The processes forced MACP to establish an elaborated system of result based review and work planning. The process results of tasks and activities were developed in consultation with the field teams. Project management reviewed progress on the basis of result achievement both at individual and team levels. The insights gained in RBM were further used to design review and planning databases. The databases enables MACP to search textual and numeric data on any combination of about 60 fields.
- (13) Engaging partners in MACP activities was helpful in establishing working partnerships at the field office level. It was also learnt that the over identification with partner organizations, especially with the government ones, has potential to disrupt the project activities. In some cases, people perceive MACP as part of the Wildlife Department. The project logo was also helpful in establishing project identity because most of the local people in project areas are illiterate and it is easy for them to remember a logo.
- (14) Sharing a monthly work schedule with partners, especially government partners, proved helpful in synchronizing field activities. The Buni field team experimented with pasting monthly work schedule on front door of the office. It proved helpful for the visitors and community people. The practice is being replicated in other field offices.
- (15) Understanding philosophy of demonstration projects was difficult for project staff. Explaining the philosophy in ordinary easy-to-understand messages for the partner communities was even more difficult. The Urdu and local languages lacks the vocabulary on conservation terms and the words available in local languages have different historical connotations. It was difficult for the field team to avoid using the demo projects as an incentive for social mobilization in community meetings. It was discovered that special sessions with communities on demo projects are useful in communicating the genuine intention of the projects.
- (16) Resource and property ownership in the Conservancies is perceived very differently than in the common-law or Roman-law countries. Often ownership is a "bundle of rights" rather than a single, absolute right. Together with the Northern Areas Conservation Strategy, MACP undertook an exploratory traditional law study to attempt to determine local understandings of resource use and control. It is important to fully understand existing modes of land ownership and resource use and not attempt to impose a foreign model.
- (17) The term "usufruct" was consistently misused as an adjective in the Project Document. A "usufruct" is a right in itself. Under Roman law, a usufruct is provided to an individual (the "usufructuary") to use the property of another so long as that property is not diminished in value. The term is confused with the common-law concept of "commons" in which lands or resources are owned by the collective (usually government) with particular rights granted to the public at large. MACP is largely concerned not with usufructs but with common-law rights.
- (18) The conservation funds established during the PRIF were evaluated in NWFP. In general, the Funds were not properly explained, organized, or monitored and many have been misused. A final lessons learned document on VCF management will be completed after evaluation of funds in Northern Areas.

4. Resources Leveraged

Apart from the co-financing contributions reflected in the budget, how has the project mobilized additional financial resources for either addressing global environmental concerns or financing baseline activities **during** implementation? Please indicate the **amounts** and **sources** of leveraged resources.

Mountain Areas Conservancy Project Analysis of Co-financing Conservancy-wise by Partners For the Year Ended June 30, 2001					
Partners	Conservancies				
	Nanga Parbat	Gojal	Trichmir	Qashqar	Total
US Dollars in thousands					
World Wide Fund for Nature- Pakistan	55	44	20	20	139
Northern Areas Conservation Strategy	14	11	11	11	47
Chitral Conservation Strategy	-	-	6	20	26
NLH University - through AKRSP	180	-	-	-	180
The Aga Khan Rural Support Programme	441	216	246	122	1,025
Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund - through AKRSP	-	49	-	-	49
Environmental Rehabilitation in NWFP and Punjab	-	-	-	42	42
Building and Construction Improvement Programme	23	32	-	11	66
Total	713	352	283	226	1,574

Mountain Areas Conservancy Project Analysis of Co-financing Conservancy-wise by partners For the Year Ended June 30, 2001					
	Nanga Parbat	Gojal	Trichmir	Qashqar	Total
US Dollars in thousands					
Complementary co-financing					
1. Environmental education, awareness and other conservation related support	25	25	20	21	91
2. Sustainable use demonstrations	234	51	-	24	309
3. Bio-diversity strategy development and legal reforms	13	11	17	17	58
Sub total	272	87	37	62	458
Substitutional co-financing					
4. Social development	54	22	19	12	107
5. Training (human resource development)	24	19	42	40	125
6. Physical infrastructure projects	139	72	105	39	355
7. Natural resource management (agriculture, livestock and forestry)	185	17	68	40	310
8. Enterprise development	22	125	2	29	178
9. Micro finance (expenses for group loans)	17	10	10	4	41
Sub total	441	265	246	164	1,116
Total	713	352	283	226	1,574

