

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		349	
GEF Agency project ID		238	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation of Biodiversity through Effective Management of Wildlife Trade	
Country/Countries		Gabon	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-3: Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		WWF-US: subcontracted agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		5/1/1991	
Effectiveness date / project start		7/14/1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		8/8/1997	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/1998	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		1	0.84
Co-financing	IA own	0	UA
	Government	0.64	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	UA
	Private sector	0	UA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	UA
Total GEF funding		1	0.84
Total Co-financing		0.64	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.64	UA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2/1999	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		J. F. Swartzendruber, Ibrahima Ly, Anaclé Bissielo	
TER completion date		September 2014	
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	n/a	n/a	n/a	UA
Sustainability of Outcomes	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
M&E Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU
Quality of Implementation	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
Quality of Execution	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document, the global environmental objective of the project is to protect biodiversity in Gabon by addressing the wildlife trade. Bushmeat is a major source of sustenance in Gabon's rural communities, but the wildlife trade is unregulated and there is a lack of information on how the trade affects biodiversity. The project aims to reduce overexploitation by improving knowledge of the wildlife trade, creating a mechanism to manage it, and increasing capacity for sustainable management of wildlife.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objectives of the project are as follows, quoted from the Project Document (PD):

1. Improved knowledge and implementation of national legislation and international treaties through training of personnel;
2. National legislation on management and trade of wildlife adapted to the socio-economic reality in Gabon and to CITES requirements;
3. Development of a framework for long-term monitoring of wildlife use and trade, and its impact on biological diversity;
4. Development of strategies to implement legislation and management policies on wildlife trade, and links with biological diversity conservation; and
5. Long-term maintenance of the directorates charged with wildlife conservation and management and continuation of monitoring activities.

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

Yes. The terminal evaluation states that the project was "originally conceived as an initiative to conserve biodiversity by better managing the trade in a wide range of species," but its scope narrowed "to the problem of domestic consumption of bushmeat" in 1996, two years after project start (TE, page 23). In

1997, a tripartite meeting increased the number of project activities. Later on in 1998, activities were cut from the project after the formation of the project steering committee. The TE does not state which activities or objectives were changed, or why the changes took place.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

This project falls under GEF Operational Program 3, Forest Ecosystems. The Operational Program prioritizes conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems, which the project intends to accomplish via gathering information, building capacity, and fostering sustainable management of the fauna used for bushmeat and the wildlife trade in Gabon’s forests.

The project is also relevant to Gabon’s national priorities. One year before the start of the project, new legislation on environmental protection was adopted. The law stipulated the protection and sustainable management of flora and fauna. Gabon had also recently signed the Convention on Biological Diversity and had adopted new decrees on wildlife protection.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unable to Assess
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The terminal evaluation does not contain a comprehensive explanation or evaluation of the project’s activities and outcomes. Instead, it provides the following list of outputs (TE, pages 29-30):

- Legal analysis of wildlife management legislation in Cameroon, Botswana and Zimbabwe.
- *Etude critique de la législation relative à la gestion de la faune sauvage au Gabon: Rapport National Botswana, Volume IV* by Batlalefhi Moeletsi, Consultant IUCN.
- *Etude critique de la législation relative à la gestion de la faune sauvage au Gabon: Rapport National Zimbabwe, Volume V* by Jennifer Clare Mohamed, Consultant IUCN
- CITES regional training seminar and training-of-trainers
- *Etude critique de la législation relative à la gestion de la faune sauvage au Gabon: Rapport National Cameroun, Volume III* by Stéphane Doumbe-Bille, Consultant IUCN
- *Etude critique de la législation relative à la gestion de la faune sauvage au Gabon: Rapport Finale, Volume I* by Patrice Christy, Consultant national WWF

- *Etude sur la faisabilité de l'élevage commercial d'espèces sauvages au Gabon* by Ferran Jori, Consultant WWF
- Training in wildlife and botanical inventory methodology, Gamba Protected Area Complex
- *Etat du commerce international des espèces animales et végétales couvertes par la CITES au Gabon* by Patrice Christy, Consultant WWF and Anne Vanden Bloock, TRAFFIC
- *Rapport final concernant l'étude sur l'élevage de gibier financée par le projet GEF* by Vétérinaires Sans Frontière
- Drafting of implementation decrees for new forestry law
- First wildlife trade working group meeting
- *Proposition sur un mécanisme de gestion du commerce national de la faune au Gabon – Synthèse du premier atelier du Groupe de Travail sur le Commerce des Espèces Sauvages (GCTES)* by Lisa Steel, Consultant WWF and Joseph Maroga Mbina, DFC
- Second wildlife trade working group meeting
- Analyse des ébauches de décrets d'application - – *Synthèse du deuxième atelier du Groupe de Travail sur le Commerce des Espèces Sauvages (GCTES)* by Lisa Steel, Consultant WWF and Joseph Maroga Mbina, DFC
- Draft implementation decrees for new legislation submitted to Ministry
- *Final Project Report*, WWF

