

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	2183		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P085734	GEF financing:	0.848	0.832
Project Name:	Community based integrated NRM	IA/EA own:	0	
Country:	GHANA	Government:	0.629	0.629
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	0.629	
Operational Program:	OP-12: Integrated ecosystem management; Multi-focal	Total Project Cost:	1.477	0.832
IA	GEF-IBRD	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Okyeman Environmental Foundation (OKE), Ghana Wildlife Society (GWS), Forestry Commission, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		02/19/2004
		Closing Date	Proposed: 02/18/2007	Actual: 6/30/2008
TER Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	TER peer reviewed by: B. Wadhwa	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 52	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 16
Author of TE: Nyaneba E. Nkrumah		TE completion date: 03/04/2009	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months):

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

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

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

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

The terminal evaluation report does a poor job of assessing actual project outcomes relative to expected outcomes and contains minimal information on M&E and the quality of project implementation and execution.

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

No such findings were noted in the GRM Report/Terminal Evaluation.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

As stated in the Project Document, the global environmental objectives of this project were to “enhance biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of renewable natural resources in Okyeman through community-based integrated natural resource management approaches.”

There were no changes to global environmental objectives during implementation.

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

The development objectives of the project (listed as “specific objectives” in the Project Document’s log-frame) were to:

1. To improve the status of forest and wildlife resources in Okyeman through better management and minimization of current threats.
2. To establish an Okyeman forest Resources Database
3. To enhance the development and implementation of local policies and regulations for natural resource management
4. To establish an Environmental Awareness Program
5. To improve local economic development and improve livelihoods

The objectives listed above are consistent with the project’s expected outcomes.

Project activities were divided into 5 components corresponding to the objectives:

1. Improving management of forest and wildlife resources
2. Forest and biodiversity resources inventory
3. Policy and regulatory reforms at the community level
4. Capacity building and environmental awareness raising
5. Best management practices and income generation

There were no changes to global environmental objectives or project components during implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance

Rating: S

Project outcomes and impacts are relevant to GEF’s focus on conservation of globally combating and its strategies to combat land degradation significant biodiversity. Project outcomes support the World Bank’s National Assistance

Strategy, Rural Development Strategy and Forestry Strategy in Ghana.

Project outcomes are consistent with Ghana's environmental priorities as outlined in the Ghanaian Forest and Wildlife Policy, the National Environment Action Plan, Biodiversity Action Plan, National Communication for Climate Change, the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy and other planning frameworks. The project supports national efforts to sustainably manage forests and conserve biodiversity, in particular under the World Bank supported Natural Resources Management Project (NRMP) and the two GEF-supported Ghana High Forest Biodiversity Project and the Ghana Northern Savanna Biodiversity Conservation Project.

Project outcomes demonstrate that traditional concepts of Okyeman resource management can be successfully combined with modern concepts. Such a combination offers a more holistic approach to biodiversity conservation and management, combining sustainable harvesting of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) and wildlife with support for the development of alternative livelihoods.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: MS

The project has been successful in achieving a number of outcomes in support of project objectives. Natural resource management plans have been implemented, a biodiversity database was established, biodiversity concerns have been incorporated into land use planning, and environmental awareness has been increased. The project has launched sustainable livelihoods projects affecting 250 people. Achievement of outcomes fell short of targeted indicators in several components. Proposed by-laws have not been enacted; environmental awareness programs were limited. Some activities such as the sustainable livelihood sub-projects were implemented too late to monitor income growth. Outcomes that are important for sustainability were not achieved. Sustained funding for the Okyeman Foundation has not been secured and there is no plan for continued monitoring of biodiversity.

Component 1: Improving Management of Forest and Wildlife Resources

The project has achieved major outputs under this component. With extensive community input and participation, natural resource management plans have been developed and implemented for all the major forested areas. Natural resources management capacity has been increased through the establishment of the Okyeman Environmental Foundation as the environmental arm of the Okyeman traditional government and through the training of local environmental specialists. Environmental Brigades were created and are active in surveillance and policing of forest areas.

