

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 4169 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | P119952 | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF 4 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | World Bank | |
| Project name | | Strategic Program for West Africa - Scaling up the impacts of good practices in linking poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation. | |
| Country/Countries | | Burkina Faso Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Togo (TE p. 1) | |
| Region | | Africa | |
| Focal area | | Biodiversity | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | BDSP3, BDSP4 | |
| Executing agencies involved | | IUCN West Africa Protected Area program (PAPACO) | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | | |
| Private sector involvement | | | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | Aug 2010 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | Mar 2011 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | Feb 2014 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | Feb 2015 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | | |
| | Co-financing | | |
| GEF Project Grant | | 0.99 | NA |
| Co-financing | IA own (IUCN) | 0.44 | .4 |
| | Government | 0.326 | |
| | Other multi- /bi-laterals | 0.374 | |
| | Private sector | | |
| | NGOs/CSOs | | |
| Total GEF funding | | 0.99 | .78 |
| Total Co-financing | | 1.14 | NA |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 2.13 | NA |
| Terminal evaluation/review information | | | |
| TE completion date | | Summary of achievements - March 2015 Final PIR- Oct 2015 | |
| Author of TE | | Summary of achievements- IUCN Final PIR- Emmanuel Y. Nikiema | |
| TER completion date | | Dec 9, 2015 | |
| TER prepared by | | Dania Trespalacios | |
| TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review) | | Molly Watts | |

2. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF IEO Review |
|---|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Project Outcomes | S | (same) | NA | S |
| Sustainability of Outcomes | Low Risk | (same) | NA | L |
| M&E Design | NR | (same) | NA | MS |
| M&E Implementation | NR | (same) | NA | MU |
| Quality of Implementation | S | (same) | NA | MS |
| Quality of Execution | S | (same) | NA | S |
| Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report | -- | -- | -- | MU |

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of this project is to enhance transfer of knowledge and information sharing for more effective protected area management in selected West African countries. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 1, 7) There is a need for a programmatic approach to biodiversity conservation that will enable integration of efforts across multiple scales and national borders. As a result, the GEF council approved the Strategic Program for West Africa (SPWA) in November 2008, including the West Africa Biodiversity Program, whose objective is to scale-up biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in West Africa while looking for socio-economic benefits in a context of poverty alleviation and growth.

This project has been developed under the West Africa Biodiversity Program. It aims to reinforce managers' skills, strengthen country capacities, enable a platform to share experiences with all partners, and enable dissemination of information beyond the program. It will also draw linkages between poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation in line with the objective of the West Africa Biodiversity Program. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 6-7)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is to enhance transfer of knowledge and information sharing for more effective protected area management in selected West African countries. The key outcomes of the project include: (1) strengthened capacity of protected area practitioners at national and regional levels; and (2) enhanced awareness and application of best practice approaches to biodiversity conservation among national and regional practitioners. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 1, 7)

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

There were **no changes** to the Global Environmental and Development Objectives of the project. (Final PIR pg. 2)

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings. Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

This project has been developed under the GEF's Strategic Program for West Africa: West Africa Biodiversity Program, and supports these GEF initiatives by enhancing the transfer of knowledge and information sharing for more effective protected area management in selected West African countries. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 7) The project responds directly to the objectives of the Biodiversity Area Focal Strategy and Strategic Programming for GEF-4. The project addresses Strategic Objective 1: to Catalyze Sustainability of Protected Areas, Strategic Program 4: Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity, and Strategic Program 3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Areas Network. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 8)

The project is consistent with COUNTRY's country priorities. The project supports various regional initiatives, including the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, and NEPAD's West Africa Sub-regional Environmental Action Plan. At national level, the seventeen participating countries have supported the development of the biodiversity component of the GEF's West Africa Program, and have separately developed projects under this program. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 7-8)

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

The Final PIR rates the project's overall progress to achieving grant objectives as Satisfactory, and states that the project met its development objectives with a strong focus on capacity building and building networks. The Final PIR rates the project's progress on the implementation of activities as Satisfactory, and states that the project completed all activities on time. (Final PIR p. 2) The TER reviewer concurs with this assessment, and rates effectiveness as Satisfactory.

The project had three main components. Components one and two had a few expected results that were either partly achieved, or not reported on. The training course for professionals held only 6 sessions instead of the expected 10. The distance learning course was not developed because the feasibility study concluded that distance learning courses should not be envisaged for the moment, given issues related to equipment and internet access in the region. The budget for the distance learning course was reallocated to other activities, especially the two training programs. (Summary of Achievements p. 2, 3) The e-platform sharing tool was established, but was not fully operational by project end, as it required staff specifically recruited to facilitate the discussions on the forum. (Summary of Achievements p. 3) Finally, the project supported the participation of two IUCN staff members and project participants to two IUCN events: the 2012 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Jeju, South Korea, and the 2014 IUCN World Parks Congress in Sydney, Australia. This fell short of the project's original goal 3 dissemination workshops. (Summary of Achievements p. 3-4)

