

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3777	
GEF Agency project ID		609234	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		CBSP Sustainable Management of the Wildlife and Bushmeat Sector in Central Africa	
Country/Countries		Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, Democratic Republic of the Congo	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD SP-4	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing, Central African Republic (CAR); Ministry of Environment, Nature and Tourism, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC); Ministry of Forest Economy, Fisheries and Environment (Gabon); Ministry of Forest economy, sustainable development and environment (Republic of Congo); Rougier Gabon; International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN); Central Africa Protected Areas Network (RAPAC); Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR); International Conservation and Education Fund (INCEF); The Wildlife Trade Monitoring Network (TRAFFIC); Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD); Regional Forestry Commission for Central Africa (COMIFAC);	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		IUCN; INCEF; TRAFFIC; Union Internationale la Conservation de la Nature (UICN)	
Private sector involvement		Rougier Gabon (consultations)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 4, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 1, 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 2016	
Actual date of project completion		August 31, 2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.28	.18
	Co-financing	.2	.2
GEF Project Grant		4.25	4.25
Co-financing	IA own	2	.99
	Government	2.36	.63
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.04	-
	Private sector	.65	-
	NGOs/CSOs	2.88	.41
Total GEF funding		4.53	4.43
Total Co-financing		8.13	2.23
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		12.66	6.66

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	May 2018
Author of TE	Rym Ben Zid and Louis Bernard Cheteu
TER completion date	December 31, 2019
TER prepared by	Laura Nissley
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Sohn

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MU	--	U
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	ML
M&E Design		MU	--	MS
M&E Implementation		U	--	U
Quality of Implementation		MU	--	MU
Quality of Execution		MU	--	U
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to “demonstrate that participatory management of wildlife can be a viable strategy for conserving forest ecosystem function, integrity and biodiversity in the Congo Basin” (TE pg. 6)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to “strengthen and increase the sustainability of local communities' livelihoods in the Congo Basin” (TE pg. 6).

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

There were no changes in the project’s global environment and development objectives. The project was designed to be implemented at 8 project sites (2 per country), and then to be scaled up to another 24 sites (TE pg. 15). However, the TE indicates that this number of sites was unrealistic given the funds available, and as a result some project sites were abandoned during implementation (TE pg. 32).

4. GEF IEO 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
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project relevance, and this TER concurs. The project was designed to “remove barriers to the sustainable management of wildlife and conservation of protected species and biodiversity on lands outside of the main protected areas networks” (PD pg. 10). This approach is consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Objective 2, *To Mainstream Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors*. The project’s global environmental objective, to demonstrate that participatory management of wildlife can be a viable strategy for conserving forest ecosystem function, integrity and biodiversity in the Congo Basin, is also consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Program 4: *Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity* (PD pg. 10).

Additionally, the project is consistent with the national strategies and priorities of the four targeted countries; specifically, the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper* in the Central African Republic; the *National Development Program* in the Congo, the *Emerging Gabon Strategic Plan* in Gabon, and the *Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper* in Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). The project’s objective is also consistent with the Central African Forest Commission’s (COMIFAC) Convergence Plan 2 for the sustainable management of forest ecosystems (TE pg. 19).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------	-------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project effectiveness, and which this TER downgrades to **Unsatisfactory**. By project end, it was expected that (1) the legal framework in all four countries would provide a clear, solid and direct basis for the development of participatory wildlife management; (2) Participatory wildlife management would operate in the communities targeted by the project and could be replicated elsewhere, and (3) Communities and supporting institutions would have the capacity to continue developing and implementing participatory wildlife management (TE pg. 18). As the TE notes, the project did not achieve its environmental and development objectives, largely due to

significant shortcomings under Component 1 (policy and legal reform) and Component 2 (participatory wildlife management).

A summary of the project's achievements, by component, is provided below. A fourth component focusing on project management, as well as monitoring and evaluation, was included in the project's design. This section of the TER will focus solely on the programmatic components of the project.

Component 1: Policy and Legal Reform

Expected results under this component included: (1) a regional strategy for the sustainable use of wildlife by indigenous and local communities, available and internalized in each country; (2) national wildlife management policies in all four countries, and (3) laws and regulations allowing for the management of wildlife. By project end, a regional strategy for wildlife management was produced and adopted by the COMIFAC Council of Ministers. Additionally, National Action Plans (NAPs) were prepared and adopted in three of the countries (Gabon, Congo, and CAR). An analysis of laws and regulations in three of the countries (Congo, Gabon, and DRC) was also carried out. The only evidence of new laws and regulations, however, was the integration of participatory wildlife management and the marketing of hunting meat into the draft forestry code in Gabon (TE pgs. 21-22).