These outputs cover “analysis of legislation pertaining to wildlife management, training of customs agents in CITES procedures...comparative studies of wildlife management approaches in other countries (Botswana, Zimbabwe, Cameroon), training of field agents in wildlife inventory techniques,” and the formation of a Wildlife Trade Working Group (TE, page 13). The TE also reports that the project activities included “a technical feasibility study and a pilot experiment on captive breeding, to establish the technical basis for potential game ranching to substitute for bushmeat hunting,” as well as the provision of equipment to support Gabon’s Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting (TE, page 13). Lastly, the project “co-funded a number of related activities with other projects and agencies operating in Gabon,” but does not explain what these other activities and projects were (TE, page 13). There is no analysis in the TE of the quality of the training or studies produced, nor of the outcome of the captive breeding program. The TE states that copies of the studies are available to the government of Gabon, but “it is not clear to what extent they have been internalized” and “the institutional capacity to use this information remains uncertain” (TE, page 22). In addition, the project’s proposed legislative reforms have yet to be adopted. The TE states that several activities were canceled, suspended, or incomplete at the end of the project, but does not explain which activities were completed and which were not.

Project effectiveness is rated unable to assess due to the lack of data and evidence for the completion and quality of project activities.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------	--

Without knowing the status of completion of the project’s activities, it is difficult to rate project efficiency. However, the TE points out several instances of poor efficiency. For example, “the project spent a considerable proportion of its time in reformulation of priorities, adding or changing activities as

objectives evolved” in its first few years (TE, page 5). A formal restructuring of the project took place in its final year, and the last six months of the project “became significantly more focused and productive” (TE, page 6). Until the final few months, the project work plan “was interrupted at numerous points and...was carried out with little discipline” (TE, page 23). There were also “long delays in the establishment of mechanisms or procedures for effective collaboration between the project partners, thus undermining the contribution of the necessary institutional and technical support to the initiative” (TE, page 23).

The TE also reports on a missed opportunity for project gains. The project’s plan included provisions for national staff members to work side-by-side with the consultants contracted by the project to complete studies, but the project managed the studies “as contract deliverables rather than as training opportunities,” thus missing an opportunity for capacity-building in Gabon’s government (TE, page 22).

The project was extended by a year and did not spend all of its resources from the GEF, but the TE does not give an explanation for either event.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unlikely
--------------------	-------------------------

It is difficult to assess project sustainability without a clear explanation of project outcomes. In general, the TE states that “some of these activities will not be followed-up. For this reason, they can be considered as results which still remain to be achieved” (TE, page 6).

Financial: Unlikely; there is no evidence for continued financial support of project gains. For example, the end of the project has left the Wildlife Trade Working Group “with an uncertain status” (TE, page 22). The management of the national counterpart agency, Gabon’s Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting, “appears to be realizing that it may have opportunities to maintain at least some activities even in the absence of additional donor funding,” but the Directorate “has yet to articulate how it will to carry forward the work begun by the GEF Wildlife Trade project” (TE, page 22). There is no evidence of any funds committed to post-project activities.

Sociopolitical: Moderately unlikely; the TE reports that the Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting has close ties to the WWF country program in Gabon. By using these ties, the WWF could provide an opportunity for the Directorate to engage in wildlife inventories and other field operations related to protected areas. But as stated above, the Directorate has no plans to continue the project’s work. Ties between the Directorate and the project appear to be weak, judging by the lower-than-expected number of counterpart staff allotted by the Directorate to the project and the lack of side-by-side work with project consultants (TE, page 22).

Institutional: Moderately likely; the project made strides in increasing the information, skills, and equipment of the Gabon government regarding wildlife management. However, “the institutional capacity to use this information remains uncertain” (TE, page 22). In addition, “it is not clear to what extent [the studies that the project commissioned] have been internalized” by the Directorate of

Wildlife and Hunting (TE, page 22). The legislation that the project drafted has yet “to be promulgated and put into practice” (TE, page 6). Therefore it is not clear that the institutional improvements attempted by the project will be sustained.

