

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

Please note that several documents necessary for the production of this TER were provided in French, including the Terminal Evaluation Report. For this document, information was translated from French as part of the review process, but did not go through professional translations. The quotes provided in the document represent the TER author's best approximation of the original meaning.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1095	
GEF Agency project ID		00043166, 3386, (PIMS 1583)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation of Transboundary Biodiversity in the Minkébé -Odzala-Dja Inter-zone in Gabon, Congo, and Cameroon ^[1]	
Country/Countries		Cameroon, Congo, Gabon	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-3 Forest Ecosystems BD-1 Sustainability of Protected Areas systems	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS with the following executing partners: WWF, WCS, CI, ECOFAC-UE, OIBT	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		WWF – informal project partner	
Private sector involvement		Extractive sector – consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 2006	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		July 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		10.46	8.23
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	11.18	0 ¹
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	23.31	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0.13	0
Total GEF funding		10.46	8.23
Total Co-financing		34.62	0
Total project funding		45.08	8.23

¹ The TE is unclear about government co-financing. In one instance, it mentions that no co-financing was received, but this might only applied to cash co-financing. Government in-kind co-financing was most likely provided, but the worth of the co-financing is not mentioned.

(GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	October 2014	
Author of TE	Dr. Ngono Grégoire	
TER completion date	January 20, 2016	
TER prepared by	Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS ²	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	ML	--	ML
M&E Design	NR	MS	--	MS
M&E Implementation	NR	MS	--	S
Quality of Implementation	NR	S	--	MS
Quality of Execution	NR	S	--	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of this project, referred to in the Project Document (PD) as the 'specific objective', is "to maintain the ecological functions and connectivity of TRIDOM, and ensure long-term conservation of its protected area system through integrated, sustainable and participatory management in the interzone between the protected areas" (PD p.24). TRIDOM [Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkebe] refers to the Tri-national area composed of Dja, Odzala, and Minkebe.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

In addition to the environmental objective, the project aims to support the long-term development objective "to conserve globally significant biodiversity in the Congo Basin through integration of conservation objectives into the national and regional sustainable development plans in the TRIDOM" (PD P.24).

In order to do so, the project will design and implement a new model for managing the various uses of the protected area. The four outcomes planned for the project, some of which are more closely related to the development objectives, are the following:

It must be noted that the final evaluation took place about 6 months prior to the end of the project, and that this might explain some of the discrepancies between the rating assigned to project outcomes by the final PIR (S) and the IA Terminal Evaluation (S).

1. The land-use and the governance structures of a trans-border complex for biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource use are designed, endorsed and operational.
2. The capacity to monitor trends in biodiversity, resource exploitation and ecological functions and to minimize pressures on natural resources is strengthened in TRIDOM.
3. Benefits from community-based natural resource management contribute to poverty alleviation.
4. Sustainable funding is mobilized for the conservation and sustainable management of the TRIDOM.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes in the project objectives during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory. This TER agrees with the assessment given the project’s good alignment with the national priorities of the three countries involved in the project, as well as with GEF priorities.

Prior to the project, Congo, Gabon and Cameroon were already involved in regional work to conserve forests. The three countries had signed the Yaoundé Declaration on Conservation and Sustainable Management of Forests in 1999. All signatories to this document committed to several measures, including accelerating the process of trans-boundary conservation and strengthening the management of existing protected areas. In order to start implementing these measures, the signatories established the COMIFAC (Conférence des Ministres en Charge des Forêts d’Afrique Centrale – Conference of Ministers in Charge of Central African Forests), an institutional mechanism that defined implementation strategies and a priority action plan.

Each of the three countries were also actively engaged in improving forest conservation at home, outside of the new regional mechanism. Congo quadrupled the area of the ODzala-Kokoua National Park in 2001. Gabon created a new national protected area system made up of 13 national parks. Cameroon established two new national parks, and put on hold some proposed logging concessions in the Ngoïla-Mitom Forest. Overall, all three countries were taking action demonstrating their commitment to the issue of forest conservation.

