

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	1067		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	\$ 0.98	0.98
Project Name:	Integrated Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management	IA/EA own:		
Countries:	Gambia	Government:	0.22	0.18
		Other*:		0.06
		Total Cofinancing	0.22	0.24
Operational Program:	OP#2: Coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems; Focal area - Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	1.22	1.22
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	National Environment Agency, Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM) – Govt. of Gambia;	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		October 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: Dec. 2005	Actual: March 2008
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 40 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 66 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 26 months
Author of TE:		TE completion date: September 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: September 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 0 months

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	MS	NA	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	Moderate	NA	MU (2)
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	N/A	NA	UA
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	MS	MS	NA	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?
No. The report does not describe project performance in adequate detail.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings mentioned in the terminal evaluation report.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

The global environment objective of this project was to enhance the conservation and management of globally significant biodiversity in coastal, marine, and wetland ecosystems in The Gambia. This was to be achieved through strengthening the system of coastal and marine protected areas and promoting in-situ conservation of globally significant species and habitats.

There were no changes in global environmental objectives during project implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?

As described in the project brief, the development objectives of the project were to strengthen Gambia's coastal and marine protected areas system and ensure conservation of globally significant species and habitats.

The project focused on the following components:

1. Deepening national and regional understanding, and improving the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine biodiversity, particularly that of global significance;
2. Increasing the area of coastal and marine habitat protected effectively, through legal and physical (infrastructure, equipment, manpower) interventions;
3. Developing and piloting replicable models of participatory biodiversity conservation and management both within and outside of the protected area network; and
4. Increasing the human resource capacities of both government and non-government stakeholders for effective management of coastal, marine and wetland protected areas and endangered and threatened species.

There were no changes in development objectives during implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

In the face of population and development pressures, conservation and sustainable use of the Gambia's coastal and marine resources is being promoted via a series of ongoing initiatives focused directly on natural resource management as well as poverty alleviation. Relevant ongoing reforms are: (i) the Gambia Environmental Action Plan (GEAP); (ii) Agricultural and Natural Resource Management Sector Policy and Legislative reforms; (iii) Local Government Reform and Decentralization Program; and (iv) the Strategy for Poverty Alleviation (SPA). The outcomes of this project will

support these ongoing reforms and also support the broad national development goals and objectives set forth in the national Mission Statement of Gambia - Vision 2020.	
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?	
The project is consistent with and supports the objectives of the Gambia Environmental Action Plan (GEAP), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) and the 1999/2000 Draft National Biodiversity/Wildlife Policy. It is a key component of the strategic plan 2000-2005 of the Department of Wildlife Management (DPWM), the biodiversity focal point for The Gambia. DPWM has reviewed and revised the Biodiversity/Wildlife policy and legislation to provide the legal and institutional framework for achieving national biodiversity goals. It was submitted to Cabinet for review in 1999 and approved in February 2001. In line with the objectives of this project, DPWM is giving priority to expanding the protection and management efforts to address the needs of the coastal and marine environment both within and outside protected areas.	
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?	
Project outcomes focus on biodiversity conservation and protected areas management. These outcomes are relevant to the goals of the GEF OP#2 on coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems.	
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)	
Project outcomes support national obligations under the CBD, which Gambia ratified in 1994.	
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership¹	
This project did not have any regional linkages.	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<p>This project has achieved most of its targeted activities despite significantly delayed implementation. Of the three sites the project was to address, two, the Tanbi Wetland Complex and the Bolong Fenyo Community Conservation Area, acquired legal status as protected areas by project closing. Tanbi is now peri-urban national park and Bolong Fenyo is a wildlife conservation area, increasing the amount of marine and coastal area under legal protection by 25%. Progress at the Bao Bolong site was limited due to unresolved conflicts over property and access rights. Although the project team has continued to engage the communities there, much broader rural development intervention will be necessary to establish the site as a protected area.</p> <p>Active management of the Tanbi and Bolong Fenyo areas has been greatly improved through the project's investments in physical infrastructure and equipment. Community and stakeholder participation in protected areas management has been an integral part of project activities at all sites. Building upon existing community structures, Site Management Committees have been created and are operational at the Tanbi, Bao Bolong and Bolong Fenyo sites. These Committees worked closely with the DPWM to prepare and ensure implementation of participatory protected area management plans and to identify appropriate sub-projects at each site. Implementation of sub-projects occurred late in implementation due to staff recruitment problems and delays in producing the Community Participation Manual. By project close, only 25% of the anticipated sub-project funding was disbursed and only three sub-projects were implemented (Tanbi-oyster farming; Bao Bolong-a hand pump for water; and Bolong Fenyo-bee keeping). The selection of the sub-projects was the result of participatory planning processes and the links between these sub-projects and biodiversity conservation is not evident.</p> <p>The project's data collection and research activities have contributed to a better understanding of coastal and marine habitats in Gambia. Many of these technical activities were achieved in partnership with the WWF. Ecosystem data was collected on current conditions as well as the potential threats to habitats and species. The project has taken steps toward establishment of a national endangered and threatened species monitoring system and database. Three endangered and threatened species conservation action plans were implemented (marine turtles, manatees, and cetaceans). Staff capacity at the DPWM has been modestly increased through two focused training sessions on protected areas management and one financial management training. The agency has also learned how to foster community involvement in conservation planning and management and intends to use participatory approaches in all future projects. Nevertheless, DPWM needs much greater reinforcement of staffing capacity and the project's scientific knowledge base is not yet consolidated.</p> <p>Overall, this project has been effective in laying the basic foundation for future conservation and management of coastal and marine protected areas and biodiversity in the Gambia on both an institutional and technical level. The project has bolstered the capacity of both the DPWM and the local stakeholders to protect and manage protected areas and expanded the country's links to regional conservation networks. Although national park status was not attributed to Bao Bolong, it was legally attributed to the Tanbi Wetlands Complex, the site which is facing the greatest population and development pressure.</p>	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: MS