Table 1 Project Components, Expected Outputs and Results (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 1-3,13-16, 20-23, 27, Summary of Achievements p. 1-4)

| Component | Activities & Expected Outputs | Results |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Component 1 Reinforce and | Implement a specialized Master's Degree program in PA management | Achieved. |
| | Develop & implement a training course on PA mgmt. for professionals | Mostly achieved. |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------|
| extend the regional network of PA managers & experts. | Conduct a study to prepare a distance e-learning training course | Partly achieved. |
| | Conduct regional workshop for West Africa biodiversity stakeholders | Achieved. |
| | Establish a forum on economic initiatives in/around PAs in West Africa | NOT REPORTED. |
| | Prepare directory of local and national NGOs involved in biodiversity conservation & PA management | Achieved. |
| Component 2 Knowledge Management & Information Dissemination | Develop tools (good practice guidelines, toolkits and information resources) and make them available | Achieved. |
| | Establish a roster of biodiversity conservation and mgmt. experts, make available on request | Achieved & exceeded. |
| | Establish a web-based information and knowledge sharing tool | Partly achieved. |
| | Develop and publish documents on the West Africa program | Achieved. |
| | Conduct dissemination workshops, enable researchers & partners to present their findings and recommendations | Mostly achieved. |
| Component 3 Project Mgmt. & Monitoring | Project is administered effectively and efficiently and a portfolio monitoring system is in place | Achieved. |

Despite these shortcomings, the Final PIR rates the implementation of component 1 as Highly Satisfactory, and rates the implementation of component 2 and 3 as satisfactory. (Final PIR p. 6-7) The project achieves the developmental and environmental objective of the project, which is to enhance the transfer of knowledge and information sharing to achieve more effective protected area management in West African countries. The project results meets the two key outcomes specified at the start of the project: (1) strengthened capacity of protected area practitioners at national and regional levels, and (2) enhanced awareness and application of best practice approaches to biodiversity conservation among national and regional practitioners. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 1, 7, 13)

The Summary of Achievements states that the most important achievement of the project are the two training programs: the Masters Degree and the Professional Training Course. (Summary of Achievements pg. 2) In general, the courses lead to a better understanding of the “protected area” concept, including the need for an up-to-date management plan, the formulation of priority objectives, and the involvement of all stakeholders in participatory protected area management planning. The students declared that they have a better understanding of the tools for evaluating protected area management effectiveness. (Summary of Achievements p. 5)

Another important achievement was the regional meeting for all West Africa Program’s partners, attended by 40 participants from 16 countries, including GEF/Biodiversity Conservation project national coordinators, key staff from national institutions involved in PA management, PA managers, and representatives from regional institutions and civil society organizations. Issues discussed included sustainable and efficient funding of biodiversity conservation, greater integration of landscape approach in West Africa, and sustainable management of PA systems. The meeting helped share West African experience in implementing GEF's Strategic Programme for West Africa projects. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)

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

Neither the Final PIR nor the Summary of Achievements document rate the efficiency of the project. The project was completed within budget, but the date of completion was delayed by a

year. This type of delay is not uncommon for GEF projects, but this moderate shortcoming merits an efficiency rating of Moderately Satisfactory.

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 4.4 Sustainability | Rating: Likely |
|--------------------|-----------------------|

The Final PIR rates the risk to this project's sustainability as negligible/low risk. (Final PIR p. 5) The Request for CEO Endorsement lists three low risks of a sociopolitical and institutional nature, and a moderate financial risk. Neither the Final PIR or the Summary of Achievements specifically discuss these or any other risks to sustainability, or how the project did or did not address them. Based on evidence found in the Final PIR and Summary of Achievements document, the TER reviewer rates sustainability as Likely.

Financial Sustainability- Likely

The 10th edition of the University Diploma in West Africa is benefiting this year from a small grant from Lux-Development in Burkina Faso of 7,000 Euros to contribute to supporting participants from Burkina Faso. (Summary of Achievements p. 4) The University Diploma training gained interest from other partners who replicated the course in Central Africa (Wildlife Conservation Society) with financing from the European Union and the Agence Française de Développement. (Summary of Achievements p. 2) The MAVA Foundation is willing to finance a meeting to continue the study on the impacts of small grants begun by the project. (Final PIR p. 5)

The mission team discussed the issue of sustainability of the project after closing, including the future potential of continuing support for similar activities using GEF-6 funds, provided that IUCN can generate significant leverage for co-financing. The meeting discussed the potential linkage to the BIOPAMA (Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management) Programme, funded by the European Union over 4 years, through the Intra ACP (Africa, Caribbean, Pacific) envelope of biodiversity. Although covering all ACP countries, BIOPAMA will focus on Africa with 60% of its overall budget. It will be implemented primarily by three main structures: EC/JRC, GIZ and IUCN through capacity building and assistance in establishing observatories on biodiversity. (PIR 2013 p.2)

Sociopolitical Sustainability - Likely

It seems there is wide spread social support for the University Diploma Program and the professional training modules. The countries in the region remain committed to cooperating at the regional level on biodiversity protection.

