

## 1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1221
IA/EA Project ID	49513
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Coastal and Biodiversity Management Project
Country/Countries	Guinea-Bissau
Geographic Scope	National
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	World Bank
Executing Agencies involved	World Bank
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Unable to Access
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	#2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems
TER Prepared by	Anoop Agarwal
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Anna F. Roumani and Liba Strengerowski-Feldblyum
Review Completion Date	2/12/2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	6/4/2004
Project Implementation Start Date	3/14/2005
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	3/31/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	3/31/2010
TE Completion Date	10/26/2011
IA Review Date	Not reviewed
TE Submission Date	10/11/2012

## 2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.35	0.35
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.35	0.35
GEF Financing	4.80	4.80
IA/EA own	5.41	N/A
Government	0.90	N/A
Other*		
Total Project Financing	11.11	4.80
Total Financing including Prep	11.46	5.15

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

### 3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	Not Reviewed	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	Not Reviewed	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	MS	S	Not Reviewed	S
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	MS	Not Reviewed	MS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not Reviewed	MS

### 4. Project Objectives

#### 4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global objective of the project is articulated in the Project Appraisal Document as: "Strengthen the conservation of globally significant ecosystem and species." (pg. 3 Project Appraisal Document)

No changes to the GEO were made.

#### 4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

"The development objective of the Coastal and Biodiversity Management Project is to build the capacity of Government agencies and natural resource users in Guinea-Bissau to collaboratively manage coastal environments and biodiversity for both conservation and sustainable development ends." (pg. 3 Project Appraisal Document)

No changes to Development Objectives were made.

#### 4.3. Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	Yes	The scope of the project activities were reduced due to a lack of progress
Other activities	No	

### 5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

#### 5.1. Relevance – *Satisfactory*

This objective is in line with the Global Environment Facility's Operational Program 2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems. The coastal biotopes are known to be among the richest on the coast of West Africa in terms of diversity, productivity and food potential. It includes vast estuaries, a large archipelago rising from a continental platform of about 70,000 km<sup>2</sup>, and seasonal coastal plains. The coastal biodiversity of neighboring countries has already been seriously degraded,

because of industrial and urban development, which has led to increased levels of pollution and the degradation of marine and coastal ecosystems.

"Guinea Bissau ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on October 27, 1995. The proposed project fits well with the GEF Biodiversity Operational Strategy and supports the objectives set out in the Operational Program on Coastal and Marine Ecosystems. The project is in line with guidance from the first, second and third Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CDB), which stresses in situ conservation of coastal and marine ecosystems. It specifically responds to the Jakarta Mandate endorsed at Conference of Parties (COP2), by supporting conservation and sustainable use of vulnerable marine habitats and species. The conservation and sustainable use of coastal and marine ecosystems have been identified as priorities within the draft National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and the National Environmental Action Plan recently adopted by the Government." (pgs. 2-4, Project Appraisal Document).

## 5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

Based on the progress of the components provided below, effectiveness is rated Mostly Satisfactory by the reviewer. Components 1, 3, and 4 achieved a majority of their project expectations. The expectations of Component 2, however, were revised to adjust for slow progress-- the objectives met were not far enough from the original objectives mentioned to justify a lower rating.

Component 1: Protected Areas and Endangered Species Management (US\$3.73 million, 33.6% of total estimated cost) financed the strengthening of the institutional framework and management capacity for biodiversity and Protected Areas by establishing a financially and administratively autonomous entity, the Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP) to manage the country's network of Protected Areas and endangered species.

\*IBAP was formally created with its mission defined, status legalized and operations initiated.

\*Created two additional Protected Areas: Cantanhez National Park and the Urok Community Marine Protected Area totaling an additional 160,267 ha, equivalent to 1,603 km<sup>2</sup> and 4.4% more national territory.

\*14.9% of the national territory is now under IBAP management

\*Put in place/facilitated the establishment of participatory Park Management Councils comprising national and regional government and local civil society (NGOs, communities and leaders).

\*Only Cufada Park's registered scores under the WWF/World Bank Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool, however, all of the Parks showed improvement.

Component 2: Natural Resources Management (US\$5.06 million, 45.5% of total estimated cost) promoted the sustainable use of biological resources at the local level. The scope and budget of the RFZ/fisheries sub-component of Component 2 were scaled back following the Mid-term Review (MTR) to three concrete activities considered attainable by end-project:

- (i) a Reserved Fishing Zone (RFZ) established at Buba;
- (ii) an operational fisheries surveillance station constructed at Caravela; and
- (iii) a national fisheries strategy completed/approved by Government, with an action plan.

