

## GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	8/9/05
GEF ID:	136		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Natural Resources Management	GEF financing:	\$8.7	Not available
Country:	Ghana	Co-financing:	\$53.5	Not available
Operational Program:	3	Total Project Cost:	\$62.2	Not available
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:			Work Program date	08/01/97
			CEO Endorsement	05/11/1998
			Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)	06/09/1999
			Closing Date	Proposed: 09/30/00 Actual: 06/30/2003
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 1 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 4 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 3
Author of TE: Nyaneba E. Nkrumah		TE completion date: January 16, 2003	TE submission date to GEF OME: 5/12/05	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 16 months

## 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	No rating	N/A	N/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	MS (rated MS in the text)	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	L	Non-evaluable	Unable to assess
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	No rating	No rating	Moderately Unsatisfactory
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

## 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

### 3.1 Project Objectives

- What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?

To increase the ecological security of globally significant biological resources, especially within

threatened tropical moist forest ecosystems. Specific objectives are to: (i) protect a significant portion of forest biodiversity through implementing an ecosystem approach to management within the high forest zone that involves strengthening management of national parks and taking selected high-biodiversity forest reserves out of production; (ii) improve knowledge of the distribution and status of rare, threatened and endemic species through targeted surveys to better focus conservation measures; (iii) to enhance biodiversity protection within multiple-use production forests through exclusion of critical habitats from logging; and (iv) ensure sustainability and preserve genetic diversity within non-timber forest species that are collected by rural populations for medicinal and consumptive uses by improved data collection, monitoring, harvest regulation and sustainable management within forest reserves.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

To protect, rehabilitate and sustainably manage national land, forest and wildlife resources and to sustainably increase the income of rural communities who own these resources. The program is to be supported under an Adaptable Program Loan (APL) approach over a period of ten years and included three implementation phases. The first phase, covering this project under review, was to focus on (a) restructuring and strengthening sector institutions; (b) finalizing policy reforms and enacting legislation related to resource pricing; (c) forest concession allocation and management; and (d) piloting collaborative resource management programs.

The second phase was to support the initial implementation of the collaborative resource management programs, focusing on selected sites considered priorities from environmental, economic or social view points. The third phase was to complete implementation of the program country-wide and ensure that the system of collaborative management with local communities was properly institutionalized at national, regional and district levels.

### **3.2 Outcomes and Impacts**

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

According to OED's evaluation summary, the project succeeded in making several changes in the policy and institutional framework, however it had significant shortcomings. The achievement and shortcomings are as follows based on the objectives above:

a) The Forestry Commission (FC) was established with four new departments. However, adoption and implementation of the Institutional Restructuring Plan for the Ghana Wildlife Department, including the recruitment and redeployment of staff has not been completed. The restructuring was significantly delayed primarily due to late arrival of donor funding resulting in non achievement of key outputs such as the completion of the process of improving the institutional, administrative and technical capacity for managing Parks and Reserves in Ghana. Neither were infrastructure improvements at wildlife and national parks completed. In addition, the Wildlife education resources facility is not operational as of the completion of the ICR. These shortcomings are particularly significant to the GEF objectives.

b) Legislation enacted includes the Forestry Plantation Fund Act (2000), the Customs and Excise Duties Amendment Act (2000), the Forest Protection Amendment Act (2002) and Amendments to the Timber Resources Management Act (1997) and the Timber Resources Management Regulations (1998). The National Action Plan to Combat Desertification has been completed and endorsed. However, the private sector plantation sub-component was unsuccessful in establishing long term involvement of the private sector mostly because the proposed funding mechanism was never established.

c) Two Forestry Acts noted above have paved the way for competitive bidding in the allocation of timber resources and the adoption of social responsibility agreements between communities and timber contractors. However implementation of recommendations on the full-scale introduction of market-based competitive bidding and timber auctioning has been very slow and have negatively affected some businesses.

d) 12 final collaborative plans were completed for 6 reserves in the high forest zone and surveys and planning were completed for 6 priority off-reserve watersheds. Management plans for 12 communities were also completed in the savannah zone. Different methods of engaging communities were piloted in 12 communities and community members engaged in a number of sustainable production activities including agroforestry, beekeeping, nursery establishment, composting, small ruminant production, and soya bean planting. However, there has been slow and unsatisfactory progress to date in identifying, documenting, demarcating and legally

establishing areas of high importance for global biodiversity within the high forest zone.

#### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1 Outcomes and impacts

**Are the project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes and impacts (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? Include an assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.**

**Rating: MU**

Many of the development objectives were achieved as mentioned above. However, the ICR indicates that the GEF funded biodiversity conservation component's progress is unsatisfactory thus far in achieving its output targets. This component did not close until September 2004 and therefore, although its progress was described, it could not be fully assessed in the ICR because it was completed in January 2003. While there has been significant progress in identifying Globally Significant Biodiversity Areas (GSBAs), the demarcation and gazetting process is still incomplete. In addition the livelihood revolving fund, envisioned to reduce encroachment into GSBAs, has not yet been established. The ICR indicates that some of these activities may still be completed by the time the GEF grant closes. In terms of efficiency, the ICR indicates that there were some delays in project implementation due to cofinancing and an overambitious agenda for the approval of legislations relevant to the project which caused some inefficiencies. It seems that the main project outcomes that are relevant to OP3 (Forest Ecosystems) and the overall biodiversity conservation as described above have not been fully achieved which compromises the relevance to the GEF biodiversity focal area. Specifically the outcomes under objective "a" and the global environmental objective.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

##### **A Financial resources**

**Rating: unable to assess**

The ICR indicates that the increased fees, improved royalty and stumpage collection rates and increased revenues in the sector as a result of new forestry legislation are sustainable because project closure is not likely to reverse the legislation, nor are collection rates likely to drop given the remarkable in-flow of funds to the sector. For example, the new forestry regulations led to an increase in the collection of outstanding royalties from 25 to 95 percent and the legislative reforms were also successful at addressing the under pricing of timber resources. Both of these factors have resulted in a significant increase in revenues to the sector. In addition, there has been a significant increase in visitors to several wildlife and nature reserves in the country resulting in increased revenue to the Wildlife Department, the District Assemblies and the communities. These results may reduce the risk that lack of financing may compromise the continuation of project outcomes. The financial sustainability of the conservation is difficult to assess given the project's limited outcomes in this area thus far as indicated above.

##### **B Socio political**

**Rating: unable to assess**

The establishment of FC has provided an opportunity for the establishment of partnerships between public, private and civil society organizations. The pilot community participation program of the project worked well and was successful in involving communities in the formation of management plans. Despite these successes it is still early to assess how they will unfold because some key activities involving communities and sustainable livelihoods to reduce encroachment have not yet been completed.

##### **C Institutional framework and governance**

**Rating: Unable to assess**

The ICR indicates that institutionally, the foundation has been laid for a longer-term sustainability of natural resource management in terms of capacity building at the FC. The FC reorganization has been successful and it has been able to assume many of its responsibilities. Most importantly, the FC is financially viable, indicating that even without support from subsequent adjustable program loans, the FC can continue to monitor and play a role in natural resource management in Ghana.

In addition, several vital pieces of legislation were adopted to establish the legal framework for

<p>the Savannah Resource Management Center (SRMC) and the Center is also financially sustainable given that all staff costs come directly from the line Ministries which, after project closure, have continued with their support, which may be an indication that it will be financially sustainable in the longer term. Legislative and policy changes in natural resources management have created a transparent log-tracking system and a transparent permit system that are sustainable.</p> <p>There is a risk to sustainability of the outcomes given that several key pieces of legislation still remain to be formulated and approved and that there was no follow on phase to support these. Therefore it is not possible to fully assess the institutional sustainability at this point.</p>
<p><b>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)</b></p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability</b></p>
<p>The ICR indicated that the SRMC is still a viable institution and provides support to other projects in the Northern part of Ghana. For example, the ongoing US\$7.6 million GEF-funded Northern Savanna Biodiversity Conservation Project (NSBCP) utilizes the existing structures and systems of the SRMC to provide support to pilot communities including those identified under the former Savanna Resources Management Project (SRMP).</p>

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

<p><b>A. Effective M&amp;E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&amp;E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Rating: MU</b></p>
<p>The OED evaluation summary indicated that monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) was weak. Specifically, baseline studies were not done and there was no M&amp;E system in place at appraisal. Only after the MTR the key position for a Director for Policy and Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation was filled and guidelines were given to clarify the role of the Project Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Department (PPMED), as well as recommendations to obtain baseline data to provide benchmarks for the evaluation. However, this was not done and thus monitoring and evaluation was limited to field visits by Desk Officers of the PPMED on an ad-hoc bases and the use of quarterly reports submitted periodically by the various component Team Leaders.</p>
<p><b>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Rating: MU</b></p>
<p>M&amp;E team operated on an ad hoc basis and had weak links with the project implementing agencies. This was reiterated by the borrower as well.</p> <p>The OED summary indicates that the Regional Environmental Information Systems were successfully installed in 10 regions and 6 pilot districts and the National Framework for Geospatial Information Management was successfully set up and participating institutions have begun contributing data, but there was no information on how these data was used.</p>
<p><b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice? No</b></p>