Component 2: Tools for Participatory Wildlife Management

Expected results under this component included: (1) participatory wildlife management tools in the field are developed; (2) tools for financial incentives and sustainable financing are developed; (3) wildlife monitoring and evaluation systems for communities and technical services are developed; (4) knowledge management tools are produced; and (5) awareness campaigns and related materials are produced. By project end, community forests had been established in Ovan and Djoutou (Gabon), as well as Baego and Maduda (DRC), however no participatory wildlife management had been finalized for hunting as envisioned in the project design (TE pg. 23). Additionally, no funding mechanism was developed to finance income-generating activities for participatory wildlife management. Some income generating activities took place with the support of the project, however these were not focused on hunting (i.e. timber exploitation in Gabon; collective ponds in the DRC; and a local development fund in the Congo) (TE pg. 27). By project end, wildlife inventories were conducted at all project sites, however the TE indicates that the data analysis was not returned to the communities. As a result, monitoring of wildlife resources by the communities was limited (pgs. 27-28). By project end, three knowledge management guides were produced (TE pg. 26). In terms of awareness raising, the project helped form community associations and cooperatives, however these were not yet functional by project end (TE pg. 24).

Component 3: Capacity Building

Expected results under this component included: (1) community members trained in participatory wildlife management techniques and other resource management skills; (2) government and NGO staff trained in participatory wildlife management techniques, monitoring and conflict resolution; and (3) government and NGO staff trained in participatory rural appraisal, land-use planning/zoning and adaptive management. By project end, the TE reports that communities and other stakeholders were trained on relevant topics during the implementation of activities under Component 2. These topics

included: community forests, bushmeat data collection, demographic data collection, participatory wildlife management, forest resource management, developing community action plans, management of a community organization, and techniques and tools for carrying out inventory work. The TE reports that in total, 5,437 people were trained (1,684 in the DRC; 906 in the Congo; 1257 in Gabon; and 1590 in CAR) (TE pgs. 29-30).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Unsatisfactory**. The TE indicates that the achievement of project objectives was significantly hindered by an intervention strategy which was “cumbersome, very costly and time-consuming” (pg. 62). Overall, the TE notes that the project design was too complex (i.e. four countries with remote project sites and different levels of intervention) and too ambitious (i.e. number and scope of outputs) given the project’s budget and timeframe (TE pg. 32). Additionally, the TE notes that expenditures were high due to: (1) lack of planning resulting in similar or duplicative studies done at the same project site; (2) costly travel expenses due to remote project sites; (3) too many project sites given the budget, (4) organization of workshops at many levels (community, national, and sub-regional), and (5) multiple steering committees at different levels (pgs. 41-42). At the same time, co-financing was significantly lower than anticipated. As a result, the TE estimated that the financial implementation rate was about 50% (TE pg. 41). Given the available resources, the TE estimates that only 30% of the project could be executed (TE pg. 62).

According to the 2013 Project Implementation Report (PIR), the project end date was extended from May 2016 to August 2017 to accommodate a delay in the signing of the project document by one participating country at startup (pg. 30). This extension did not allow the project to complete its objectives.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for the sustainability of project outcomes, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unlikely** for the sustainability of financial resources, which this TER increases to **Moderately Likely**. By project end, funding mechanisms for participatory wildlife management activities had not been established. Additionally, co-financing from governments and other stakeholders was significantly lower than expected during implementation, which could indicate a

pattern for future activities (pg. TE pg. 44). The “Management Response to the Evaluation,” does indicate however, that a large European Union project (\$45 million) was approved to work on sustainable wildlife management in 3 of the beneficiary countries (Gabon, Congo, and the DRC) (pg. 3).

Sociopolitical

The TE assesses sociopolitical sustainability to be **Moderately Likely**, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unlikely**. As the TE notes, all four countries supported the sub-regional strategy approved by COMIFAC, which could indicate their commitment to work toward participatory wildlife management (pg. 42). At the same time, the TE indicates that community ownership over the project was limited due to the fact that they were not initially consulted, and many are still waiting for activities to be implemented (pg.43). Additionally, political climate in the region is unstable, which the TE indicates is likely to negatively affect participatory wildlife management. The political situation in the DRC was also compounded by the outbreak of Ebola (TE pg. 62).