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

Most of the planned activities were implemented, albeit with delays. Project implementation was not as efficient due to poor planning, unforeseen counterpart funding constraints, and, at times, lack of accessibility to funds.

The total area of new marine and coastal ecosystem brought under protection with the establishment of the Tanbi National Park (6000 ha) and Bolong Fenyo (356 ha) is 6356 ha. For a total project cost of \$1.2 M project, this indicates a cost of \$191 per ha.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

The project design addressed the issue of trade-offs by promoting stakeholder participation in conservation planning and management. During implementation, the project team did work closely with communities. However, the sub-project component, which financed income-generating activities in local communities was only partially implemented, due to staffing problems at the DPWM.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

This project has improved the capacity of both the DPWM and local stakeholders to protect and manage areas of significant biodiversity. DPWM’s technical competencies have been moderately enhanced and the agency has established stronger links to regional and international conservation networks. The participatory approaches adopted by the project have created a strong sense of ownership and commitment to the protected areas. Consequently, DPWM is integrating community involvement in all of its conservation activities.

This project also tested the legal process for establishing protected areas in Gambia, including preparing the country’s first Process Framework to formally address issues of compensation or loss of access/use rights. It also developed and piloted the methodologies for community consultation and participation in conservation planning and management. The DPWM is considering replicating the project at another site and adapting the approach to the fisheries sector. In addition, the three sub-projects implemented thus far also provide good models for replication elsewhere, and it is expected that if their success are sustained, the approaches will be adopted by other communities..

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: 3 (ML)
The DPWM has been allocated an investment budget by the Govt. for the costs of contracting new staff and purchasing additional vehicles. Provisions were made under the 2002 Biodiversity and Wildlife Act for the establishment of a Biodiversity Trust Fund, through which a portion of DPWM generated revenues (park fees, licenses, etc.) could be retained for protected areas management. A preliminary park revenue generation strategy, including the establishment and funding of this Biodiversity Trust Fund was undertaken by DPWM in early 2008, but its recommendations have not yet been implemented. A preliminary financing commitment of Euro 700,000 from the Regional Coastal and Marine Conservation Program for West Africa (PRCM) has been secured and the MAVA Foundation has agreed to match any supplemental financing that the DPWM secures up to Euro 1M.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: 3 (ML)
The project has educated local stakeholders about the need for conservation and strongly implicated them in the management plans for both the Tanbi Park and Bolong Fenyo. But, understaffing at DPWM may delay the operationalization of management plans and limit the resources needed for continued stakeholder participation.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 2 (MU)
Government awareness of coastal and marine ecosystems has increased considerably through the training activities. Government support is strong as evidenced by increased funding commitments. Institutional partnerships between DPWM and WWF-WARPO and PRCM show strong indications of solidifying into durable collaborative relationships.	

² Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

A direct follow-on project has been designed in partnership by DPWM and WWF-WARPO. DPWM resources and capacity are still weak compared to the tasks of sustaining and expanding project outcomes.	
d. Environmental	Rating: UA
There was no assessment of environmental risks.	
e. Technological	Rating: N/A
This project did not introduce any new technologies.	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders
The participatory approaches adopted by the project have strongly fostered ownership and commitment to the protected areas. Three sustainable use sub-projects were implemented at pilot sites: oyster farming and alternative livelihoods in Tanbi, installation of a hand pump for water in Bao Bolong and bee keeping in Bolong Fenyo. These project are being monitored
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
The project has enabled the DPWM to shift from a communication and information sharing approach, to a more integrative one in which communities and other natural resource users are active partners in the conservation process. This project also tested the legal process for establishing protected areas, including preparing the country's first Process Framework to formally address issues of compensation and loss of access/use rights.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
The Bolong Fenyo Reserve and the Tanbi National Park have been accorded legal status as protected areas.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
The government has committed to increase the DPWM budget to continue project activities.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
No such project champions mentioned.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The Government of Gambia was to co-finance about 20% of the project. This co-financing covered essential staffing costs. The Government could not initially provide sufficient counterparty funds, but a \$65,000 emergency contribution by the WWF permitted the project to proceed.
b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
Although the project effectiveness date was August 2002, implementation did not begin until April 2005. Startup was delayed to the end of 2003 because Bank rules forbade the provisioning of any project's Special Account until an outstanding balance for a separate trust fund related to the small works project (GamWorks) was reimbursed. Startup was delayed again in 2004 because the Government, due to unforeseen budget constraints, was unable to provide the counterpart funds required by the project. WWF eventually agreed to provide the required counterpart funds on behalf of the government, but the first tranche of their funding did not arrive until March 2005.
After two approved extensions, the project closed in March 2008, after 38 months. There was another delay in early 2007, when project activities ground to a halt for over three months due to administrative difficulties surrounding the launch of the World Bank's Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS)
As a result of these delays some monitoring activities were not implemented in the protected areas.
c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

³ Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

Country ownership posed some initial problems for this project. As mentioned, the Government of Gambia was unable to raise the required counterparty funds in 2004 and risked losing the entire project. During the implementation period, the Government has also been slow in attributing legal status as protected areas to the Tanbi National Park and the Bolong Fenyo Reserve. This was accomplished just prior to project closing. However, towards the end of the project, the Government has expanded the DPWM budget and expressed interest in replicating the project at other sites.

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

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): MU
The project document had a brief description of the M&E system and a project implementation timeline. The project team along with specialist consultants was to develop a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan within 6 months of project start up that would measure both progress and impact indicators. It is not known whether this plan was ever implemented. The project document stipulated monitoring by the Project Steering Committee and semi-annual reports by the project team to all stakeholders.	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): UA
No information is available on M&E plan implementation.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Unable to assess.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess.	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Unable to assess.	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. Unable to assess.	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i>
Based on information in the terminal evaluation, overall supervision by the IA, the World Bank, was adequate. The bank team carried out technical field supervision missions every year of implementation, supplemented by three formal virtual missions and regular audio conferences. It provided regular interaction and technical assistance in identifying and overcoming operational challenges in a timely fashion and the project team received support from the regional financial management and procurement specialists.
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale) MS <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.</i>
The executing agency for this project was the Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM). The terminal evaluations notes that while the project achieved its objectives, the management of funds and project activities according to timeline was poor. Initial lack of experience with Bank procedures combined with staffing problems slowed implementation. The project management unit was not fully staffed at the start and there was considerable turnover in key positions throughout implementation. The project was implemented in its entirety under an Acting Project Coordinator. According to the terminal evaluation, the project's procurement processes were slower than expected, and activities on the implementation work plans often slipped behind schedule. Despite this weak management, the project has achieved its core objectives in 38 months.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

⁴ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure sustainability of biodiversity and protected area conservation outcomes, a long term engagement is needed. 2. Building strong partnerships between the government, local communities and other partners is a key element of protected area conservation. 3. Facilitating partnerships between government conservation bodies and locally/regionally based international conservation NGOs can help lay the foundations for long term working relationships, which help promote ongoing capacity building and bring about long term conservation outcomes. 4. Activities related to biodiversity conservation should have a practical and realistic time frame. Unlike in Tanbi, the project duration and resources available were inadequate to secure community stakeholder buy-in in Bao Bolong. Adapting the approach to a longer time frame, and focusing on building good relationships with the communities is likely to lead to stronger conservation efforts over the long term than forcing the community dialogue to fit to the timetable of the project.
<p>b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation</p> <p>A GEF MSP project, such as this one, did not have the resources required to address the underlying lack of capacity and low profile of DPWM. Nevertheless an MSP can and did serve as a catalyst, attaining concrete but limited results and laying the foundations for a follow up operation that will address the long term institutional issues required for sustainable protected area and biodiversity management.</p>

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

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

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Outcomes and impacts are assessed fairly.</p>	S
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? Although the report succinctly covers most of the major parameters, it does not cover M&E issues well. The IA ratings are substantiated.</p>	MS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report assesses risks to the sustainability of development outcomes and discusses follow-on strategies.</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned focus largely on where the project (or project design) went wrong, but they are supported by the evidence presented.</p>	MS
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Total costs, per activity costs, and actual co-financing contributions are listed.</p>	S
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report does not contain an evaluation of the project M&E system.</p>	HU

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)

