

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3961	
GEF Agency project ID		P115585	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		The Gambia Biodiversity Management and Institutional Strengthening Project	
Country/Countries		The Gambia	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD SP#1 and BD SP #2	
Executing agencies involved		Department of Parks and Wildlife Management	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		WWF-WAMER, PRCM/FIBA/FFEM [Through consultations]	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		July 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 2013	
Actual date of project completion		May 31, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.05	0.05
	Co-financing	0.01	
GEF Project Grant		0.95	0.95
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.10	0.10
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	1.10	1.30
Total GEF funding		1.00	1.00
Total Co-financing		1.21	1.40
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.21	2.40
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		06/17/14 (ICM)	
TE submission date (ICM)		UA	
Author of TE		UA	
TER completion date		February 2015	
TER prepared by		Michelle Peña Nelz	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Shanna Rachelle Edberg	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	U/A	S	NR	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	U/A	S	NR	ML
M&E Design	U/A	U/A	NR	S
M&E Implementation	U/A	U/A	NR	U/A
Quality of Implementation	U/A	S	NR	S
Quality of Execution	U/A	S	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	NR	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global objective of the Biodiversity Management and Institutional Strengthening Project is to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of biodiversity and protected areas management in two selected protected areas in Gambia, namely Tanji and Kian West National Park.

The Gambia contains globally significant biodiversity and harbors a wealth of terrestrial, coastal, marine and wetland habitats and species of local, national, regional and global significance. The current formal protected area system comprises 7 national parks and nature reserves, under the mandate of the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPWM), and is complemented by a community managed reserve, , and as well as a series of forest reserves managed by the Department of Forestry together with local communities. The protected area network is representative of the principal habitats and ecosystems found in the country, and houses several habitats and rare and endangered species of global importance. Habitat types within the protected area network include mangrove ecosystems, tidal zones, as well as guinea savannah and dry deciduous woodlands. Mangrove and tidal areas serve as important spawning and nursery grounds for more than 114 species of coastal and marine fish, providing nesting and feeding habitats for endangered and threatened species.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the project had 3 development objectives:

1. Strengthened Field effectiveness of biodiversity and protected areas (PA) management
2. Development of Long Term sustainable financing vision
3. Capacity Development for management of PAs and biodiversity

The expected project results corresponding to each of the 3 development objectives above are:

1. *Management and Infrastructure:* Improved biodiversity and protected area management as well as infrastructure and equipment in two protected areas. Protected area communities identifying and implementing initiatives compatible with the protected area management objectives.

2. *Sustainability in conservation and revenues:* Vision developed and PA revenue generation piloted. Furthermore, PA/biodiversity revenue generation potential demonstrated and mechanism in place for managing and allocating these funds to conservation activities.
3. *Institutional/human capacity building:* Management of PA network supported as well as environmental education and awareness enhancement

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

The Project did not experience any changes during the project implementation time.

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
<p>The Project is highly relevant to GEF and stakeholder countries. The proposed project has been developed as part of the West Africa biodiversity program and lies within the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area. The project is fully consistent with the Biodiversity Program's second Strategic Objective: <i>To Catalyse the Sustainability of Protected Area Systems</i>. It fulfils the eligibility criteria of Strategic Programme 2: <i>Increasing Representation for Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas</i> by strengthening the ongoing efforts to improve the management effectiveness of Gambia's government and community-managed system of protected areas. Through the field based activities supported under Component 1 and the human resource capacity and institutional strengthening activities supported under Component 3, the project will help DPWM and its partners improve the quality and effectiveness of current management of the country's existing protected areas.</p>	
<p>The project was furthermore in line with the country's priorities. The protection and management of the country's natural environment dates back to the Banjul Declaration and the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1977, which laid the basis for conservation and sustainable use of biological resources. The National Mission Statement, <i>The Gambia Incorporated Vision 2020</i>, sees "a well-balanced ecosystem" as fundamental to achieving the national goal of Middle Income Country status by 2020. The Gambia ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on June 10th, 1994. The Gambia Environmental Action Plan (GEAP, 1992) and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 1999) both emphasize biodiversity conservation as a critical element of achieving this goal.</p>	

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

The RFA Results Framework Analysis (RFA) as well as the Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM) assess a rating of satisfactory for project effectiveness considering the achievement of set objectives. From the evidence presented, the project has attained all the set outcomes and objectives and exceeded the some targets, for example in the area of management and conservation capacity. (RFA, p.1) It only experienced some minor shortcomings in the area of introducing sustainable financing mechanisms in the protected areas (PA), especially around the planned study on crocodile hunting in the Kian West Park. (ibid). This study was completed but not tested before the end of project.