Mountain Areas Conservancy Project Analysis of Co-financing Output-wise by Partners For the Year Ended June 30, 2001								
	Building local-level planning and management capacities	Education and awareness	Monitoring capacity	Ecologically sustainable developmen t	Sustainable uses of biological resources	Policy, legislative and institutional framework of government	Financial framework	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Partners	US Dollars in thousands							
World Wide Fund for Nature- Pakistan	-	84	-	-	55	-	-	139
Northern Areas Conservation Strategy	-	1	-	-	-	46	-	47
Chitral Conservation Strategy	-	-	-	-	14	12	-	180
NLH University - through AKRSP	-	-	-	-	180	-	-	26
The Aga Khan Rural Support Programme	-	-	-	1,025	-	-	-	1,025
Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund - through AKRSP	-	-	-	49	-	-	-	49
Environmental Rehabilitation in NWFP and Punjab	-	-	-	42	-	-	-	42
Building and Construction Improvement Programme	-	6	-	-	60	-	-	66
Total	-	91	-	1,116	309	58	-	1,574

Mountain Areas Conservancy Project Analysis of Co-financing Output-wise by conservancy For the Year Ended June 30, 2001								
	Outputs							Total
	Building local-level planning and management capacities	Education and awareness	Monitoring capacity	Ecologically sustainable development	Sustainable uses of biological resources	Policy, legislative and institutional framework of government	Financial framework	
Conservancy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	US Dollars in thousands							
Nanga Parbat	-	25	-	441	234	13	-	713
Gojal	-	25	-	265	51	11	-	352
Trichmir	-	20	-	246	-	17	-	283
Qashqar	-	21	-	164	24	17	-	226
Total	-	91	-	1,116	309	58	-	1,574

5. Demonstration, Catalytic Effects and Synergies

- 5.1 Describe efforts to draw and disseminate lessons and transferring knowledge that have had or are expected to have demonstration and replication effects.

MACP funded and facilitated a review of community-based trophy hunting in Pakistan by the Head of the IUCN Species Survival Commission Caprinae Specialist Group. This report made numerous recommendations for the improvement of Pakistan's community-based trophy hunting programmes.

- 5.2 How has the project contributed to bringing about policy or legislation changes in the country, changes in Implementing Agency or other donor strategies – or private business practices – to give stronger emphasis to global environmental issues?

To date, the Project has been doing preparatory work for policy and legal reform. Statutory law reviews were completed or are being finished for the federal government, NAs, and NWFP. An analysis was completed to determine how well existing policies and laws meet the obligations of international conventions. In conjunction with partners, customary law studies are being undertaken in NAs and in Chitral.

One ecotourism operator has agreed to contribute a portion of each trek's earnings to the local Valley Conservation Fund. MACP printed a brochure advertising the trek and the contribution to conservation activities. The impact has not yet been evaluated.

- 5.3 Have there been any interactions/synergies with similar projects in the country/region during project preparation and/or implementation?

MACP has worked effectively with the Northern Areas Conservation Strategy (IUCN), the Chitral Conservation Strategy (IUCN), the Malakand Rural Development Programme, the EC project in support of MACP (WWF), and many of AKRSP's on-going projects. MACP will be working closely with the Protected Areas Management Project in Chitral Gol National Park contiguous to the Tirichmir Conservancy.

6. Further Needs for Information Exchange

Discuss whether the project has further needs for receiving technical and operational knowledge, and suggest areas/issues that could be subject to enhanced knowledge/information exchange.