\*The first part of component 2 was delayed due to ambiguity in the legal definition and applicable regulatory framework and was therefore refined. After the MTR, the Buba Fishing Zone was established.

\*The Caravela surveillance base was constructed, equipped, officially handed over in July 2010 and is operational utilizing the two surveillance patrol vessels financed (separately) by the Government of Turkey

\*The National Fisheries Strategy was completed with an Action Plan, and is the basis for the new West Africa/Guinea-Bissau Regional Fisheries Program, now effective

\*CBMP assisted 129 different communities with an equal number of micro-project grants averaging about XOF 7.31 million (US\$16,045) each. The total in project funding allocated to these micro-projects is estimated to have generated a minimum of 25% in revenues to local communities, or at least XOF 182.74 million (US\$0.40 million) in net earnings over the life of the micro-projects.

Component 3: Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (US\$0.63 million, 5.7% of total estimated cost) financed the establishment and implementation of an environmental safeguards framework supporting policies, procedures, and capacity-building to ensure the incorporation of environmental and social concerns into development decision-making. A new Unit for Environmental and Social Safeguards (CAIA) was intended to build national capacity to evaluate and monitor the environmental and social implications of development proposals.

\*CAIA was established in 2004 within the Prime Minister's Office and has become the institution legally representing national policy on environmental and social development.

\*Environmental and social safeguards are now embodied in the country's legal system and such considerations are also reflected in sector policies affecting forests, mining, fisheries and petroleum

\*Approval and ratification of the Environmental Impact Assessment Law authorized CAIA to review EIAs for 100% of all development projects proposed, granted CAIA fee-for-service authority supporting its future sustainability.

\*Preparation of nine environmental reference guides for economic sectors (e.g., Fishing, Industry, Tourism, Energy, Agriculture, Infrastructure, Water, Hydro-carbons and Mines); 92 projects from various sectors have been registered with CAIA since 2005 of which 53 required completion of an EIA.

\*Government's promised allocation of FCFA 50 million for CAIA (and similar amount for IBAP) from the 2010 national budget was not allotted but the Bank was informed that the issue would be re-visited: at project closing, this had not yet occurred.

Component 4: Project Management, and Monitoring and Evaluation (US\$1.69 million, 15.2% of total estimated cost) financed the daily management and tracking of project implementation, project financial management and procurement, the monitoring and evaluation of progress and impact, and facilitation of inter-agency relationships.

\*The component financed three independent evaluations of FIAL and a good-quality Final Report, along with substantial output data collection throughout project execution.

\*The TE lists the end-project results for the output indicators listed in the PAD Project Design Summary, however, no targets were established at appraisal.

According to the TE, "This project has generated a range of benefits, such as biodiversity protection, critical fishery habitat protection, poverty alleviation through productivity and income increase, as well as better institutional capacity and an improved education system."

### 5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The actual disbursements for co-financing are not specified and therefore an assessment of the cost of the project to the outcomes is not available. According to the TE, while there was a lack of progress in the early years to accomplish the goals under Component 2, the other components seemed to have met their objectives in due course.

There were several indications of strong efficiency. For example, the total amount of the project used for Natural Resources Management (which includes IDA and the EU) totals US\$ 4.8 million, out of which, US\$ 1.60 million (31%) was used for micro-projects (FIAL). There was no economic analysis for all the micro-projects, but an ex-post analysis of the five typical FIAL micro-projects, found positive IRRs ranging from 21.17% for the rehabilitation of bas fond (lowland) rice dykes to 50.13% for palm oil production. Net Present Value (NPV) ranged from CFA 219,700 for the former to CFA 8.2 million for the latter. Returns on school buildings - using an incremental cost analysis - showed an incremental increase in student output of 466%, compared with an incremental increase in student cost of just 45%."

The evidence presented in the TE justifies a Mostly Satisfactory rating for efficiency.

### 5.4. *Sustainability* – **Low/Moderate Risks**

The risks to sustainability for this project are rated Low to Moderate. The project has been able to incorporate sustainability measures from the beginning of the project, such as, ensuring that funding support does not simply rely on the State. The creation of IBAP, its solid management structure, and its limited fiscal needs ensures the project to protect the biodiversity will be sustained.

According to the TE, IBAP's sustainability will depend on:

- (i) sufficient capital for a basic patrimony permitting minimum acceptable functionality;
- (ii) an adequate control structure with satisfactory management rules;
- (iii) a robust institutional framework permitting good relationships between IBAP, the Foundation and the Ministry; and (iv) engagement of beneficiaries and other sectors and interest groups to participate in conservation activities promoted by the Program.