Progress under each of the 3 development objectives is detailed below:

1. Strengthened Field effectiveness of biodiversity and protected areas (PA) management

The Participatory Management Plans (PMPs) were finalized in both of the identified protected areas as planned. Furthermore two action plans for two endangered species were completed and implemented by the executing agencies. In addition to these efforts, different sets of data were collected. These sets relate to species abundance, distribution, threats and other relevant information and are subsequently used to populate the national species database. (ICM, p.5) Regarding the targeted field effectiveness, the project successfully conducted capacity building and training activities for example in sustainable management and fundraising.

On infrastructural level, all set targets were completed successfully. The sub-projects under the umbrella of sustainable alternative livelihood approaches were also successfully implemented and benefited about five thousand people in and around the parks. Through introducing beekeeping and agro-forestry to the local population, “it was estimated that the percentage of the population benefitting from the programs would have increased as the production of honey is increased and sold on the market.” (ICM, p.6)

2. Development of Long Term sustainable financing vision

The project conducted several studies, which scrutinized the long-term sustainable conservation financing options and identified sources for sustainable revenues as well as possibilities to include public/private partnerships. These efforts were furthermore useful for the completion of “Guidelines for Private Sector Involvement”. According to the ICM this report “is a milestone for the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPWM) and provides a valuable guide for future investments in biodiversity and wildlife management.” (ICM, p.7)

3. Capacity Development for management of PAs and biodiversity

Under this objective the project reorganized the executing agency DPWM into a more streamlined structure. Additionally the all staff was trained in institutional management aligned with the restructuring process of the organizations. Further information about this component is not available.

Additionally a study helped the organization develop a business plan and fundraising strategies in order to acquire funds from likely sources.

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

Based on the information provided from the ICM and Grant Reporting and Monitoring Report (GRM), the overall assessment of efficiency was satisfactory. The main evidence for project efficiency is that the project successfully matched or exceeded set targets within the calculated budget. The best example of this is the effective implementation of Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools in the Protected Areas Management. The GRM comes to the assessment that “the development impact compared to the investment costs are substantial.” (GRM p.8)

The ICM furthermore stresses the cost-effectiveness ratio of the project and how it is beneficial for PA management and biodiversity conservation. Moreover, the global nature and benefits of the project “have demonstrated positive results for communities and the public, and carried a larger impact than anticipated in terms of institutional strengthening for the government institutions in The Gambia.” (ICM, p.9) One example given was the achievement under objective 1, where on infrastructural level all set targets were completed successfully and ahead of schedule.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following 4 dimensions:

- **Environmental threats** (U/A): An assessment of environmental threats is not possible due to the limited sources available.
- **Financial**-(ML): Based on the evidence presented in the ICM report, the project had a special focus on financial sustainability within the protected areas. For example a study on “long-term sustainable conservation financing options” was launched in order to develop a business plan and fund- raising strategy which matched biodiversity and protected area goals with likely sources of financing. Another focus was set on institutional development and restructuring efforts, which strengthened a continuation of its “successful collaboration with partners in the private sector, government and local communities, ranging from establishing and developing financing options such as eco-tourism to finance future operations.” The financial sustainability is therefore moderately likely.
- **Socio-political**-(ML): As mentioned in the earlier section the project is tightly connected with the establishment of alternative livelihood efforts, which were developed through participatory consultations with local communities. Therefore about 5,000 people in the community are now involved in beekeeping and agro-forestry projects around the parks. Furthermore the government conducted an evaluation on the work of the Protected Areas/ executing agency. After the evaluation, the Minister for Environment stated support for the project from his ministry. The scope of this support was not mentioned in the documents.
- **Institutional framework and governance**- (U/A). TE does not assess or discuss institutional and governance-related risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.

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?

An assessment on co-financing is not possible due to the limited sources available.

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?

No. The project did not experience any significant extension or delays.

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:

An assessment on country ownership is not possible due to the limited sources available.

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

Based on the Project Document, the M&E plan is presented with clear indicators and timelines. Quarterly and annual reports are set in reference to a baseline, and the responsibilities are clearly specified. The indicators listed in the M&E Design are specific and connected to the expected outputs. The chosen methods of monitoring the progress within the projects are measurable and achievable. The project will utilized the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools, developed by WWF and the World Bank. Furthermore the indicators are realistic in reference to the time frame of the project. Regarding the financial plan, the PD states that "the additional cost burden to the project for implementation of the monitoring and evaluation activities will be minimal, [and] these costs are included under Component 1." (PD, p.4) This component focusses on strengthening field effectiveness of biodiversity and protected areas management. Furthermore the PD foresees that "all other M&E costs are embedded in the activities, and staff and site management committee time being financed under each of the two project sites." (PD, p.4)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: U/A
-----------------------------------	-------------

Due to the limited information available in the TE, it is not possible to assign a rating for quality of M&E Implementation.

