

Terminal Evaluation Review Form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3817	
GEF Agency project ID		P083172	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		SPWA-BD: Guinea Bissau Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund Project	
Country/Countries		Guinea-Bissau	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD 1- Sustainable Financing of PA systems at the National level BD 2- Increasing representation of effectively managed marine PAs in PA systems BD 3- 3: Strengthened Terrestrial Protected Area Networks	
Executing agencies involved		Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP) [Govt Agency]	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None noted in TE.	
Private sector involvement		None noted in TE.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		Jun 30, 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		Mar 17, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		July 2012 (PD) or Feb 2013 (PIR 2012)	
Actual date of project completion		Feb 28, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.95	0.923
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.213	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.8 (Noe) 0.613 (FIBA), 0.168 (PRCM)	
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.95	0.923
Total Co-financing		2.794	2.52
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.744	3.443
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Sep 29, 2014	
TE submission date		Sep 29, 2014	
Author of TE		Liba C. Strengerowski-Feldblyum	
TER completion date		January 13, 2014	
TER prepared by		Dania M Trespalacios	
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	MS	MS	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	MS	L	NR	ML
M&E Design	NR	NR	NR	MS
M&E Implementation	MS	MS	NR	S
Quality of Implementation	MS	S	NR	S
Quality of Execution	S	MS/S	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objective is to protect Guinea-Bissau's globally significant biodiversity in perpetuity by providing a secure source of funding for the protection of mangroves, forests and other coastal habitats. (PD pg. 7) Guinea-Bissau contains globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity. The West African coast is threatened by climate change, including more intermittent and unreliable precipitation, increasing temperatures and increasing sea level. (PD pg. 6)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is to continue to manage and conserve Guinea-Bissau's existing network of protected areas and biodiversity, and to simultaneously operationalize a Foundation. (PD pg. 7) This project would strengthen the ongoing management of Guinea-Bissau's PA network, and simultaneously operationalize a Foundation that would ensure the PA network's financial sustainability. (PD pg. 8)

The project's two main expected outcomes were the strengthening of capacity of the country's network of protected areas, and the establishment and operationalization of a Foundation that would ensure the financial sustainability of the country's PA network.

The Project Document outlined 3 project components by which project objectives would be achieved:

- 1- Consolidation and strengthened capacity for management of coastal and marine protected areas and biodiversity.** The project would support Guinea-Bissau's existing network of protected areas, and ensure the sustainability of the PA mgmt. initiatives launched under the GEF's earlier Coastal and Biodiversity Management Project (CBMP). It would finance Guinea-Bissau's Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP, responsible for PA management) while the Foundation was operationalized. It would directly support at least four coastal MPAs: Orango, Joao Viera and Poilao, Cacheu and Cufada. Specific activities include: implementation of park mgmt. plans; regular meetings and functioning of the Park Management Councils; implementation of endangered and threatened species action plans; training/capacity building for IBAP staff and partners; participation in regional and international fora for biodiversity and PA mgmt. issues.
- 2- Operationalization and capitalization of the Foundation.** The project would support the establishment and operationalization of the Foundation for Biodiversity (FBG). The FBG

would be both administratively and financially autonomous, and would attract both national and international donors and local partners.

- 3- **Project management and evaluation.** This component would ensure effective and efficient implementation of project activities, and would finance the oversight and management of project implementation and coordination.
(PD pg. 1-2, 31- 33)

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

There were **no changes** to Global Environmental or Development objectives. The project was restructured on April 2013 to redefine the second project development objective outcome indicator.

Original: At least US \$3 million initial capital secured and managed by FBG.

Revised: BioGuinea Foundation legally established and administrative structures in place.

Intermediate indicators were refined to strengthen them and increase their specificity and measurability, and also facilitate M&E. (TE pg. 3)

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
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project outcomes are consistent with the GEF's Biodiversity focal area, particularly the Strategic Long-Term Biodiversity Objective: To Catalyze the Sustainability of Protected Area Systems. The project is consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Program 1: Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level, since it establishes the endowment fund that will be managed by the Foundation for Biodiversity in Guinea-Bissau. The project also fits within Strategic Program 2: Increasing Representation for Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), by strengthening the ongoing efforts to improve the management of Guinea Bissau's network of coastal and marine protected areas. The project supports the GEF's Strategic Program 3: Strengthened Terrestrial Protected Area Networks being led by United Nations Development Program (UNDP)/GEF, which aims to expand the country's protected area network to include the Dulombe-Boe terrestrial protected area complex. (PD pg. 8-9) The

project also contributes to the GEF's climate change objective to reduce Green House Gas (GHG) emissions from land use and land use change by conserving coastal mangroves. (PD pg. 9)