Environmental: UA; environment risks are not assessed or mentioned in the TE.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Unable to assess; the TE does not give numbers or detailed information on cofinancing. It states that “the government did not provide a substantial portion of the in-kind resources committed in the project document,” particularly staff hours from the Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting (TE, page 22). No information is available on other potential sources of cofinancing or how the lower-than-expected staff hours affected the project.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Unable to assess. While PMIS reports the project effectiveness date as July 1994, the TE states that project operations did not begin until November 1995, when the Chief Technical Advisor for the project was hired. The TE does not give the reason for the hiring delay. The project ended a year and four months later than expected at project start, but there is no explanation for why this occurred or how either event affected the project.

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

Country ownership of the project appears to be low. According to the TE, ties between the project and the national counterpart, the Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting, were weak (TE, page 22). The Directorate did not assign as many personnel to the project as was agreed in the project document. The TE states that the Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting “appears to have played a fairly passive role until the final year of the project” (TE, page 22). Since the TE gives only a cursory description of project activities and outputs, it is unclear what role the Directorate played in the project. The apparent lack of commitment to the project may have negatively affected sustainability, since the Directorate “has yet to articulate how it will to carry forward the work begun by the GEF Wildlife Trade project” (TE, page 22).

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately

Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The Project Document stipulates yearly tripartite reviews, yearly evaluation reports, and a midterm and final evaluation. However, “no specific provision was made for project monitoring” (TE, page 19). The Project Document intended for the collection of data on wildlife populations and the bushmeat market, but there is no budget for data collection or surveys in the Project Document. Overall, the TE considers M&E design to be deficient: “the primary indicator of project success remains the completion of a series of studies, consultant reports, and workshop proceedings...but this provides little sense of the degree to which the project has been able to implant at least the initial components of a longer-term mechanism for sustainable management of wildlife trade” (TE, page 22).

M&E design is rated moderately unsatisfactory for the lack of monitoring provisions and poor indicators of project outcomes.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	--

M&E implementation was poor. According to the TE, “there has been only sporadic monitoring of bushmeat markets,” and “there has been no systematic recording of prices or other data, thus at present there is little basis for assessing changes in the [bushmeat] market” (TE, page 20). Two tripartite meetings brought about changes in the project framework and activity list, but the TE does not specify what changes were made or why. There is little information to make an assessment on adaptive management.

The midterm evaluation proposed a new set of monitoring indicators that would better track project outcomes and impacts, such as the number of people trained on various topics, customs statistics, market indicators, indicators on the changes in Gabon’s national strategy, and more. The TE calls the number of proposed indicators “unrealistic and excessive,” but also states that “it would have been useful for the project to have initiated at least a subset of the proposed monitoring system” (TE, page 20). The project did not adopt any of these new indicators. Therefore the aforementioned M&E design, which prioritized the status of project activities over project outcomes, remained intact and very little monitoring was carried out.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout

project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--	-------------------------------

The TE points out several flaws in project design. First, “it is probably fair to say that the project document...did not provide a fully-sufficient basis for beginning field activities by the time work began in late 1995. At the least, a project launch workshop should have been held with close collaboration of the project partners (UNDP, UNOPS, DFC, and WWF) to review assumptions, verify the feasibility of proposed activities, and develop mechanisms for communication and coordination” (TE, page 18). Also, the TE states that the \$1 million budget was too low for the range of activities included in the Project Document, and “the project document also added an ambitious but poorly-formulated component for community-based wildlife management” (TE, page 5). Also, the expectations for the number of staff members that would be assigned to the project from the Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting were too high. Lastly, the TE mentions that “it was probably unrealistic” to build a comprehensive network with other agencies involved in the wildlife trade (such as customs) without trying to change the organizational structure of the Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting or identifying policy bottlenecks (TE, page 19).

Project supervision appears to have been ineffective. The TE reports that the work plan “was interrupted at numerous points and...was carried out with little discipline” (TE, page 23). This situation was not corrected and may have been exacerbated by the two tripartite reviews that changed project activities and objectives. In addition, there was no project steering committee until the project’s final year and the roles of the project partners were unclear. There were “long delays in the establishment of mechanisms or procedures for effective collaboration between the project partners, thus undermining the contribution of the necessary institutional and technical support to the initiative” (TE, page 23).