- (1) Mobilizing communities for conservation is a challenge because the Project has no immediate and tangible incentives to offer. Many conservation benefits take years to become realized. In a poor country like Pakistan, waiting is a luxury that few can afford. MACP would like to better understand the experience of similar projects, preferably in the Asian or Muslim contexts.
- (2) Involving women in conservation is proving to be difficult because of the mix of culture and religion. Experiences elsewhere on how to increase women's participation in decision making and conservation activities within an orthodox Islamic context would be appreciated.
- (3) MACP is currently looking for a very simple accounting system for use by the VCCs. Advice on training modules would also. The project is interested to know experience of other similar projects in pursuing the communities to establish accounting system.

- (4) Documenting co-financing was a new experience for MACP. It would be helpful to know how the other similar projects documented co-financing.

7. Monitoring and Evaluation

7.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures and Tools

Please provide dates, availability of reports, and any relevant comments for each of the following Monitoring and Evaluation tools.

	Date	Report available/comments
Field Visits	There were no GEF visits. The UNDP Programme Manager visited project areas on three occasions. The UNDP Resident Representative visited the field team and a community in June.	Unknown
Annual Project Report (APR)	Previous: November 20, 2000 Next: November 21, 2001	Yes
Tripartite Review (TPR)	Previous: November 24, 2000 Next: Not yet planned As well, there were 4 Project Management Committee meetings and 3 Project Steering Committee Meetings.	Yes
Mid-Term Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Final Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

8. NGO Involvement

8.1 Basic Information

Please enter the following information into the table below for each NGO involved in the project:

Full Name: Please list the full name of the NGO.

Acronym: The official initials of the NGO's name.

Type: Put the cursor over the highlighted word "Type" in the table below to access the different types.

Project Stage: Please indicate where the NGO involvement took place, e.g. preparation (PDF A or PDF B), implementation or evaluation stage.

Role: Put the cursor over the highlighted word "Role" in the table below to access the different roles.

Activity: Brief description of services provided by NGO.

\$ Value: \$ value of contracted project services assigned to NGO (if applicable).

Full Name (Do not give acronym only!)	Acronym	Type	Project Stage	Role	Activity	\$ Value of contracted services
International Union for Conservation of Nature	IUCN	IGO	IMPL	Provider of project services	Overall implementation of the project, coordination of project inputs at all levels (including capacity building and institutional development) and ensuring timely completion of outputs.	7,121,313
World Wide Fund for Nature	WWF	NGO	IMPL	Provider of project services	Implementation of Output 2. Coordination of project inputs and ensuring timely completion of Output 2.	644,421
Aga Khan Rural Support Program	AKRSP	NGO	IMPL	Social Mobilization	AKRSP works in partnership with IUCN-	NIL

Full Name (Do not give acronym only!)	Acronym	Type	Project Stage	Role	Activity	\$ Value of contracted services
					Pakistan to provide the necessary support and technical input for social mobilization.	
Himalayan Wildlife Foundation	HWF	NGO	IMPL		HWF works in partnership with IUCN-P on conservation and social mobilization in Skardu and Diamer Districts.	NIL

8.2 Please indicate factors that have facilitated or contributed to NGO involvement:

- ✓ Project design has been made in close collaboration/building upon structures and channels provided by AKRSP.
- ✓ As an IGO, IUCN has more flexibility and ability to take innovative approaches.
- ✓ Ability to offer higher salaries than are possible within government structure.
- ✓ The operation through IUCN takes a more active and positive approach to gender issues.
- ✓ It is easier for IUCN to develop an integral working relationship with other NGOs.
- ✓ IUCN provides credible and transparent accounting for use of resources.
- ✓ IUCN can draw on considerable in-house expertise.
- ✓ IUCN has global stature providing credibility.
- ✓ Differential areas of expertise exhibited by partner NGOs leads to effective synergies.