The project is consistent with Guinea-Bissau's priorities. The strategy of creating and capitalizing a Biodiversity Foundation as the means to sustain the conservation efforts in Guinea Bissau was formally adopted by the government in 2004. This sustainable financing vision is a central theme in the country's National Strategy for Protected Areas and Conservation of Biodiversity (2007-2011). The project contributes to the implementation of Guinea Bissau's National Program of Action of Adaptation to Negative Effects of Climate Changes (NAPA) prepared in 2006. Finally, the Guinea-Bissau government recognizes the connection between natural resources and national security. Under the Strategy Document for the Restructuring and Modernization of the Security and Defense Sector (SSR Strategy Document) aimed at reforming and modernizing the defense and security sector, protection of natural and environmental resources is highlighted as one of the main strategic approaches. By strengthening the ongoing park management and strengthening the ties between the services the parks provide and the local communities, the project will be supporting the SSR strategy as well. (PD pg. 8)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	----------------------------------------

The objective of this project was to support Guinea-Bissau's protected area network while establishing a Foundation that would ensure the financial sustainability of this PA network. The TE assesses a rating of Moderately Satisfactory to overall effectiveness, and this TER concurs. Although the project had significant achievements, there were shortcomings in the achievement of important outcomes. In particular, the project hoped to establish and operationalize a financially stable Foundation that would fund conservation activities. This Foundation was established, but was not fully operationalized, and its financial stability was still in question by project end.

Progress along each of the 3 project components defined in the PD is detailed further in Table 1 and below:

Table 1: Project components, respective outcomes, and results reported by TE. (PD Annex A, TE pg. 3-6)

Objective/ Component	Expected Outcome	TE Results
PDO To strengthen the ongoing management and conservation of the network of parks and protected areas in Guinea Bissau so that this network becomes financially self sustaining in the future.	Stable or increasing combined METT scores for the 5 existing parks. (baseline 433, target 448)	Achieved. METT score reached 467.
	Foundation is operationalized and sufficient funds are secured to initially capitalize the endowment with at least \$3 to 5 million.	This indicator was revised to "BioGuinea Foundation (FBG) is legally established and an administrative structure is in place." This was achieved . However, sufficient funds were not secured.
Component 1 Consolidation and strengthened capacity for management of coastal	Participatory management plans, including surveillance and control systems, implemented in at least three protected areas.	Achieved.
	All five participatory Park Management Councils	Achieved

and marine protected areas and biodiversity.	continue to meet at least bi-annually with required quorum of attendees.	
	At least 50 protected area staff and community co-managers trained in key species and protected area field monitoring.	Achieved. 161 staff trained.
	At least 3 action plans for key endangered and threatened species start/ continue to be under implementation (turtles, chimpanzee, hippo.)	Achieved.
	At least 3 key endangered and threatened species data management systems designed and in place (turtles, chimpanzees, hippos).	Achieved.
Component 2 Operationalization and capitalization of the Foundation.	UK Charity status established and Protocol signed between FBG and GOGb, giving FBG tax exemption status.	Dropped. However, FBG established in UK and conforms to the UK's legislative requirements.
	FBG decision and execution structures (Board and Executive secretariat) established and meeting in accordance with TORs and timetable defined in the Statutes.	Dropped. However, FBG's fiduciary system and reporting structure were established and incorporated into IBAP.
	Comprehensive capitalization strategy, incorporating diverse financial mechanisms, developed and implemented in accordance with annual work program.	Partially achieved. Capitalization strategy developed and under implementation
	Management and monitoring systems (including fiduciary systems) in place and operational, producing annual and quarterly reports in a timely fashion.	Achieved. M&E and financial reports produced in a timely manner.
Component 3 Project implementation managed effectively.	Project work plan activities executed without significant delay.	The TE reports that this was achieved, but also reports significant delays in procurement due to political instability.
	Project M&E system providing required reports and data in a timely manner.	Achieved.

The TE rates each of the 3 components individually: Component 1 is rated Satisfactory. Component 2 and 3 are both rated Moderately Satisfactory. For evidence behind these ratings, Table 1 lists the 3 components with their respective outcomes, and the results reported by the TE.