Based on the information provided, risks to the sustainability of IBAP seem to be low. The sustainability of FIAL objectives was evident from certain entities such as Management Committees which demonstrated the social engagement of the community in awareness-building and mobilization. FIAL acts at the micro level financing grass-roots initiatives which satisfy the immediate needs of communities.

Other factors such as literacy, community organization and poverty could influence the sustainability of conservation initiatives, but seem to be contained.

## **6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

### **6.1. Co-financing**

- 6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

No information on Co-financers or Co-financing is provided.

- 6.1.2. 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?

Unable to access.

### **6.2. Delays**

- 6.2.1. 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?

\*The project received initial deposits about two months after the date of effectiveness due to problems with authorized signatures for those accounts, which in turn delayed the acquisition of goods and services and recruitment of personnel for the project. (pg. 60)

\*The Bio-Guinea Foundation (FBG) was expected to be established and operational by May 2008 and needed an estimated endowment of EUR 14.0 million, however, delays occurred in establishing a location for the FBG, its objectives, statutes and structure.

\*Measurement of the number of infringements of the regulatory framework of the Reserved Fishing Zones (RFZ) by fishing vessels was delayed by ambiguity in the legal definition and applicable regulatory framework for RFZs. (pg. 40)

\*Shortages of funds and delayed receipt of EU trust funds affected project management and coordination by delaying activities and reducing the quality of goods and services acquired. (Section 2.26, pg. 43) This directly delayed the pilot phase of the FIAL micro-projects as their implementation was reliant on EU Funds.

These delays did affect project outcomes, and seem to be partially responsible for the redesigning of component 2. Risk to sustainability was still low at the end of the project and it doesn't seem that delays impacted that strongly.

### 6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. 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:

The government was directly involved in this project, through the Ministry of Finances, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development, Ministry of Fisheries, and the Office of the Prime Minister. Several of these were implementing agencies and their progress was directly linked to the success of the project. Had there not been government support and country ownership for the establishment of the 3 institutions, IBAP, CAIA, and FIAL, the project would not have been successful.

## 7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

### 7.1. *M&E design at entry* – **Satisfactory**

Development of the M&E Plan and the Log Frame was participatory and included workshops with diverse stakeholder participation, but completion of the M&E Plan took an inordinately long time, according to the information provided in the TE. The management information system (MIS) tracked the output indicator data and impact indicators. The focus of component 4 was on project management and M&E, and made up 15.2% of the total project budget, indicating a strong focus and design at entry.

### 7.2. *M&E implementation* – **Satisfactory**

M&E implementation was Satisfactory as it managed to collect data and in the key reporting areas and included 3 evaluation reports on FIAL micro-projects, the Borrower Completion Report, legislative proposals, and strategy papers. According to the TE, "IBAP also produced a

substantial body of analytical and descriptive publications/documents. The products of project evaluation and data collection/storage were also used extensively for the new CDD, fisheries and other projects." (pg. 13) M&E plan implementation was also rated Satisfactory in the terminal evaluation.

## **8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution**

### **8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Moderately Satisfactory**

### **8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation – Satisfactory**

There were certain things the project did well: the focus on M&E, the establishment of three institutions as per the guidelines, and the focus on sustainability are all notable successes. However, based on the information provided in the TE, the delays in funding, primarily from the European Union Trust Fund, and the lack of progress made in component 2 that resulted in a revision after the Mid-term Review, affected the quality of implementation. The project was able to achieve considerable success over the 5 year duration.

### **8.3. Overall Quality of Execution – Satisfactory**

The executing agencies seem to have succeeded in managing the impact of the project and meeting the goals laid out. External factors, such as delayed funding affected the micro-projects kick-off, however, the executing agencies were able to establish IBAP, CAIA, and FIAL with a focus on community management and long-term sustainability. They also worked directly with other Ministries to gain cross governmental support. Over 5 government offices were involved on this project.