Component 2: Forest and Biodiversity Resources Inventory

Early on in the project a detailed inventory of flora and fauna in areas of high biodiversity, or at sites with good potential for recovery, was undertaken by the Ghana Wildlife Society (GWS). The TE report notes that this inventory and associated studies were "excellently done." Assessment of the extent of dependence of local communities in Okyeman on natural resources, as basis for defining alternative resources.

Component 3: Policy and Regulatory Reforms at the Community Level

Activities under this component were largely successful in meeting expected outcomes. Most importantly, an integrated land use plan was developed for Okyeman with the participation of local communities and district officials. This plan is being used as an input into district level planning. The project also assessed the effectiveness of traditional conservation strategies and natural resource management practices. Local by-laws regulating access to and use of land and forest resources have been "adopted" in selected communities according to the TE report, although not yet promulgated into law.

Component 4: Capacity Building and Environmental Awareness Raising

Outputs under this component were partially achieved. The TE report states that activities under this component were "generally well done" and "communities are well aware of the project." A community education plan was formulated and implemented in over 20 localities. There is no information whether an environmental education program for schools and community groups was ever implemented.

Component 5: Economic Development/ Sustainable Livelihoods

The project successfully supported small scale income generating activities designed to reduce pressure on the natural resources and enhance the livelihoods of people living around protected reserves. According to the TE report around 250 people received training and equipment, established businesses, and "some are already receiving revenues." These sustainable livelihoods sub-projects were supposed to target the most vulnerable groups, but there is no information on whether this was accomplished. The project also has not implemented any ecotourism activities or established arboreta.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MU

The original 3-year timeline for this project was extended by 12 months for a total 4-year implementation period. Project start-up was slow as the initial project team was inexperienced or ineffective. Most activities were executed only in years 3 and 4 of the project. The project cost \$1.47 M and made important progress towards achieving objectives. Given the delay in project activities and partial achievement of outputs and outcomes, efficiency is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

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

a. Financial resources	Rating: MU
<p>Without any sustained funding for the OEF or for the environmental brigades, there is a significant risk that the project will not be able to maintain surveillance of illegal activity or continue to implement the natural resource management plans. The GWF also needs sustained funding to continue environmental monitoring in the project area.</p> <p>Funds to support sustainable livelihoods sub-projects were managed by two rural banks rather than the traditional authority even though fees were charged for the management of these funds. Participants had received all their funding and loans prior to project close. This allowed for some continuity after the project ended- the banks would continue to monitor repayment, report to the OEF on the successfulness of the projects, and ensure the funds would be paid back over time.</p>	
b. Socio political	Rating: ML
<p>Project activities targeted smaller, more rural communities and sustainability of project outcomes is very likely among these “smaller, tighter knit communities” which are more dependent on natural resources and where traditional authorities have more weight. According to the TE report, more urbanized communities had “less interest” in the project and are less likely to provide support for maintaining outcomes. Risks to the sustainability of livelihoods sub-projects are minor. The TE report notes that some participants were already receiving income from these sub-projects by the project’s close, but that further training for participants was needed.</p> <p>There are no identified political risks in the short-term. The current King of the area is seeking to sustain and consolidate project outcomes through implementation of the NRM plans and passage of the proposed by-laws regarding land use. In the long-term, a change of power or a new King with differing priorities poses a risk to sustainability.</p>	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
<p>Institutional risks are low. At the local and district level, the land use plan developed under this project was incorporated into the district level planning framework ensuring that biodiversity will be a consideration in future decisions on development and land use. The proposed by-laws have not yet been promulgated into law, but the TE report did note any opposition. At the national level, the Forestry Commission and EPA were project partners and their policies are aligned with project outcomes.</p> <p>The OEF, the project executor, is located in the community and, if funding is available, the mobile brigades will continue to do their work in the communities. Even though OEF capacity was strengthened under this project, further improvement is required for the OEF to be able to independently sustain and continue project related activities.</p>	
d. Environmental	Rating: MU
<p>Environmental risks noted in the ProDoc remain significant and pressures to develop or exploit areas in the Okyeman may overwhelm the management plans and safeguards developed under this project.</p>	

