

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		August 2008
GEF Project ID:	359		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	139	GEF financing:	2,454,540	1,157,000
Project Name:	Optimization of biodiversity in game ranching systems; a pilot experiment in a semi arid area	IA/EA own:	0	
Country:	Burkina Faso	Government:	1,032,700	UA*
		Other**:	0	0
		Total Cofinancing	1,032,700	0
Operational Program:	Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	3,487,240	1,157,000
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Government of Burkina Faso, Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Jul 1994
		Closing Date	Proposed: Dec 2000	Actual: Dec 2005
Prepared by:	Reviewed by: Alejandro Imbach	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 78 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 138 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 60 months
Author of TE: Roy Hagen, Team Leader, Intntl. Consultant Jean-Baptiste KAMBOU, Consultant National		TE completion date: May 2006	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 23 months

* The co-financing aspects are confusing and inconsistent across the Project document, the PIRs and the TE. Some documents mention no co-financing, some others speak about in-kind contributions, two research organizations from Belgium and Italy are mentioned as part of the Project and contributing to get results, but their contribution is accounted for financially just in the last PIR but not at TE or Project document.

** 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	S	MS*	NA	U
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MS*	NA	U
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS*	NA	U
2.1d Quality of Implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MU
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

* The actual rating of the Terminal Evaluation is Half-Satisfactory (Moyennement satisfaisante, in the original French) on a scale of just 4 categories (Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Half-satisfactory and Unsatisfactory). Therefore, when converted to the 6-category scale used by GEF, the equivalent is between MU and U.

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?
 YES. The TE made a thorough effort to present and describe the Project successes and shortcomings despite feeble TOR. The evaluators commented in their Report some inadequacies in the Evaluation TOR towards highlighting the good results and their efforts to overcome them and to present a complete view.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
 YES. There is a clear divergence between the findings of the internal reviews and reports prepared by the operational staff (APR and PIR) and the findings of the terminal evaluation report. This divergence may be due to differences in the criteria used and people doing the evaluations. Therefore, finding out what really happened and learning from that experience may be a useful follow-up task for GEF EO. An issue of concern that the terminal evaluation points out is that the PIRs were light and, in some analyzed cases, the information provided by the PIR is exactly the opposite to that from the TE analysis (PIR reported 50% income gains, while TE reports 15% income decrease, related with Nazinga financial sustainability analysis). An obvious difficulty for follow-up will be that the Project closed 3 years ago.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

The Project was originally approved in 1994 with its original Project appraisal document. After a couple of years of implementation it was stopped and redesigned through a two year long process during which there were no fund disbursements. The restructured project was approved in 2001. The Objectives of the original and restructured project are different. The Terminal Evaluation is based on the objectives of the restructured project.

According to the original project appraisal document (1994) the main objective of the project was to determine “how to optimize biodiversity conservation in wild life ranching systems, and more particularly in those systems that are located in the arid and semi arid zones of western Africa.

According to PIR 2002, after restructuring the global environmental objective of the project changed to: “demonstrating ways of optimizing both the conservation of biodiversity and the productivity of game ranching systems in Western Africa.”

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The original development objectives (1994) of the project and those after restructuring (2001) are listed below.

Original Development objectives:

1. Define and apply a replicable approach to the integration of biodiversity within the Nazinga Game Ranch.
2. Help develop an entity in charge of research applied to the management of game ranches in order to optimize biodiversity, training in game ranching at the national and regional levels, and dissemination of the outputs
3. Help develop a model partnership between the government, the private sector, local population groups and NGOs in a sound commercial operation for the use of wildlife and biodiversity conservation;
4. Help the Nazinga Ranch reach its objective of integrating the rural population groups in an efficient system for land and natural resource management;
5. Strengthen the national capacities in ecologically sound game ranching, both within the government and the local population

Development objectives after restructuring:

1. Each category of identified actors (private sector; public sector; local communities) carries out at least one portion/activity of the shared-management of the ranch at Nazinga
2. Financial resources necessary for capitalization and valorisation of biological diversity at Nazinga are mobilized
3. Improved knowledge of biodiversity and its economics potentials for sustainable exploitation at Nazinga
4. Acquired knowledge on Nazinga game ranching and biodiversity conservation sufficiently put to use, particularly local knowledge in biological diversity harnessed and available document disseminated
5. Models of game ranching management / operations for economic profitability and biodiversity conservation formulated and tested

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance	Rating: S
The project aimed to address issues such as involvement of private and NGO partners, engagement of local communities, doubtful wildlife monitoring methods, hunting quotas not supported by adequate studies, increased poaching, that are important for biodiversity conservation in arid and semi arid areas of Africa.	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: U
The project failed to achieve expected outcomes and performed unsatisfactorily on the specified indicators. The TE highlights the following shortcomings:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The co-management of the Game Ranch included in the ProDoc was not achieved. It remains under Governmental management • Poaching levels can be considered as a good indicator of the good relationships with the neighboring communities. Unfortunately poaching is still a strong threat. Moreover, the alliance with the ONG FEM seems good, but it seems inadequate to deal with these issues. • Neither the diversification of activities included in the ProDoc nor their privatization happened yet. • Buffalo is by far the most hunted species. Its hunting quota is not based on population studies nor, at least, on established and known rules. The quota is highly higher than international recommendations and buffaloes are also strongly poached. • The Project did not establish a basic list of the Ranch species that are endangered nor their critical habitats in the Ranch. Therefore it is difficult to identify the measurements taken to optimize biodiversity conservation. • The rotation of Ranch Staff is quite high and conspires against the good management of the Ranch • The Ranch does not have neither a Management Plan nor a Business Plan. Their preparation was not even foreseen in the ProDoc, despite the concept that the Ranch should be managed as a commercial enterprise. • Several pieces of Research were carried out with external support. Their findings and recommendations were not adequately considered for the management of the Ranch • There are serious constraints for the use in the Ranch of the income generated there due to the absence of adequate legal documents establishing an management regime with the necessary autonomy to do that. 	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: U
The efficiency of the Project was also Unsatisfactory considering the long time taken for its implementation (more than a decade), the use of more than US\$ 1 million of GEF funds plus other cofinancing and the limited number of results achieved.	