Project implementation is rated unsatisfactory for an overambitious, under-budgeted, and poorly formulated project design, as well as a lack of effective supervision on the part of UNDP.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unsatisfactory
---	-------------------------------

Partly as a result of weak project design and supervision, project execution experienced many problems. The Chief Technical Advisor was not recruited for a year, which delayed the start of project activities. In addition, there was a lack of clarity of his role: “UNDP and UNOPS expected the Chief Technical Advisor

to function as a technical support contractor...with no a priori commitments to WWF program responsibilities... In contrast, within WWF the CTA represented a senior member of the WWF country staff...and responsible to WWF-US management on a day-to-day basis” (TE, page 24). An institutional reorganization within the WWF negatively affected the project as well. WWF’s country program in Gabon was transferred from WWF-International to WWF-US, which caused “a long management gap in the Libreville office” (TE, page 23). Confusion over the various roles and responsibilities for the project lasted until the project’s final year, when the steering committee was created and a new international consultant was hired. Other execution problems included disagreements between WWF and the two UN agencies over the role of community management in the project, and the perceived lack of buy-in and institutional support on the part of WWF.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No environmental changes were reported by the project.

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

No socioeconomic changes were reported by the project.

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

a) Capacities

The extent of capacity changes in the government of Gabon is unclear. The project initiated several studies, including an analysis of wildlife management legislation and comparative studies of wildlife management in other countries, such as Botswana, Zimbabwe, and Cameroon. The project also trained customs agents in CITES procedures and trained field agents in wildlife inventory techniques.

Finally, it provided equipment to the Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting to aid in field studies. But there is no information in the TE on the number of people trained or how the studies were disseminated.

b) Governance

The project attempted to bring about governance improvements by drafting legislation and decrees on the wildlife trade. However, none of the recommendations of the project have been implemented by the government of Gabon, so there were no governance impacts at the time of writing of the TE.

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

No unintended impacts were reported by the project.

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

There were no plans for adoption or replication, and no instances of adoption were reported in the TE.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The lessons learned in the TE are as follows:

There are weaknesses in the GEF pilot phase procedures for project design, technical review, and work-planning, but these weaknesses are being addressed through logframes, independent technical review, and closer supervision of field activities.

A foot-in-the-door approach to funding can backfire if there are inadequate resources available to ensure a solid base is built for follow-on activities.

NGOs should only be used as technical assistance or consulting providers in rare situations, and when procedures and costs are agreed upon by all parties to ensure supervision and monitoring.

In-kind government contributions “are often honored in the breach,” which affects country ownership, internalization of lessons, and enthusiasm for project interventions (TE, page 28).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The first recommendation presented regards the potential for a follow-up project. A follow-up project is recommended under certain conditions: conduct a preliminary feasibility studies for project identification, assure delivery of partner commitments, and achieve a sustainable mechanism for monitoring and management of wildlife.

The Gabon Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting should be transformed into a wildlife and national parks management agency. Donors should provide financial support for growing the number of protected areas.

Game ranching should be continued, but with more analysis of economic factors, substitution effects, and the experiences of game ranching in other countries. Well-understood approaches should be studied in favor of novel and uncertain approaches to domestication.

There should be feasibility studies on zoning and hunting concession management based on ecological potential.

A comparative assessment of experiences in land and resource tenure among central African countries would be very useful.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE does not contain an assessment of outcomes, impacts, and achievement of objectives. At best it provides a list of project outputs. The TE implies that some activities were left incomplete but does not explain which ones.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence presented in the TE is severely incomplete. There is no explanation for many of the events that affected the project (e.g. hiring delay of the Chief Technical Advisor, extension of the project, changes to development objectives and project activities, etc.)	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE's section on sustainability is only one paragraph long and mainly addresses the Wildlife Trade Working Group, but other parts of the TE give a little more information. The lack of information on project outcomes made it difficult to assess project sustainability.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	It is difficult to assess whether the lessons learned are supported by evidence, when there is so little evidence presented in the TE on project outcomes. However, they seem adequate and based on project experience.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE states that in-kind cofinancing from the government of Gabon was lower than planned, but does not give end-of-project financing numbers.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Generally adequate, but the TE does not give enough details about the results of the tripartite meetings. It does not explain what was changed by the meetings.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MU

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