Institutional Framework and Governance

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance to be **Likely**, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Likely**. By project end, some participatory wildlife management policies were in place, including National Action Plans (NAPs) in three of the countries (Gabon, Congo, and CAR), as well as a regional strategy for wildlife management adopted by the COMIFAC Council of Ministers. An analysis of laws and regulations in three of the countries (Congo, Gabon, and DRC) had also been carried out, however no new laws and regulations were in place by the end of the project. The project also facilitated the creation of cooperatives and associations in each target country; however, these were fragile and not fully functional by the end of the project. Additionally, the cooperatives and associations had not focused their efforts on the participatory management of hunting (TE pg. 63).

Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability to be **Moderately Unlikely**, however this TER did not find enough evidence in the TE to adequately assess environmental sustainability. The TE does note that in the Ovan Community Forest (Gabon), “tenure tenants harvest the timber without respecting the regulations, especially the minimum cutting diameter and the volumes allowed per year,” which could affect environmental sustainability (pg. 63).

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?

Actual co-financing from both the government and other stakeholders was significantly lower than expected (\$2.23 million vs. \$8.13 million; or approximately 25%). In many cases, Letters of Agreement (LoAs) for service delivery were signed with partners instead of co-financing agreements. As a result, partners used funds rather than contributed funds for co-financing (TE pg. 38). The TE indicates that this significantly limited the project's ability to achieve its objectives, particularly the expected outcomes under Component 2: Participatory Wildlife Management (pg. 48). For example, in Gabon, partners refused to facilitate participatory management processes due to a lack of co-financing (TE pg. 28).

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?

Project start-up was delayed one year while the project waited for one participating country to sign the project document. As a result, the project end date was extended one year, from May 2016 to August 2016 (2013 PIR pg. 30). Additionally, the TE indicates that the project experienced numerous delays in implementation due to a cumbersome and time-consuming intervention strategy, which affected the achievement of project outcomes (pg. 62). The TE also notes that the absence of a monitoring and evaluation system delayed decision-making (pg. 34). In the case of the CAR, implementation of activities was slow due to political instability and security concerns (TE pg. 38).

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:

The TE does not directly assess country ownership. However, it does note a number of factors which affected ownership at the local and national levels. The TE indicates that the project was implemented using a top-down approach, and that communities were not initially consulted in choosing project activities (pgs. 34; 43). Additionally, the TE notes that the wildlife inventories were conducted as a part of student dissertations, and therefore weakened community ownership over the studies (pgs. 27; 44).

At the sub-regional level, the support of all four countries for the strategy for wildlife management was promising in terms of ownership (TE pg. 42). The TE does note however, that ownership may be limited at the ministry-level as the relevant ministries did not have a leadership role in implementation (TE pg. 44).

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 Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for the quality of M&E design at entry, which this TER increases to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project document included a results framework outlining the expected outputs, outcomes, and objectives, along with indicators, baseline values, source of verification, risks, and assumptions. As the TE notes, the results framework has some weaknesses, particularly in terms of indicators, which are of mixed quality (TE pg. 21). For example, an indicator under Component 2 reads, *Knowledge and information about participatory wildlife management in the humid forests of the 4 countries*. This indicator is not SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely), as it's unclear what knowledge and information is being measured, and how. The TE also indicates that the project objectives and outcomes were too ambitious given the budget and timeframe (pg. 32).

The project document does, however, thoroughly outline the components of the project's M&E plan, including M&E activities, responsible parties, budget, and timeframe. Provisions were included for establishing a baseline in year one of the project, as well as undertaking a midterm evaluation at the midpoint of the project. In total, \$.26 million was allocated for establishing a functioning M&E system (TE pgs. 67-68)

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

The TE provides a rating of **Unsatisfactory** for M&E implementation, and this TER concurs. The TE indicates that an M&E system was not operational throughout the life of the project. A draft M&E system was developed in 2013, however it was never implemented. The TE stresses that "the absence of a formalized monitoring and evaluation system had a negative effect on reporting and project implementation" (pg. 34). A midterm review, conducted in January 2015, indicated that the project could not achieve the expected objectives, however there was no adjustment to the project's results framework. Moreover, the TE indicates that this "resulted in uneven reporting using indicators that were not in line with the initial indicators included in the logical framework" (pg. 34).