It is clear that component 1 was successfully achieved. The management and conservation of the national system of protected areas was strengthened, including the capacity building of national institutions. (TE pg. 2) Component 2 was not successful. Two of the expected outcomes were dropped, although the project did achieve some progress towards their achievement. The Foundation was legally established and operationalized, but efforts to secure long-term funding were ongoing at project end. Thus the TE's rating of MS for component 2 is well supported. Regarding component 3, the TE reports very satisfactory project implementation, on both the part of the World Bank and the executing agency. There were significant project delays, but these were due to political instability, and were completely outside of the control of the project.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------	----------------------------------------

There was a delay in both the implementation start (original August 2010, actual March 2011), and the closing date of the project (original July 2012, actual 2014). This delay in part was due to political instability, which stalled the project for at least 8 months. Despite the delay in implementation and project end, the project was implemented within the original budget, with a bit less co-financing than was planned at project start.

The World Bank's missions were timed to coincide with donor coordination/consultation meetings, and Consultative Committee or Board meetings. This increased productivity and efficiency and avoided taxing the limited staff and budgetary resources of the client and the Bank, but also allowed for a broader interaction and dialogue between the different donors, partners, and stakeholders of the Project. (TE pg. 10)

Due to project delays, efficiency is rated moderately satisfactory.

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

The TE rates arrangements for sustainability as Moderately Satisfactory, the risk for activities as modest, and rates the sustainability of outcomes as Likely. (TE pg. 3, 9, 10) However, significant socio-political risks warrant a lower rating. Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

Financial Risks – Sustainability Likely

The establishment of an off-shore BioGuinea Foundation, independent from the Government, will not be directly affected by institutional and political changes. This foundation will provide revenues for IBAP and its park management partners. (TE pg. 3) The Foundation gained tax exempt status and is recognized as a charitable organization in the UK, an important step in attracting sustainable sources of financing for conservation operations. (TE pg. 10) Other entities expressed an interest in funding the FBG, including the EU's Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA+), for which an initial proposal was prepared in 2013. Debt for Nature Swaps were being explored. (TE pg. 10)

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

The project implementation was disrupted due to a political coup, which led to the World Bank and other donors to suspend project activities for around eight months. The TE notes that political uncertainty associated with the post-coup transitional government may threaten the project's sustainability. (TE pg. 2)

Environmental Risks- Sustainability Unable to Assess

The West African coast is threatened by climate change, including more intermittent and unreliable precipitation, increasing temperatures and increasing sea level. (PD pg. 6) The TE does not address these risks, and does not provide sufficient evidence to rate these risks.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely

The BioGuinea Foundation is at its final stages of recruiting staff and becoming operational. The financial manager and the board are already in place; the FBG is registered as a non profit organization in the UK. The recruitment of the Executive Director still needs to be finalized, as

well as the preparation of a fund raising strategy. (TE pg. 3) The project was able to achieve important results on the ground, particularly in capacity building and institutional strengthening. (TE pg. 10)

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?

The PD lists a total of US \$2,794 388 expected in co-financing from: the Guinea-Bissau govt. (US \$212,800), Noe Conservation (US \$1,800,000), Fondation Internationale du Banc d'Arguin (FIBA) (US \$ 613,588), and Programme régional de Conservation de la zone Côtière et Marine en Afrique de l'Ouest (PRCM) (US \$168,00). (PD pg. 4) At project start, co-financing represented nearly 75% of the total project budget.

The TE reports that about US \$2.52 million of co-financing materialized, and that the project's impact could not have been achieved without this additional funding. (TE pg. 11)

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?

Delays in project implementation were caused by a coup in April 2012, which led to the World Bank and other donors suspending project activities for around eight months. (TE pg. 2) Procurement performance was weakened by delays. (TE pg. 8)

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 reports that commitment and dedication of the project implementation unit, particularly in difficult political situations, demonstrated to stakeholders and the international donor community a strong ownership of the projects. (TE pg. 10) This commitment was particularly evident during the 2012 suspension of disbursements when IBAP personnel continued to implement project activities under funding shortages and budget constraints, and political instability, without receiving regular salaries. (TE pg. 11)

The Government demonstrated its commitment to the project through direct project financing and through supporting legislation, such as granting tax exempt status to the FBG, and continued support to a simultaneous IDA project that shared the same objectives as this one. (TE pg. 11)

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Design. This TER assess a rating of Satisfactory based on the design presented in the PD. The Project Document provides a very specific list of indicators and targets for each of the project's 3 components that are measurable.. The PD calls for annual audits and a project final evaluation. The PD identifies the entities that would be responsible for overall monitoring evaluation, and provides an explicit budget for M&E activities. In addition to monitoring the key performance indicators, IBAP would monitor the implementation of park management activities in accordance with the indicators identified in individual park management plans. (PD pg. 5)

It seems that the M&E plan at entry included mostly SMART indicators with baselines and targets clearly indicated, and the provision for evaluation studies to measure progress. The M&E plan at entry was sufficient, and is thus rated satisfactory.