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

According to the ICM and GRM Report the World Bank successfully designed a project which was rated satisfactory. This review concurs with this assessment based on following evidence.

The close collaboration with the executing agency (Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPWM)) allowed the achievement of all planned activities within the project's planned time frame. The design allowed all planned activities were realistic, measurable, and achievable. The Bank furthermore provided a specialized Task Team, which) "carried out regular field implementation support missions on a restricted trust fund budget and included the TTL, a Procurement and a Financial Management Specialist." (ICM, p.12) It also closely monitored project progress and maintained a constant dialogue with the Government, its representatives, and other donors and development partners during the course of implementation. One minor shortcoming was the lack of participatory approaches to consult local PA experts/environmental resources specialists instead of bringing the World Bank's own experts into the project.

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

According to the ICM and GRM Report the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPWM) as executing agency achieved all the set objectives. The overall project was rated satisfactory. This review concurs with this assessment based on following evidence.

As mentioned earlier the project was prepared and implemented with strong ownership on the part of the executing agency and the government of The Gambia. The Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPWM) contributed to the satisfactory completion of project activities. The ICM Report highlights:

1. The expansion of monitoring and data collection to other PAs and ecologically sensitive areas besides the project sites.

2. Development of partnerships with a private UK conservation agency, and the Gambian Tourism Board to pilot revenue-generating initiatives in each of the PAs.

Minor shortcomings were experienced: “some initial delays in procurement and disbursements early in implementation occurred due to a lack of familiarity with Bank procedures”. (ICM, p.12)

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 below that this is indeed the case. 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.

An assessment of environmental change is not possible due to the limited sources available.

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 project managed to reach communities within and on the outskirts of the protected areas. Due to the already mentioned “Sustainable alternative livelihood sub-projects” revenues from beekeeping and agro-forestry were opened for the local population. As the ICM states, “it was estimated that about five thousand people in the five villages in and around the parks benefitted from the woodlot gardens established by the project, and more than a hundred people were engaged in beekeeping activities at EOP.” (ICM, p.6)

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

Capacity building efforts were undertaken under different objectives. Based on the limited information from the ICM and Results Framework Analysis (RFM), all of the executing agencies' staff members were trained in the following areas:

- Techniques of preparing and developing a business plan
- Introduction to the Biodiversity/Wildlife Act of 2003 and training on conducting patrols, arrests, reporting and prosecution.

These training events enabled the DPWM to attract participants who attended a project workshop for the first time.

Under the umbrella of sustainable alternative livelihood sub programs, the local population was introduced to beekeeping and agro-forestry. (ICM, p.6)

b) Governance

No impact reported.

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.

An assessment on unintended impacts is not possible due to the limited information available.

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.

An assessment on adoption of GEF initiatives at scale is not possible due to the limited information available.

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 Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM) comes to following lesson learned:

- Strong commitment and political will combined with early consultations with the implementing agencies and stakeholders can produce realistic expectations and design for project activities, appropriate and measurable indicators, and improve prospects for obtaining positive results for the project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM) gives following recommendations:

- Sustainable PA management requires the active involvement of affected local communities to be successful. PMPs provide a flexible and essential method for gaining the support of local communities for new conservation initiatives and the possibility of involving local communities in managing business ventures (e.g., ecotourism) for income generation could save costs and increase chances of success. In return for consultation, local communities can effectively contribute to surveillance and monitoring activities, data collection, and providing information/feedback on tests and new initiatives for the management of natural resources.
- National environment trust funds, such as the National Biodiversity Trust Fund, if successful, could send a strong indicator to investors of government commitment, ownership and political stability and would also be an important complement to tourism development goals.

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 Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM) gives basic information about the achievements of the project. However, due to the scope of this memorandum a comparison with the length of a TE is not possible. The rating comes to a moderately unsatisfactory rating, considering that shortcomings were found in the specific (quantitative) description of the outcomes and impacts.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The ratings and assessment was presented convincingly based on the amount of evidences presented. However, this rating can't assess the completeness of the Memorandum based on the little evidences presented.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The ICM gives a short rating on sustainability based on criteria's around stakeholder, national and local environment. However, these there shortly addressed issues cannot be seen as properly assessed strategies.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and well structured. But considering the length of the memorandum, the evidences are not assessable.	MU

Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not assess M&E Design or Implementation at all.	HU
Overall TE Rating		MU

Overall TE Rating: $(0.3 * (4+3)) + (0.1 * (3+3+5+1)) = 2.1 + 1.2 = 3.3 = \text{MU}$

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

The TER is only based on the evidences provided by an "Implementation Completion Memorandum", a "Results Framework Analysis" and a World Bank "Grant Reporting and Monitoring Report".