#### 4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

<p><b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very close attention to ensuring quality at entry can help avoid several implementation problems down the road. For example, project design should avoid being unnecessarily complex and must be tailored to the skills and institutional short and medium term implementation capacities of the implementing agency. For an agency with lower capacity, the</li> </ul>

design should focus on fewer, core project activities. This will avoid overly ambitious project designs which often result in a stumbling block to implementation.

- Parallel financing under this project led to a fragmentation of the project authority, disjointed implementation and a funding crisis that almost derailed the project. Therefore, to achieve the benefits of a partnership with donors, it is essential that joint financing be sought as this has shown to unify the funds and improve coordination to produce a beneficial synergy of effects. Other mechanisms of funding should be explored that ensure that funds come in simultaneously and well before implementation.
- In natural resource management projects, there can be a tendency to focus on implementing natural resources management measures i.e., protection of forests, watersheds, etc without sufficiently addressing the needs of the community. This project responded well to communities articulated needs. A lesson learnt is that it is important to ensure that the natural resource goals of the project are well integrated into the wider developmental needs of the community such as access to water, energy and food requirements.
- Monitoring and evaluation needs and capacities should be assessed in the first two or three supervision missions. For projects with a long time line such as NRMP, the project should consider establishing a separate M&E unit to increase effectiveness.
- Legislative procedures and creation of by-laws is a slow process and it may be necessary to ensure that some of the critical legislation is passed early on to ensure that this does not delay project implementation.
- The level of government commitment to the project needs to be assessed at the early stages of appraisal. If it is perceived to be lacking, there is a need to engage in discussions with the government, at a higher level, to determine where the problem lies. In some cases, this may be due to a financial crisis in the government or changing priorities in the government's agenda or perhaps even a failure to engage the appropriate Ministers. Once the exact problem is determined, there are many ways to address it including scaling down the project, reshaping it to address particular priorities, etc. However, early diagnosis is important to ensure that this does not adversely affect the project. In this project, GoG's level of financial commitment to the project was low and therefore the project suffered from inadequate and untimely release of funds.

**4.5 Quality of the evaluation report** 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 the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

**4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings**

In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

**4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report**

	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Not complete. The ICR was completed in January of 2003 before the GEF grant closed in September 2004, therefore the assessment of the outcomes related to identifying, demarcating and gazettement Globally Significant Biodiversity Areas (GSBAs) and working with communities to ensure their sustainable management could not be done. It is not clear why this ICR was completed so early, especially when the ICR indicates that a separate ICR will be done once</p>	4 (MS)

<p>this GEF component is complete. Doing two ICRs will increase costs especially in the absence of the second phase.</p>	
<p><b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> Yes. However there were a few issues that remain unclear from the ICR. For example, the ICR indicates that the WB and the Government of Ghana decided not to have a follow up phase without further explanation. However, the borrower's comments in the ICR note that "Without an immediate successor project, all the achievements made under the project are gradually being eroded."</p>	5 (S)
<p><b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> Yes, but the ICR does not explain what is the impact of the WB's decision not to go ahead with a second phase on the GEF component whose implementation was to cover the first two phases of Bank support.</p>	4 (MS)
<p><b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Yes, they were very good and very well written lessons applicable to a wide variety of projects.</p>	6 (HS)
<p><b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> OED evaluation summary indicates that Government contributions were well below the amount expected --US \$0.66 million compared to US\$2.2 million expected at appraisal. Of the total project cost of US\$ 25.7 million almost half came from 6 co-financiers through 14 different technical assistance and investment projects. Actual cofinancing figures were not available because several donors managed their own funds and did not report all expenditures to the Bank. The ICR did not provide what was the actual expenses from GEF funds (because GEF activities had not been completed yet)</p>	4 (MS)
<p><b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> Yes</p>	5 (S)

**4.6 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes:

No:

Explain: It would be interesting to assess how the project outcomes play out in the absence of a GEF/WB follow on phase and also how the other donor interventions affect the project outcomes, for example, the DFID supported Forest Sector Development Project (FSDP-2), which closes in 2005, and is providing support in the areas of policy, institutional and legislative reforms as well as other areas.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No

**4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

OED Evaluation summary and ICR.