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for the quality of project implementation, and this TER concurs. The implementing agency for this project was the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). As noted above, the project design, while relevant to the countries' contexts, was overly ambitious given the budget and timeframe for implementation. The mid-term review concluded that the project could not achieve its objectives given these constraints, however the project's results framework was not amended (TE pg. 34). Overall, the TE also found the intervention strategy to be cumbersome and time-consuming, and ultimately prevented the project from achieving its objectives (pg. 62).

The TE does note that the sub-regional steering committee set up by FAO "played its role effectively and supported operational decisions." In particular, the sub-regional steering committee implemented the following key decisions: (1) terminating the initial (CTA) contract in 2014, (2) focusing on one site per country in 2016, (3) restarting activities in the CAR in 2014, and (4) reviewing budgets in 2015 and 2016 (TE pg. 33). At the national level, the effectiveness of steering committees was more questionable, as there is no evidence meetings were held in the DRC, and only one meeting was held in the CAR (meetings in the Congo and Gabon were more regular) (TE pg. 33). The TE also indicates that there was a lack of coordination between the regional and national committees (pg. 34).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for the quality of project execution, which this TER downgrades to **Unsatisfactory**. The lead executing partners for the project were the Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing in the Central African Republic (CAR); the Ministry of Environment, Nature and Tourism in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC); the Ministry of Forest Economy, Fisheries and Environment in Gabon; and the Ministry of Forest Economy, Sustainable Development and Environment in the Republic of Congo. In practice, however, the TE notes that the ministries were not

empowered during project implementation (pg. 44). A Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), recruited at the beginning of the project, was responsible for project management and technical assistance. As noted above, the CTA's contract was terminated in 2014. The midterm review in 2015 highlighted the importance of recruiting a new CTA, however this did not take place until 10 months before the end of the project (TE pg. 35). Project coordination at the regional and national levels was adversely affected, which bled into the implementation of activities on the ground. The absence of a monitoring and evaluation system also significantly delayed decision-making (TE pg. 34).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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.

The TE does not cite any environmental changes that had occurred by the end of 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.

The TE does not cite any socioeconomic changes that had occurred by the end of the project. Some income-generating activities took place (timber exploitation in Gabon; collective ponds in the DRC; and a local development fund in the Congo), however these changes were not quantified (TE pg. 27).

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

By project end, wildlife inventories were conducted at all project sites and three knowledge management guides were produced (TE pg. 26-28). Additionally, the project helped form community associations and cooperatives, however these were not yet functional by project end (TE pg. 24). The TE also indicates that communities and other stakeholders were trained on relevant topics (community forests, bushmeat data collection, demographic data collection, participatory wildlife management, forest resource management, developing community action plans, management of a community organization, and techniques and tools for carrying out inventory work). The TE reports that in total, 5,437 people were trained (1,684 in the DRC; 906 in the Congo; 1257 in Gabon; and 1590 in CAR) (TE pgs. 29-30).

b) Governance

By project end, a regional strategy for wildlife management was produced and adopted by the COMIFAC Council of Ministers. Additionally, National Action Plans (NAPs) were prepared and adopted in three of the countries (Gabon, Congo, and CAR). An analysis of laws and regulations in three of the countries (Congo, Gabon, and DRC) was also carried out (TE pgs. 21-22).

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.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts.

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.

The TE does not provide any evidence of GEF initiatives at scale, however, the "Management Response to the Evaluation," does indicate that a large European Union project (\$45 million) was approved to work on sustainable wildlife management in 3 of the beneficiary countries (Gabon, Congo, and the DRC) (pg. 3). The Response notes that the EU program will be "directly built of the GEF project achievements in terms of legal analysis, which will be completed and capitalized for future reforms" (pg. 7)

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 TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. 50-51):