The project fell under the GEF biodiversity focal area and more specifically, OP-3 (Forest Ecosystems) and SP-1 (Sustainability of Protected Area Systems). The project aims to strengthen the conservation of a large area (147,000 square kilometers) in a priority region for biodiversity conservation. Indeed, the stated project objectives are to maintain the ecological connectivity and to ensure the conservation of the TRIDOM area, both of which clearly support GEF priorities.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	--

The TE rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory due to the realization of about 50% of planned outputs. This TER also rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory due to the good progress the project has made towards most outcomes.

Activities and accomplishments under each of the four planned outcomes for this project will be discussed below.

1. The land-use and the governance structures of a trans-border complex for biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource use are designed, endorsed and operational.

According to the TE, this outcome was partially achieved. The first output is ‘TRIDOM zoning is effective through legal endorsement of three national land-use plans and their implementation’. While much has been done towards the delivery of this outcome, according to the TE, the consensual plan for zoning is still being elaborated, and not yet harmonized between the three countries. Once finalized, this will integrate elephant migration corridors into national land use plans. As for output 2, ‘A transboundary status is adopted for the TRIDOM and operational management systems are effective at the regional, national and local levels’, management plans have been approved and implemented, but the transboundary status is not yet approved. According to the 2015 PIR, the transboundary status was close to being reached at project end.

Overall, achievements against this outcome can be rated as satisfactory. According to the TE, the difficulties in achieving this outcome came from “the complexity of a trans-border complex encompassing three countries, and the lack of financing resources which could have allowed a faster process and better management.” (TE p.29)

2. The capacity to monitor trends in biodiversity, resource exploitation and ecological functions and to minimize pressures on natural resources is strengthened in TRIDOM.

According to the TE, this outcome was mostly unachieved. The first output under this outcome was ‘A pragmatic and cost-efficient system to monitor biodiversity, resource exploitation and ecological functions is operational’. A lot of community monitoring is now taking place as a result of the project, but not all planned monitoring activities have been implemented. For example, aquatic species monitoring is not taking place, but a strong clearing community monitoring system has been put in place in 17 locations. The second output was that ‘The legal framework is refined and law enforcement systems are effective’. A MoU was signed between the parties and enforcement systems have been put in place. The third output was ‘Mechanisms are in place to strengthen effective biodiversity conservation in logging concessions’. Various activities took place, for example, the introduction of canine brigades in the fight against poaching, as well as various training sessions to raise awareness of conservation priorities and teach best practices.

3. Benefits from community-based natural resource management contribute to poverty alleviation.

According to the TE, this outcome was mostly achieved. The sole output for this outcome was ‘Viable community initiatives providing socio-economic incentives for biodiversity conservation are designed and operational’. Several initiatives were developed as part of the project, including ARBRAT (Association de reconversion sociale des braconniers - Association for the Social Restructuring of Poachers) – a program to create alternative livelihoods for poachers, which was implemented in Cameroon and Congo. According to the TE, in Cameroon, “income-generating activities are making a noticeable difference, but these are not very developed in the other two countries” (TE pp.30-31). The 2015 PIR also reveals that the development of new national parks in Congo has created several jobs and led to a substantial increase in revenues from eco-tourism.

4. Sustainable funding is mobilized for the conservation and sustainable management of the TRIDOM.

According to the TE, this outcome was only partially achieved. The main output ‘A multi-level financing plan is developed, endorsed and implemented’ was not achieved due “to the complexity of the funding mechanism developed and the number of actors involved” (TE p.29). Some steps have been taken towards the development of a sustainable funding mechanism for the TRIDOM, but little progress has been made. Overall, the effectiveness of the project in realizing this outcome has been unsatisfactory. According to the 2015 PIR, this outcome “was removed during the mid-term review and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee” (PIR 2015, p.50). It is unclear whether or not this outcome was officially removed from the project, especially since the project team kept including it and reporting against it in the PIR reports.