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

The TE rates monitoring and evaluation as moderately satisfactory. (TE pg. 9) This rating is not consistent with the TE's various reports of timely and satisfactory M&E activities:

"Monitoring and Evaluation and Financial reports were submitted regularly and on time." (TE pg. 7)

"...timely monitoring and quality reporting." (TE pg. 11)

"M&E reports were submitted regularly and on time." (TE pg. 8, 2)

The PIR from 2013 reports that M&E reports were produced in a timely manner on a quarterly basis. (TE pg. 7) The TE and the PIR from 2013 both record a meticulous measurement of the original and revised outcome indicators, and a consideration of project sustainability. The TE reports that IBAP established an integrated monitoring system that provides an overview of all projects and sources of financing and enables IBAP to track its progress, and thus greatly enhanced IBAP's ability to manage its portfolio efficiently. (TE pg. 11) Without any evidence to point to the contrary, it seems that M&E implementation was satisfactory.

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: Satisfactory
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The implementing agency for this project is the World Bank. The TE rates the performance of the WB as satisfactory, and this TER concurs.

The TE reports that the WB carried out regular field implementation support missions. At all times, including during the suspension of disbursements period, the task team maintained contact with the Government project team and provided implementation support. This enabled the task team to monitor progress while maintaining a constant dialogue with the Government, its representatives, and other donors and development partners. Close donor coordination and consultation meetings allowed better collaboration between donors, so that during suspension of disbursements, alternate donors temporarily funded the project. The World Bank's missions were timed to coincide with donor coordination/consultation meetings, and Consultative Committee or Board meetings, which increased productivity and efficiency and avoided taxing limited staff and budgetary resources. (TE pg. 10) Thus the quality of project implementation is rated satisfactory.

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

The executing agency for this project is the Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas in Guinea-Bissau (IBAP). IBAP is a semi-autonomous government agency established by an earlier GEF project, responsible for managing Guinea-Bissau's national protected areas network. (PD pg. 6) During the first year of the project, implementation would be led by IBAP. During the second year, and once the new Foundation became operational, IBAP would be replaced as the executing agency by the Foundation for Biodiversity (FBG) Executive Secretariat. (PD pg. 12) However, the project was not successful in securing long term funding for the Foundation, thus IBAP remained the executing agency for the life of the project.

The TE rates IBAP's project management, procurement and M&E as moderately satisfactory, and rates financial management as satisfactory. (TE pg. 8-9) The TE's MS ratings for some of these components are not consistent with the written report of IBAP's performance. The TE reports that IBAP had an effective management structure that provided strong leadership, and it implemented its work plans effectively and made advancements on its plans to integrate its project activities into a programmatic approach. (TE pg. 8) Project management and monitoring and evaluation was efficient, and M&E reports were submitted regularly and on time. (TE pg. 8, 2) An integrated information management system improved transparency for donors and government and enhanced IBAP's ability to manage various funding sources and monitor different programs effectively. (TE pg. 8)

The TE reports that the procurement delays were due to a coup in 2012, which led to the World Bank and other donors suspending project activities for around eight months. (TE pg. 2) The TE also reports that despite the political uncertainty associated with post-coup transition government, the project team continued to keep the project largely on track towards achieving its intended results. The TE concludes that most of the end of project targets were met and most project activities were satisfactorily implemented. (TE pg. 2)

The TE also states that the commitment and dedication of the project implementation unit was instrumental in maintaining the momentum of project activities under the BCTF, particularly

during the suspension of disbursements and transition period between operations, which demonstrated to stakeholders and international donor community a strong ownership of the projects. (TE pg. 10) Particularly because of IBAP's continued successful project management in the face of political instability, project execution is rated satisfactory.

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.