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

<p>a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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?</p>	
<p>The expected amount of co-financing was \$0.629 M from OEF and GWS in the form of personnel, operational costs, and equipment. There is no estimate of actual co-financing amounts in the TE report. The TE report notes only that “GWS provided funds- both in cash and in kind, in the form of work, staff and vehicles.” Other than funds from GWS, “there were no additional resources leveraged.” The GWS contribution was essential to developing the biodiversity inventory and conducting all the preliminary studies. The GWS funded activities were well integrated into the project. Information on the kind and extent of co-financing from the recipient, OEF, is not presented in the TE report.</p>	
<p>b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>	
<p>Based on information in the TE report, there was an almost 18-month delay associated with project start-up. The first</p>	

project team was unfamiliar with managing projects of this type and scope. It was only after the first mission by the Bank team that the project team was replaced. The pace of implementation picked up after this change in staff.

c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

Based on the TE report, the Government of Ghana (GoG) appears to have had little direct involvement in this project. The project was proposed by the OEF, an environmental organization established by the traditional King of the Okyeman. The project had strong support from the king throughout implementation. According to the TE report the King was “instrumental” in moving the project forward, in “checking the excesses of others” and in promoting the project locally. The King’s continued support for OEF is critical for sustaining and expanding project outcomes.

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

a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MS

The M&E plan in the ProDoc included a project log-frame with objectives, objectively verifiable indicators, means of verification, and risk assumptions. The ProDoc also included an implementation timeline and detailed description of how to implement project monitoring and evaluation. The proposed budget also includes sufficient funding for project M&E activities.

While the project M&E plan contains all the necessary elements, they are not well connected. In the project log-frame the means of verification, in a few instances, do not logically permit measurement of the relevant indicators. Furthermore, the indicators specified in the log-frame are only a few of the rather ambitious and extensive set of indicators noted in project summary.

b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MS

There is little information in the TE report on the M&E plan implementation. The TE report does note that the “M&E system was set-up,” adding “there were some deficiencies but it [the M&E system] was functional.” In some aspects the M&E system was useful in monitoring project implementation. Supervisory missions from the Bank, for example, were conducted routinely and the recommendations from these missions were implemented. However there is no evidence that the project team used the M&E system to improve project performance or to adapt activities to the on-the-ground reality. The TE report does not mention training in M&E implementation and given the low capacity of the executing agency, it is unlikely that any data collection or monitoring will continue after project closure.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS

b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

Bank performance and the overall quality of implementation were moderately satisfactory. This project was unique in that the executing agency (and project proposer) was a traditional authority rather than a government agency or NGO. Given the limited capacity and inexperience of the executing agency, the project’s design was over-ambitious. A project with fewer components or fewer expected outputs for each component might have been more feasible within the 3-year time frame.

There was an 18-month delay in the start of implementation. More extensive training and management input at the start of the project might have reduced the delay in start-up. The Bank did identify and remedy the situation. The TE report notes that a “key mission at the end of the first year was instrumental in changing implementation arrangements and putting the focus and resources 100% at engaging the local communities.” Following this mission, the Bank also pushed for a change in staff at the project management unit (PMU). Input and oversight by the Bank was stronger during the latter half of the implementation period, and the pace of implementation was stepped up.

Supervision by the Bank was adequate. The Bank team conducted semi-annual missions. The quality of risk management and procurement oversight was appropriate. To reduce disbursement risks, the Bank ensured that funds for the sustainable livelihoods sub-projects were disbursed to local banks rather than directly to the office of the King. The TE report notes that “a procurement review has been done and was found satisfactory.”

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) MS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The executing agency was the Okyeman Environment Foundation (OEF), the environmental arm of the Okyeman traditional authority, in partnership with the Ghana Wildlife Society (GWS). The OEF had very limited capacity for managing an internationally funded project. The TE report notes “the OEF totally lacked experience in project implementation, planning, etc.” The OEF had no knowledge of bank procedures. The OEF initially sought to fully control grant funds. It took over ten months to resolve conflicts over control of funds and begin implementation. GWS, an organization with greater administrative and technical capabilities, was an invaluable partner, and worked closely with OEF to move the project forward. According to the TE report “GWS taught the OEF aspects of community engagement, community training and organization,” although this was not a major aspect of project design. The quality of outputs, particularly the biodiversity studies and inventory conducted by GWS, was high.