4.1.2 Impacts

Following impacts have been noted in the terminal evaluation report:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The population of most of the wild herbivore species has increased. • Tourism has increased significantly

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: 3
The increase in tourism visitation is bringing income to the protected game ranch. The income for hunting fees, which is second major source of income, is also growing. Thus, financial risks are small.	
b. Socio political	Rating: 1
The poor engagement of the local communities, including the riverine ones, and the persistence of poaching activities means a significant level of risk for sustainability of results, particularly because the main instrument to solve that problem (the GEF Project) is no longer active.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 2
The institutional framework is feeble as the local groups, private sector and other stakeholders are integrated in an advisory body with little direct influence on the Game Ranch management that remains fully under Governmental management.	
d. Environmental	Rating: 3
The quotas for the major hunted species including buffaloes are not based in reliable studies. This poses a small potential risk to sustainability of project outcomes.	
e. Technological	Rating: 4
No technological risks seem to affect the project outcomes.	

b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?

There is no evidence about an M&E System further than the UNDP visits. According to the TE these missions were late and the planned mid-term review was cancelled. Moreover, the reports from these missions (the PIRs) were light and did not assign responsibility to anybody about the implementation of their recommendations.

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.

No. It was not according to the TE given that several key problems were ignored or weakly mentioned and no attempt was made to hold Government responsible for implementing M&E recommendations

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

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

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

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.

The original quality of original project design was unsatisfactory due to which the project had to be redesigned. The project document for the restructured project was not available for the review. The shortcomings highlighted by the TE indicate that the IA supervision was less than satisfactory. The PIRs are not candid and do not adequately report on problems that the project was facing. As a result, there is considerable disconnect between the performance reported through PIRs and that through the TE report. The TE has addressed this issue in a candid manner. It points out that due project performance suffered due to insufficient supervision and follow-up by the IA.

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

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 performance of the Executing Agency also seems to be unsatisfactory. This is reflected not only in significant delays in Project implementation but also in the lack of will to progress in achieving targets specified in the Project document. The unsatisfactory performance of the executing agency is underscored by its failure in facilitating modifications in the legal basis for of the Ranch operations, proper engagement of all surrounding communities, insufficient opportunities and incentives to the private sector, little or no use of the research to adjust wildlife management techniques, unjustified increases in the number of hunting licenses, etc.

5. 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

The key lessons listed in the TE pertain to the need to have better project planning procedures. According to the TE the problem diagnosis for the project was weak, the expected situation at the end of the project was not clearly defined and the Logframe design was not in sync with the problem analysis and the expected outcomes.

It also highlights the need to engage technical experts in the key project areas. In the Nazinga case these areas are wildlife management for hunting, tourism, and community participation. The lack of technical expertise in these areas was probably one of the key reasons that led to several of the project failures detailed in the TE report.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE has a long list of recommendations, consistent with the shortcoming found by the Evaluation Team. They are related to the following areas.

- Adoption of legal measures that adequately address issues pertinent to the Game Ranch management
- Better management of the co-management process and real involvement of the neighboring communities
- Adoption of better practices for the definition and adjustment of the hunting quotas, based on scientific results and inventories
- Adequate attention to the research results in the overall management of the Ranch (hunting quotas, zoning, etc)
- Adequate attention to the engagement of the private sector for an efficient operation of the different services and opportunities

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.

- Development of a connectivity corridor for wild fauna
- Improvement of several management structures and procedures
- Adequate attention to the basic key issues of biodiversity conservation common to any area under management
- Open the entire field of river fisheries to the attention of the Ranch managers.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 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.

NA

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

6.2 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? The evaluation team analyzed thoroughly the different objectives of the Project and assessed them based on document reviews, field visits and interviews. The information was adequately organized and presented in the TE</p>	5
<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? The Report is consistent and convincing and there ratings are well substantiated. No major evidence gaps were found</p>	6
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? There is a good analysis of the project sustainability and the consequences of the completion of the Project. Both assessments led to strong expressions of concern about the future.</p>	5
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The Chapter on lessons learned is short and it is focused on what the evaluators considered as the basic causes of the problems. Throughout the text there are several other aspects that can also be considered as lessons learned, even if they were not included in the pertinent section.</p>	5
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The assessment of costs is not satisfactory. The evaluation team just included a table on co-financing and comments on Ranch income, but it has not analyzed of actual Project costs</p>	3
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The analysis of the M&E systems is barely satisfactory. The TE analysis is focused on the evaluation visits of the IA (the PIRs, which they strongly criticize) and the tripartite meetings among the key players. The Project M&E system itself is not analyzed. As the second Prodos was not available for the TE Review it is not possible to assess the quality of the M&E system for the project</p>	4

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

None