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

Below is a summary of the lessons learned reported in the TE:

- \*The sustainability of projects in countries like Guinea-Bissau benefits from multiple, donor-supported interventions over a lengthy period. since organizational and institutional capacity is generally modest and the problems immense, multiple projects which address "segments" of large, complex sectors.
- \*Stability of the Bank and Borrower core teams is advantageous, albeit not easy to achieve.
- \*Intense and sustained supervision is entirely appropriate for high-risk environments like Guinea-Bissau
- \*The Cufada Park experience was a milestone in the Bank's relationship with the Government, showing how the Bank can support the country's natural resource management agenda.
- \*Poor procurement performance is a serious constraint for projects in Guinea-Bissau due to the lack of in-country capacity. Mentoring arrangements need a formal structure with guidelines on responsibilities and expected outcomes.
- \*The CDD approach melded with conservation incentives/goals clearly works well even in the poorest communities, and can provide substantial and sustainable benefits. This is especially important where institutional volatility and civil unrest persist.
- \*Building capacity and empowering community beneficiaries through continuous "learning by doing" which extends well beyond the specific micro-project cycle is prudent and innovative. The FIAL program adopted the principle that beneficiary community capacity should be tracked by local NGOs/authorities to assess communities' capacity and readiness to operate and maintain their investments on their own.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal



## evaluation

According to the TE, communities need to be informed up front about the amount of financing they will receive for their micro-project and who will be managing these resources to avoid discontent, suspicion and alienation from the entire micro-project cycle. This recommendation is likely based on the fact that there were delays from the EU Trust Fund that led to a delay of the micro-projects.

The TE only provided recommendations on the micro-projects program and not the rest of the project.

## 9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The terminal evaluation does a Satisfactory job of assessing relevant outcomes and impacts and the achievement of the project objectives. It provided both summary and a detail analysis (pgs. 15- 26).
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	The TE is internally consistent, provides clear and complete evidence, and justifies its rating appropriately. It does, however, take the changes made to component 2 after the publication of the Mid-term Report as given, and does not go into the details of why the component was revised. It then rates the project according to the revised components, while the project seems to have made that revision due to a lack of progress, which should be taken into consideration in the rating.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	Sustainability is mentioned throughout the document in various sections. However, the overall sustainability assessment (on pg. 61) only mentions the factors affecting sustainability and does not assess the likelihood of these risks in detail.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	The TE provides substantial lessons learned, as summarized above in section 10, however, the TE only provides recommendations for the micro-projects (FIAL) and does not address recommendations for the other components.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	No co-financing data is provided; the TE simply marks co-financing as "N/A". It does provide the initial estimated cost breakdown by component, but no actuals.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The TE does evaluate the project's M&E systems sufficiently. It would have been helpful to expand on the conclusions from the 3 internal evaluations expected on the projects, but it is unclear whether these evaluations had been carried out by the time this TE was written.

## 10. Other issues to follow up on

No areas of follow-up, however, it would be useful to have the co-financing breakdown provided.

## Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

An unintended impact of the project has been a database on all species existing in each of the five parks, thereby encouraging the possibility of achieving United Nations World Heritage Site status.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

U/A

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

No evidence yet, but it is possible that the evidence will be used for management/governance in the future.

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

As per the goals of component 4, there were 3 independent evaluations of FIAL conducted and a final report using data collected through the project.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

UA

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

According to the TE, the study assessed 45 more recently-executed micro-projects in the five Parks, using field surveys and semi-structured and informal interviews with beneficiaries and local stakeholders and found:

- (i) satisfaction levels were universally high, especially on the part of direct beneficiaries who identified many positive aspects of FIAL and even suggested further improvements;
- (ii) beneficiary communities saw FIAL's participatory approach as enabling them to analyze their problems and formulate solutions collectively;
- (iii) gender was a micro-project focus, despite the dominant presence of men in leadership positions, and important lessons were learned for gender approaches;
- (iv) communities participated at all stages of their micro-project - diagnosis, proposal preparation, implementation, operation and maintenance;
- (vii) Some communities expressed concern that the financial processes involved in their micro-project be decided and managed transparently to avoid loss of interest/motivation. (pg. 24 TE)

It is unclear how these findings were used based on the information in the TE.

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

FIAL financed 129 micro-projects (it approved 145, but was not able to finance 16 due to lack of available funds) that were tied to the park objectives. These micro-projects ranged from rehabilitation of rice paddies to installation of 130 beehives (for a more complete list, see section 2.9 on page 36 of the TE). By the end of the project, all 129 micro-projects were completed or very close to completion and had been handed off to the communities for their management, operation, and maintenance.