Project execution took over 18-months to get off the ground. The first major grant disbursement was in late 2005, although the project start date was Feb. 2004. Project baselines were established over a year and half after signing. Greater management input from the IA at the start of project execution might have reduced this delay. Execution improved significantly after the Bank pushed for staffing changes in the PMU. There is insufficient information in the TE report to assess the quality of risk management or candor in reporting by the executing agency.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?

Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Support to design and implement community-based integrated natural resource management plans incorporating traditional knowledge and practices.	Natural resource assessments fed into participative management plans for critical forests habitats and key wildlife species.	Improved natural resources management strategies and minimization of current threats.	Status of forest and wildlife resources in Okyeman is improved.
Support to develop local expertise through training workshops and study tours	Integrated land use plan for Okyeman to guide land-based development initiatives.	Strengthened local policies and regulations for natural resources management.	Enhanced biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of renewable natural resources.
Support to strengthen the work initiated by the Okyeman Environment Brigades	An environmental awareness program about key environmental issues and threats to biodiversity.	Greater community understanding of biodiversity management.	Illegal exploitation of resources is minimized.
Production and dissemination of environmental education/awareness materials and implementation of a school environmental education program.	Sustainable livelihoods/ecotourism projects launched.	Community support for enactment of appropriate local by-laws to enforce local NRM regulations.	Improved capacity of local institutions and communities to manage natural resources in a sustainable manner.
	Strengthened natural resources management capacity of local institutions.	Widespread adoption of sustainable livelihoods practices.	Increased food and income security through sustainable livelihoods and natural resource management strategies.

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

<p>Identification and support for innovative sustainable natural resource use options and demonstrate best natural resources management practices.</p> <p>Support small scale income generating activities and ecotourism ventures to reduce pressure on the natural resources and enhance livelihood sources of people living around protected reserves</p>	<p>Linkages with Community Biodiversity Advisory Groups and community Forest Committees as well as other community-based NRM groups.</p>			
<p>b. What are the actual (<i>intended or unintended</i>) impacts of the project? Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts <u>and to impact drivers</u> (Impact drivers are the <i>significant factors</i> that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence.)</p>				
<p>Although a number of baseline studies were done at the beginning of the study, there is no information on the current level of illegal logging or hunting, or on species population levels. It is not possible to gauge whether the project has had environmental impacts. This project has significantly improved the capacity of the executing agency, the Okyeman Environment Foundation (OEF), to manage future initiatives focused on biodiversity conservation and natural resource management. The project has also mobilized community support for sustainable resource management, through environmental awareness campaigns in over 20 localities and extensive community participation in developing NRM plans and strategies. Surveillance and policing of illegal activity has been strengthened through the establishment of local environmental brigades. And, the biodiversity inventory and studies conducted by the Ghana Wildlife Foundation (GWF) present useful tools for monitoring area biodiversity, identifying potential risks, and as an input into land use planning.</p> <p>Impact Drivers: The involvement and person support of the traditional King was an important factor in achievement of project outcomes and ultimately impacts. Another impact driver was the participation of the GWF, which was critical to successful implementation of the project. Continued and close involvement of the King and GWF will help ensure that the project realize long-term impacts.</p>				
<p>c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?</p>				
<p>There are significant risks to the sustainability of impacts. The sustainability of the community environmental brigades and the continuation of environmental monitoring activities depend on funding availability. There is also some risk that the weak administrative capacity of the OEF will hamper implementation of the NRM plans. Politically, there is a risk that a change of authority could erode any progress made under this project; therefore it is important that the proposed environmental regulations be legally adopted.</p>				
<p>d. Evidence of Impact</p>				

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?		X	
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?		X	
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)		X	
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?		X	
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?		X	
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?			
e. Monitoring of impacts			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?	X		
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?		X	

6. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

- When implementing sustainable livelihoods projects, it is important to establish high standards for equipment and materials purchased by beneficiaries, or have the project, itself, purchase and deliver the equipment and breeding stock. This project had better results than another project that directly gave participants the funds to get their own equipment and breeding stock- the lesson learnt from that project was that materials and breeding stock were substandard because participants used the funds for themselves and spent the least they could on equipment. This resulted in a lot of loss. This project learnt from this experience and ensured an improved design.
- Directing funding through traditional authorities (i.e. the King) is risky. In this project, the funds for sustainable livelihoods component were managed by two local banks rather than by the traditional authority. This allowed for

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

some continuity after the project ended- the banks would continue to monitor, report to the OEF on the successfulness of the projects, and ensure the funds would be paid back over time. This external oversight was very important in minimizing the risk that funds would be misused.

3. Role of Traditional Rulers: Top-level political support for the project was crucial. The highest level of the Kingship, not the smaller chiefs who reside over the villages, should always be involved in the project, if his reputation is a good one. A number of times we needed the King's assistance and he was instrumental in being the force that helped move the project forward and in checking the excesses of others and in ensuring that the communities knew that the GEF/Bank were there at the invitation of the King.
4. Role of NGOs: The Ghana Wildlife Society (GWS) was an exceptional asset in the implementation of this project, particularly in dealing with the communities, organizing activities, and putting structure into implementation.
5. Direct Control of Forest Resources: A final key lesson learnt is that communities will be more likely to protect those resources for which they have direct control. Smaller, tighter knit communities closer to the resource were more likely to have great enthusiasm for protection of their forest and water resource, once trained. In more urban communities, where control by local authorities was looser, there was less interest and the project lagged in these communities. Choosing sites and communities is therefore important farming after a period of 2 years- this agreement took more than 9 months to achieve- too late for the project.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

- The Bank/GEF should continue to support these non-traditional approaches but ensure certain safeguards- the use of an NGO, highly reputable, to provide technical expertise and to do some of the implementation is important since capacity is extremely low.
- The time-frame of a project such as this should be extended to obtain a better result- 5 years minimum.
- Financial accountability needs to be ensured because traditional authorities (Kings, Chiefs, etc.), are not used to being accountable for detailed levels of expenditures. Direct funding of a traditional authority, as opposed to a government agency, must come with strong financial and procurement oversight because a) these groups are not used to receiving these large sums and b) they may not be clear that the Bank has stringent requirements in terms of use and accountability. As such, the project has to be designed so that procurement and financial risks are minimized. Options are to use banks or an international NGO in areas where the local bank network is not as well developed.
- Sustainability needs to be ensured-perhaps by linking the project up more closely with a government or local government institution that can continue to fund the ventures.
- Despite the difficulties associated with implementing such a project, extensive community participation ensures that elements of biodiversity protection will continue once it is engrained in the fabric of the community's by-laws.
- One issue the GEF should decide on is what form the livelihoods package should be delivered to these poor communities-loans, grants or low interest loans. The problem with using current interest rates is that they are often so high that one wonders whether the cost of the livelihoods will ultimately cause more poverty rather than less. Banks are less likely to want to manage a project's funds and recover those funds if no interest is used. This issue needs to be discussed, with a clear approach articulated, for biodiversity livelihood ventures in poorer countries.
- The poverty reduction benefits through the livelihood fund are probably the most successful part of this project, providing real alternatives to communities and this should be continued as an essential part of biodiversity conservation.

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

No other sources were available.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criterion based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to

document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The report briefly assesses outcomes for each component, but there is little evidence to support the assessments. Actual outcomes are not compared to expected outcomes. Project impacts are briefly mentioned however there is no mention of environmental impacts.</p>	MU
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</p> <p>No evidence gaps or inconsistencies were noted. The report was prepared by the IA. The evidence presented provides minimal support for the ratings.</p>	MS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The report briefly discusses institutional and financial risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.</p>	MS
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>There is some evidence to support the lessons learned. The lessons are not comprehensive. Further lessons might consider issues in project design, capacity of executing agency, ensuring sustainability, etc.</p>	MS
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>The report includes the total actual cost, but not the actual co-financing or costs per activity.</p>	U
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?</p> <p>The report contains only a rating of the M&E system.</p>	U

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

No other sources were available.