Overall, project effectiveness is rated as moderately satisfactory due to the number of outputs and activities that were accomplished and the progress that has been made against most outcomes. In

addition, the 2015 PIR noted that several of the activities were still ongoing at project end, and overall project effectiveness will probably continue to improve over time.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory due to the cost effectiveness of the project, but noting that there were important delays at the start of the project.

When the TE was completed, 84% of the GEF budget had been disbursed. More funding was originally expected, but due to a delayed project start, all co-financers dropped out, which substantially reduced project budget.

Spending on activities largely went as planned, except for management costs which were slightly higher than expected. No cost benefit analysis was done for the project, nor was it compared to other similar projects. The TE claims that the cost of activities appears “not to have been higher than those of similar activities” (TE p.35). Cost effectiveness therefore appears to have been overall satisfactory.

Once the project was approved, project implementation started rather slowly. According to the TE, this was due to “insufficient motivation and rather difficult work conditions” (TE p.34) for staff, but the project team made the necessary changes to improve working conditions and get the project started.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE rates sustainability as moderately unlikely. This TER rates sustainability as moderately likely due to the positive socio-political, institutional and environmental outlooks for the project.

Financial Sustainability: Unlikely

The TE does not explicitly discuss financial sustainability, nor does the 2015 PIR. However, referring to the effectiveness section above, this TER notes that outcome 4 (sustainable funding is mobilized for the conservation and sustainable management of the TRIDOM) has been largely unachieved. The TE recommends that a next phase of the project focus on ensuring more sustainable funding (TE p.44), as there is as of now no evidence of future funding for the conservation of the TRIDOM.

Socio-political sustainability: Moderately Likely

The TE describes some of the factors that influence the project’s socio-political sustainability. First, it mentions that local communities are now very supportive and involved in the project. They are participating in monitoring activities, and benefiting from income generating and ecotourism activities.

On the political level, countries have agreed to develop a consensual plan to integrate elephant migration corridors into national land use plans. However, the TE describes country ownership as 'insufficient', which could affect the project's sustainability. (TE p.37)

Institutional sustainability: Moderately Likely

The TE describes some of the factors that influence the project's socio-political sustainability. First, the capacity of governments to engage with conservation issues has been improved over the course of the project. Training and awareness efforts were successful, and governments became increasingly engaged with the project. Second, the principle of biodiversity conservation has been integrated in various national documents including mining codes and forest use codes. Third, some of the project outputs, such as the zoning of TRIDOM as a protected area and the construction of eco guard stations in TRIDOM, will help ensure that conservation efforts are maintained after the project has ended. However, there still lacks adequate coordination mechanisms between national actors, and this could negatively influence the sustainability of the project. In addition, according to the TE (P.36), too few stakeholders (government administrators, community members and NGO workers) were trained to make a real difference to biodiversity conservation.

Environmental sustainability: Moderately Likely

The conservation of the TRIDOM area should be maintained thanks to the inter-state efforts made as part of the project. However, land grabbing is a serious concern in the region, and it is unclear that the push to use land for agriculture and forestry will not become too strong for the government to maintain its conservation objectives in the TRIDOM area. While at the moment, their motivation still appears strong, this is a risk that will need to be monitored going forward.

Overall, despite not being in a position to ensure the continuation of project activities in the future, the project made important accomplishments in improving capacities and enshrining conservation principles into national documents, thereby protecting some of the project's conservation achievements. Project sustainability is rated as moderately likely.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Because of the delays in getting the project started (see below), all of the co-financing partners dropped out, which substantially reduced the project budget (TE p.25). Unfortunately, the TE does not clearly describe how the project was restructured to deal with this lower-than-expected financing. Some of the co-financing partners still supported the project through their own anti-poaching and conservation activities.

While the TE provides conflicting information regarding Government co-financing, it appears that the national Governments still provided in-kind co-financing to the project by way of personnel, office supplies and investments in protected areas (TE p.25). The value of this contribution has not been calculated.