- **Wildlife resources.** There is certainly human pressure on wildlife resources, but it must be put into perspective given the state of the resource as demonstrated by wildlife inventories, the different demographic situations in the various countries, and the behavior of the most prized species (duikers, brush-tailed porcupine, etc.).
- **Design.** The objectives of the project were too ambitious, in terms of the number of targeted sites and the results to be achieved, given the action-research approach that was adopted. The institutional set-up characterized by the multiplication of partners of different kinds (research, ministries, NGOs) was not adapted to an action-research project. An institutional set-up involving fewer partners would facilitate the implementation of action-research projects and allow the achievement of the project objectives.
- **Intervention strategy.** The intervention strategy (3 different levels, 4 countries, 8 sites at the kickoff) was not suitable for an action-research project to be implemented over a 5-year period. The time allocated to the implementation of the project was unrealistic in relation to the number of targeted countries, the number of sites considered, the issue addressed which was largely controversial with the existence of external pressure groups having a negative influence on the project. In the future, it will be worth limiting the number of sites, harmonizing the use of human and financial resources and optimizing the time allocated to implementation in order to achieve the expected results.
- **Implementation staff.** The implementation staff (CTA, NTA, etc.) was largely insufficient to achieve the expected results. Moreover, this staff was regularly reviewed and adjusted during the life of the project: NTAs responsible for the implementation of the project in two sites at the kickoff the project, then doubling of NTAs or recruitment of facilitators – depending on the defections of NTAs (Gabon, CAR, etc.) – to have a technical assistant or site facilitator.
- **Implementation.** The lack of coordination due to the fact that the CTA position remained vacant for half of the project's duration or was not initially properly budgeted explains why the project's objectives were not achieved, and why the project diverged from its main purpose, which was to promote participatory wildlife management and bushmeat marketing. The NPC's limited contribution and accountability to implementation has not contributed to improve the monitoring of field activities and may have a negative impact on the sustainability of the project effects.
- **Co-financing.** In the absence of a written commitment from the co-financiers, they are unlikely to contribute as much as expected and this prevents the project from achieving its objectives.

Funds must be mobilized before the project is designed, so that sizing is carried out on the basis of actual funding: sizing a project on the basis of resources not yet mobilized is a risk factor that jeopardizes the implementation of the project and its success.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following conclusions and recommendations (pgs. 9-10):

Conclusion 1. Certain progress have contributed to consolidating the transition from the conservation paradigm to the paradigm combining conservation and participatory management approaches for bushmeat.

Conclusion 2. Continuous coordination throughout the duration of the project could have substantially improved the implementation of the project, which was essential given the design of the implementation mechanism and the main theme addressed in this project – participatory wildlife management.

Conclusion 3. A functional monitoring and evaluation system could have improved project implementation. The lack of a monitoring and evaluation system increased the challenge of coordination.

Conclusion 4. A clear strategy establishing priorities in the management of project implementation from the start of the project, determining the coherence of actions, would also have helped to optimize the project's outcomes.

Conclusion 5. A more structured management of the project's financial and human resources could have facilitated implementation.

Recommendation 1. The mission recommends that **FAO** reconsider the implementation model for this type of complex projects, particularly in response to the geographical spread of activities and the diversity of stakeholders involved.

Recommendation 2. Given the complexity of the project and the different levels of intervention, the evaluation mission recommends that **FAO** and **GEF**: increase the duration of the implementation of similar projects to at least 7 years to finalize the development of hunting plans; use the income from the implementation of simple management plans to finance the implementation of hunting plans; and revise national laws on the basis of text analyses.

Recommendation 3. The evaluation mission recommends that **COMIFAC** strengthen advocacy to encourage the countries concerned to include in their budgets the implementation of the National Action Plans or at least a part of them that would contribute to the development of participatory wildlife management.

Recommendation 4. The mission recommends that **FAO** conduct the analysis of legal texts from the beginning of the project. Given the importance of legal aspects, in the future, if such a project were to

be repeated, it would be necessary to ensure that a thorough analysis of existing texts and laws and their effective implementation from the start of the project in all sectors relating to the problem of bushmeat hunting and marketing.

Recommendation 5. The mission recommends that **FAO** involve wildlife conservation organizations, from the outset of the project, in discussions on changing the regulatory framework.

Recommendation 6. The mission recommends that **FAO** scale similar projects to the actual co- financing amounts.

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 IEO 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 report adequately assesses the outcomes and impacts of the project. Under component 1, it was difficult to determine the project's achievements against the expected results (which were not fully articulated). Impact level indicators are reported on in the PIRs but not in the TE.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and ratings are substantiated, if mildly inflated in some areas. More attention could have been paid to evaluating the implementing/executing functions of the project in an organized way.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report addresses all aspects of sustainability, except environmental.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes total project costs and actual co-financing. Cost by activity were not available due to incomplete records from the project (TE pg. 37)	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report doesn't evaluate the M&E design outlined in the project document. It does provide a thorough evaluation of M&E implementation.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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