Was any **positive** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

According to Table 2.13.1 on page 38 of the TE, one of the indicators was "% of population of PAs with increased incomes from new knowledge, technologies and access to resources rises from 2006." The results expected for this indicator was 10% pa, however, the project achieved 16% pa due to FIAL investments for park residents in basic socio-economic infrastructure.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

All the micro-projects, as part of the FIAL investments, were handed off to the local communities. The communities were responsible for managing, operating, and maintaining the projects.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

UA

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

According to the TE, about 350 decision-makers, technicians and other stakeholders received training in environmental evaluation instruments and techniques (pg. 42). How these skills were applied by the people trained is unclear based on the information presented.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The project led to the Environmental Impact Assessment Law being approved, which sets the "legal basis for mainstreaming environmental and social considerations into future development and economic growth while legally reinforcing Environmental and Social Safeguards Unit's (CAIA's) institutional role in biodiversity conservation" (pg. 25). Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP) and CAIA prepared the "analytical basis for new laws and regulatory frameworks" (section 3.2.3, pg 17 TE). The TE mentions that by the end of the project, CAIA had acquired the legal authority to charge fees for its services; the details and structure of this process were being finalized.

In regards to the Bio-Guinea Foundation (FBG), the FBG was legally incorporated offshore and "the protocol for signature by FBG and Government was drafted, along with the Foundation's Operational Manual. Government requested EUR 1.0 million in initial capitalization for FBG as part of its commercial fisheries agreement with the EU, and another US\$2.0 - 4.0 million has been sought from the GEF." (pg 25, TE). Decisions were pending on both cases.

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

#### WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Unit for Environment and Social Safeguards (CAIA) was established in 2004 with the Prime Minister's Office and has become the institution legally representing national policy on environmental and social development.

Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP) was formally created with its mission defined, status legalized, and operations initiated.

Fund for Local Environment Initiatives (FIAL), the community fund focusing on local projects, has been established and sees 75% of it's micro-projects rated satisfactorily.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

UA

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

UA

#### WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

No clear evidence provided in the TE.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

Yes

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?  
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

With the establishment of the Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP), the managing of the country's network of protected areas and endangered species in one central location facilitated conflict resolution and decision making.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches

No

Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies

No

Financial Mechanisms

No

Please specify what was contributed:


Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

No

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

--

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

--

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

--

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

--

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Institutional Capacity (governance)

<--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

&  <--dropdown menu

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)  
 Systemic     Intended (systemic)     Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?  Measured  Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)  
 Systemic     Intended (systemic)     Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?  Measured  Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

The counterfactual in this case is the neighboring countries with coastal plains that have been seriously degraded. While the evidence presented in the TE is not conclusive, there are indications that stress reduction has, and will continue to be reduced through the Reserved Fishing Zone (RFZ) at Buba and the FIAL micro-projects addressing a variety of environmental concerns through pilot innovations.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

For the same reasons mentioned above under stress reduction at the local level, it is possible that there has been a change in environmental status, but the evidence has not been presented in the TE.

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental  Yes

Socioeconomic  Yes

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

As per component 4 of the PAD, the project invested US\$1.69 in the daily management and tracking of project implementation, project financial management and procurement, and the M&E of progress and impact. There were specific indicators established to measure socioeconomic impact, and each of the three major institutions (IBAP, CAIA, and FIAL) were to conduct its own evaluation of activities.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

The M&E design incorporated the Log Frame and was participatory and included workshops with stakeholder participation, according to the TE. The performance output indicators seem to be directly related to what the project was trying to achieve. See Table 2.29.1 on pages 43-47 for more detail.

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

Yes

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

The three institutions that were established, (IBAP, CAIA, and FIAL) all were expected to continue performing after the project. Additionally, the micro-projects that were started through FIAL were transferred into the hands of the local communities and expected to continue.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?



As stated above, IBAP, CAIA, and FIAL were given the mandate to conduct 3 evaluations at the end of the project. The monitoring that began with the establishment of these institutions is expected to continue after the project.

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

Yes

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

One instance is that the Mid-term Review (MTR) suggested that Component 2 was too ambitious, which led to the reclassification of goals and modification of the component by management.

In other regards, the monitoring data from RFZ surveillance has also been used by management to design the new (approved) West Africa Regional Fisheries Program.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

No

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

*“SOCIOECONOMIC” REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE “BEFORE” AND “AFTER” NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.*

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

Yes

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local  Intended (local)  Unintended (local)

Systemic  Intended (systemic)  Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured  Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local  Intended (local)  Unintended (local)

Systemic  Intended (systemic)  Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured  Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

According to Table 2.13.1 on page 38 of the TE, one of the indicators was "% of population of PAs with increased incomes from new knowledge, technologies and access to resources rises from 2006." The results expected for this indicator was 10% pa increase, however, the project achieved an increase of 16% pa due to FIAL investments for park residents in basic socio-economic infrastructure.