5.2 Project extensions and/or 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The preparation phase for this project was very long, with project identification happening in 1998/1999 and project start only taking place in 2009 – even though the Project Document was finalized and approved in 2004. Because of the delays in getting the project started, all of the co-financing partners dropped out, which substantially reduced the project budget. Unfortunately, the TE does not clearly describe how the project was restructured to deal with this lower-than-expected financing.

Finally, despite the official start being planned for 2008, the project only started in 2009 due to administrative delays.

5.3 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:

Country ownership appeared moderately satisfactory. The project was highly contingent on the national governments' participation and, at start all three governments voiced their support for the project.

Both in Cameroon and Congo, activities took place smoothly and in collaboration with the national governments. However, in Gabon, there were some collaboration problems with the National Park Agency. The TE does not provide much information regarding country ownership, but describes it as "insufficient" (TE p.37). Unfortunately, no additional information is available in the TE or the PIRs regarding country ownership.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E Design at entry as moderately satisfactory, a score this TER agrees with. The M&E framework for this project was very complete, but the indicators selected were not well suited to track progress against the project’s objectives.

The Project Document presents a fairly complete M&E framework for the project (PD pp.40-41), including a complete logical framework with detailed objectives, outcomes and outputs. Targets and indicators were clearly specified, as well as means of verification and assumption. A summary ‘measurement table’ was provided to clearly identify the key metrics for the project, and independent evaluations were planned. At face value, the M&E framework appears to follow best practices. However, the indicators selected were ill suited to provide meaningful information about project progress. Most indicators are related to the implementation of project activities, and not to the impact of those activities on the project’s conservation objectives. As a result, project indicators had little relevance to outcomes, and were little more than a well-defined work plan for the project. It could have been useful to include indicators directly measuring conservation outcomes. (TE p.11)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory, but provides little in the way of justification for the score outside the fact that project monitoring got better over time. This TER notes that PIRs were produced for the project every year and its associated monitoring data was collected regularly. Evaluation activities also took place as expected. While the TE provides little information about the way M&E was conducted, or how M&E information fed into the project, M&E appears to have been conducted satisfactorily.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP, the performance of which the TE rates as satisfactory. This TER rates project implementation as moderately satisfactory due to the issues that came up during the design phase of the project.

According to the TE, the management arrangements selected for this project were rather cumbersome:

“Management arrangements including UNOPS as executing agency, the GABON UNDP office as UNDP reference office and national UNDP offices for the disbursement of funds turned out to be very complex and cumbersome, creating coordination difficulties” (TE P.10).

The UNDP indeed appears to have committed several mistakes during the design phase. First, as mentioned above, the M&E framework designed for the project featured poor indicators. Second, there were substantial delays in the project preparation phase as well as the first year of project implementation, leading to less co-financing and to shorter-than-expected project implementation time. Third, the management arrangements it defined were too cumbersome.

During project implementation, the UNDP appears to have been supportive. “The UNDP provided technical help in the form of advice for project implementation and controlled the project with regards to procurement and payments” (TE p.27). Despite not substantiating its score, the TE rates UNDP performance as satisfactory, which indicates it has assessed its performance to be adequate.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	---------------------------------

The executing agency for this project was UNOPS, the performance of which the TE rates as satisfactory. According to the TE, the selection of UNOPS as the executing agency “substantially increased the burden of work and delays in the start of activities” because of UNOPS “remoteness from operations” (TE p.27). That being said, the TE still describes as satisfactory UNOPS’s performance as executing agency. Because additional information is provided in the TE or the PIRs, this TER is unable to assess the quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented,

sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

As mentioned in the M&E section above, the project indicators did not capture environmental outcomes for the project.