This project targeted the marine protected areas of Orango, Joao Viera and Poilao, Cacheu and Cufada. The TE reports that biodiversity in each Protected Area has been strengthened through improved data collection and sharing, information dissemination and communication, and effective management. The project has contributed to the increased regional and international knowledge on globally significant and endangered species. (TE pg. 10)

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 report any changes in human well-being as a result of this 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 TE reports the following changes in capacity:

- The project enabled knowledge exchange training, stakeholder participation, community initiatives geared towards biodiversity conservation, surveillance activities, species monitoring in each park, communication and awareness raising. (TE pg. 11)
- The establishment of the FBG has promoted increased awareness and exposure for the cause of Guinea Bissau's biodiversity conservation and for the country as a whole. Under the project, fund-raising efforts attracted the interest of the international community and improved prospects of securing sustainable funding. The experience of campaigning for

financing, although being developed, has contributed to building capacity for IBAP and increasing its visibility in the sector. (TE pg. 11)

b) Governance - The TE does not report any changes in governance.

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.

There were no unintended impacts reported by the TE.

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 report any project initiatives that were adopted at scale by either the government or other parties. The project established a private Foundation to ensure the financial stability of the PA network of Guinea-Bissau. The Foundation is in the process of securing future investments. The TE discusses that there is potential for replication of this system in other developing countries, but at project end it had not yet happened.

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 lists the following lessons learned (TE pg. 9-10):

- In the design of a new financing mechanism such as the FBG, sponsorship from multiple partners in the biodiversity conservation community (GEF, World Bank, IUCN, WWF, MAVA, FIBA, UNDP) using various means (funding, technical assistance, fostering of participatory processes and networks) played a significant role and in obtaining support for the Foundation's establishment nationally and internationally.
- Raising funds for conservation was challenging in this case because: there was insufficient time to build the confidence of the international community to invest in the country; there were inadequate prospects for building strategic partnerships with the private sector to leverage funds; and insufficient time to raise interest from the public and potential contributors (e.g., businesses, mining companies, etc.). In a fragile state such as Guinea Bissau, the building blocks would need to be assembled over a longer term and constructed slowly and incrementally towards the goal. This project is moving towards that longer-term goal, but would require long-term donor collaboration and support, and using a programmatic approach.
- Because of Guinea-Bissau's poverty and fragility, PAs need to be managed by many conservation partners and stakeholders. Innovative mechanisms such as the FBG provide a way to finance PA management so that it can eventually be mainstreamed into the national

and local economies. The FBG, if successful, could provide a stable means of funding conservation activities, even in fragile states and in times of political instability.

- Successful institutional strengthening to manage the PAs in a fragile state requires long-term support. A key success of the CBMP, which was continued under the BCTF and the BCP (IDA), is the strengthening of IBAP to become an effective PA management partner in the country. This is partly due to the long-term support (ten years of technical assistance) that IBAP received from various donors including the support provided by the Bank through its three operations.
- The commitment and dedication of the project implementation unit was instrumental in maintaining the momentum of project activities under the BCTF, particularly during the suspension of disbursements and transition period between operations, which demonstrated to stakeholders and international donor community a strong ownership of the projects.
- A broad, multi-stakeholder, multi-donor, participatory process during project preparation and implementation was instrumental in ensuring a coherent approach to PA system management, efficient use of budgetary resources, and synergy between operations in a relatively small country.

The TE provides the following recommendations:

- Successfully establishing the Foundation as a private charity in the UK which operates in Guinea Bissau, allowed for the foundation to be free of political interferences and was an important step in obtaining the confidence of international donors and investors to consider investing in conservation funding in the country. As such, it demonstrated that it is possible to launch such efforts in fragile states and attract potential funding. If successful, this model could be an approach to follow in securing funding for PA management in fragile states, one which will provide comfort for investors and donors. (TE pg. 11)
- The operating environment and political instability in Guinea Bissau is challenging and could diminish positive development results even though such mechanisms as the FBG may have some protection against future political disruptions in the country, and raising funds for the foundation also proved to be challenging. (TE pg. 12)

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 adequately reports the relevant outcomes and the achievement of objectives.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is not always internally consistent, and the evidence presented is not always complete.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE addresses sustainability, although not all facets. Three different ratings for sustainability are given, which create confusion.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are presented by the evidence, but not entirely comprehensive.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not list project costs per activity, and mentions co-financing only in passing. Actual project costs are listed briefly on the first and last page.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE discusses the implementation of M&E reports various times in the document, but provides an incongruent rating. It does not discuss nor rate the project's M&E design.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(10) + 0.1(14) = 3.1 + 1.4 = 4.5 \sim 5$$

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER, other than PIRs, TE, and the PD.