8.3 Please indicate factors that have constrained NGO involvement:

- ✓ Personalities

9. Financial Information

9.1 Financial Status (Please enter information if available in Country Office, otherwise this section will be filled out in HQ)

- Planned disbursements (\$millions) from beginning of project to 6/30/01 \$ 1,537,198
- Actual disbursements (\$millions) \$ 1,135,358 (as of March 2001)
- Timing of disbursement (percentage of planned vs actual expenditures): 73.86%
- Date/Period of First Disbursement: October 1999

9.2 Procurement Data (please refer to instruction sheet for details)

Note : For projects or project components executed by UNOPS this section ***must not*** be filled in - data will be provided by UNOPS headquarters-.

Please report the **US\$ value** of UNDP/GEF Payments to Supplying Countries for Procurement in GEF Donor Countries. Please enter Project **expenditure** from project start up until June 30, 2001 into the matrix against the donor country **supplying** the personnel, sub-contract, equipment and training to the project.

Supplying Country (only donor countries)	Personnel (in US\$)	Sub-contracts (in US\$)	Equipment (in US\$)	Training (in US\$)	Total (in US\$)
Canada	171				171
Japan			102		102
United Kingdom				8	8
Italy		8			8
Pakistan	279	381	124	72	856
USA				9	9

(*Note data are calculated from the expenditure reports from 1999 and 2000 adding one-half the budgeted expenditures for 2001)

Please calculate the following ratio:

Procurement from donor countries as a % of total project expenditure from project start up to June 30, 2001:

9.3 Audit Requirements for Government and NGO Executed Projects

The UN Board of Auditors has established that an annual audit is necessary for all Nationally Executed and NGO Executed GEF projects, whose expenditures for the calendar year (January - December) exceed \$20,000. Expenditures below that amount are subject to normal UNDP audit procedures, which is once in the project's lifetime.

According to the above regulations, please indicate:

- For which calendar year's expenditures, an audited financial statements have been issued;

January 2000-December 2000

- Which will be next calendar year for which an audit will next occur:

January 2001-December 2001

- Date of Submission to HQ UNDP Office of Audit and Performance Review, National Execution Audit Section:

29 May, 2001

- If the report has not been received from the Government or NGO, please comment on actions taken by the Country Office to ensure compliance.

There were no negative comments in the audit report, except for minor observations.

- If the Audit Report contains negative comments, please indicate what actions have been taken by the Government or NGO.

- N/A

Your Opinion:

Please make any comments you might have on the PIR questionnaire, the PIR process or other PIR related matters. Your comments will help us to improve the PIR process for the next year.

Many of the sections deal with “challenges” and “lessons-learned” resulting in considerable duplication of reporting, particularly of aspects of implementation that are not working as well as might be hoped. This may lead to inappropriate conclusions that projects are underperforming.

The procurement section (9.2) is not particularly well explained in the questionnaire or the instructions. It would help if the intent and level of accuracy required were explained, a list of GEF donor countries provided, and the explanations sharpened.

Since the UNDP fiscal and reporting year is January 1 – December 31, it would be most appropriate to undertake the PIR at that time and perhaps integrate it with the UNDP Annual Programme Review.

Addendum—Private Sector Involvement in UNDP-GEF Projects Under Implementation

A. If the project is benefiting from such private sector resources, please answer the following five questions for each company involved in the project.

1. What is the name and type of company (local, national, multi-national)?

Lost Horizon Treks and Tours
Local

2. What economic sector does the company work in (e.g., tourism, fisheries, forestry, agriculture)?

Tourism

3. What resources/benefits is the company bringing to the project and how do they help to achieve the project objectives?

The company is contributing a share of its profit margin for the Dashkin-Rama trek to the Mushkin-Dashkin-Turbelin Valley Conservation Fund.

4. How is the company being involved in project implementation (being consulted as part of project activities, working jointly on project activities, participating in steering committees, carrying out parallel activities with project beneficiaries).

The company is consulted informally about ecotourism issues.

5. What benefit is the company deriving from contributing to the project?

- a) MACP printed a brochure advertising the trek. This brochure also explains the conservation significance of the initiative.
- b) The company gains the goodwill and support of the community.