Given that a great number project activities were accomplished, it is clear that some progress has been made towards the project's global environmental objectives. Anti-poaching measures have been put in place, and policies have been adopted for the conservation of wildlife in the TRIDOM area. At project end, hunting was prohibited on 50% of the TRIDOM area, and illegal hunting has gone down by 75% in the monitored areas. Conservation clauses have been added to mining and forestry codes. All of the above demonstrate that the project can make a plausible claim to biodiversity protection outcomes. However, no biological measures of conservation or biodiversity have been recorded. (TE pp.29-31)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

As with environmental change, no indicators specifically tracked socioeconomic outcomes throughout the project. 2015 PIR also reveals that the development of new national parks in Congo has created several jobs and led to an important increase in revenues from eco-tourism. New surveys were conducted to measure changes in well-being. (TE pp.29-31)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The capacity of governments to engage with conservation issues has been improved over the course of the project. Training and awareness efforts were successful, and governments became increasingly engaged with the project over time. Communities were successfully trained to monitor environmental outcomes in the region. (TE p.30)

b) Governance

Countries have agreed to develop a consensual plan to integrate elephant migration corridors into national land use plans. Conservation clauses have been added to mining and forestry codes. (TE pp.29-30)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were recorded as part of this project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Not applicable

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE proposes the following key lessons for the project:

1. Sustainable resource management is by nature a multi sectoral problem. It requires the joining of efforts by all relevant actors and the harmonization of positions.
2. The project demonstrated that country ownership, the involvement of local technical experts and that of community-based organizations are necessary for the success of biodiversity and conservation projects.
3. Building the trust of local populations by supporting income generating activities has allowed to reduce poaching.
4. Understanding the differences in the institutional context between states facilitates consensus building, but is time consuming.
5. Depending on external funding weakens financial sustainability.
6. Strong partnerships are essential to the success of sustainable resource development projects.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations for the project:

1. Bring to a conclusion all procedures and activities initiated as part of the project, including achieving the status of Transboundary Biosphere Reserve of the TRIDOM area.
2. In case of a second phase, review institutional and organizational arrangements
 - a. Consider decentralizing fund management and thereby facilitation activity implementation;
 - b. Elaborate a process manual including M&E;
 - c. Facilitate the hosting of a GIS database by government offices;
 - d. Improve the monitoring of WWF activities and improve the relationship between TRIDOM and WWF staff;
 - e. Harmonize responsibilities between UNDP and COMIFAC staff;
 - f. Reconsider the need for UNOPS to be the executing agency for this project;
 - g. Contact IUCN to establish a technical collaboration.
3. Review the length of the implementation phase for a potential phase 2
 - a. Increase implementation phase to at least 5 years
 - b. Shorten delays between project design and implementation, and involve all stakeholders from the start.
4. Support the creation of complementary income generating activities
 - a. Promote tourism and ecotourism activities to insure additional income for the protected area.
 - b. Promote the idea of 'conservation leaders' within villages, and provide them with teaching and income-generating tools.
5. Create a strong synergy between actors between countries
 - a. Increase the emphasis on co-financing
 - b. Collaborate with universities and research centers and develop partnerships
 - c. Involve government organizations and NGOs in implementing project activities to ensure their sustainability.
 - d. Develop a financing system around the private sector and propose a new project "Sustainable financing mechanism for protected areas".
6. Improve collaboration with various ministries to as to improve the training and working conditions of conservation agents and other conservation workers.
7. Define a communication strategy and a plan to bank on project results
 - a. Identify a mechanism to collect lessons learned and good practices as part of the project
 - b. Identify targets, communication material and communication tools
 - c. Provide project partners with the database and project mapping information.
8. Reinforce stakeholder capacities
 - a. Ensure a good inclusion of women in various committees and consultation mechanisms, and consider their role within the village community

- b. Use the Transboundary Biosphere Reserve status to reinforce project benefits.
9. Strengthen anti-poaching efforts

(TE pp.42-43)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report does contain an assessment of all relevant outcomes, but the discussion of impact is limited. The achievement of objectives is superficially discussed.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, but only limited evidence is presented. Ratings are often not very well substantiated.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report mentions project sustainability, but the report does not assess it adequately. The discussion around sustainability is very limited, and several factors are not mentioned.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned appear comprehensive and supported by evidence provided in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes project costs and co-financing, but costs per activity are not reported.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's discussion of M&E systems at entry is basic but adequate, but M&E implementation is not properly addressed.	U
Overall TE Rating		MU

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER, other than PIRs, TE, and PD.