Sustainability of Institutional Frameworks and Governance - Likely

The project Steering Committee members and staff have been thinking about how to continue running the University Diploma, and have proposed various options. (Summary of Achievements p. 4) The existing legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes do not pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits.

Environmental Sustainability- Likely

There are no environmental risks associated with the activities of the project. However, challenges to the protection of biodiversity in the area remain high.

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 Summary of Achievements document states that the professional training and the Masters Diploma courses benefitted from the co-financing from the MAVA Foundation and from support from the Francophonie. The professional training course was replicated in Central Africa with financing from the European Union and the Agence Française de Développement. (Summary of Achievements p. 1-2). At least US \$1,000,000 of co-financing materialized by the mid term of the project. This indicates that co-financing was essential to the achievement of the project's objectives.

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?

The initial completion date was February 2014. After approval of a project revision to enable the training of more protected areas managers, the final end date was delayed to February 2015. (Summary of Achievements p. 1)

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:

There is a lack of information regarding country ownership, much less information at the country level. There seems to be great interest from various partners to continue the activities of the project, specifically the professional training and Masters Degree programs.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 6.1 M&E Design at entry | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|-------------------------|--|

Neither the Final PIR or the Summary of Achievements rate the quality of M&E Design at project entry. Based on the evidence provided in the Request for CEO Endorsement, M&E Design at entry is rated Moderately Satisfactory. Although the project developed SMART indicators, there was no specific budget for M&E activities, and there were very vague timelines for M&E activities, both of which are key components of the M&E Design.

The Request for CEO Endorsement explains that the project's M&E system will be based on the projects results framework, specifically on the tracking of output indicators listed on p.4-5, and that at least one annual supervision mission would be conducted by the World Bank to monitor the progress made towards the achievements of the project objectives as defined in the result framework. There is no specific budget for M&E activities- the Request for CEO Endorsement justifies this decision by stating that "monitoring will be part of the day to day work of the

project manager”, and that the project manager will update the indicator matrix every trimester as deliverables are expected. (Request for CEO Endorsement p 4-5, 10) The Request for CEO Endorsement also calls for an implementation completion workshop at project end to evaluate results, effectiveness and impact of the project, and to draw experience and lessons learnt from the project for the benefits of similar projects to be designed or implemented in the future. (Request for CEO Endorsement p 23)

The Request for CEO Endorsement also specifies that an IUCN-PAPACO program officer will be responsible for day-to-day operational management of the project, coordination of planning and monitoring of progress and impact, under the supervision of PAPACO’s coordinator, in order to meet the project stated objectives efficiently and effectively. (Request for CEO Endorsement p. 10)

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

The Final PIR rates Monitoring and Evaluation as executed by IUCN PAPACO as Satisfactory. (Final PIR p.8) However, the evidence for the M&E activities of the project fall short of this rating, and M&E implementation is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory.

Four M&E documents were made available to the TER reviewer: 3 PIRs and 1 Summary of Achievements document. The PIR dated February 2013 was mostly blank. The Summary of Achievements document does not comment on M&E. The PIR dated November 2013 reports on various M&E activities (PIR 2013 p. 2,5)

- there were 3 implementation support missions which reviewed the progress of project activities against indicator targets, and found the activities on track and performing well.
- The project team provided a progress report in 2011 and 2012, and developed a work plan for 2013.
- Overall progress since March 2012 was reviewed with the IUCN counterparts and found to be progressing well and on track to be completed on time. *(However, the project was completed with one year delay.)*
- The 2013 PIR rates procurement, financial management, project management and M&E as satisfactory, and states that indicators were tracked regularly and updated.

The PIR dated 2015 rates M&E as Satisfactory, and states that all projected Indicators in results agreement have been achieved. (PIR 2015 p.8)

There is strong evidence that the M&E system operated throughout the life of the project and served its purpose, since almost all of the initial indicators are reported on in the Final PIR. It seems that an M&E system was in place and allowed the timely tracking of results and progress throughout the project. However, there is no evidence that the implementation completion workshop specified by the Request for CEO Endorsement at the end of the project was held. There was no complete Terminal Evaluation submitted. Annual project reports with complete ratings were not available to the TER reviewer, and the available PIRs were incomplete, missing key ratings and information on co-financing and project financing. There is no evidence that proper training was provided for parties responsible for M&E activities. For these significant shortcomings, M&E Implementation is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

| | |
|--|--|
| 7.1 Quality of Project Implementation | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|--|--|

The implementing agency for this project was the World Bank. The Final PIR does not explicitly rate the World Bank's performance, but rates the project management and monitoring component of the project as Satisfactory, and the implementation of grant financed activities as Satisfactory. (Final PIR p. 2, 7) Evidence suggests that the World Bank worked closely with the IUCN to monitor the project's progress: there were 3 implementation support missions which reviewed the progress of project activities against indicator targets with the IUCN counterparts. (PIR 2013 p. 2) However, two shortcomings stand out: the project end date was delayed by one year, and there were very poor M&E documents provided, particularly, there was no proper terminal evaluation provided. More is expected from the World Bank as a regular implementing agency for GEF projects. For these shortcomings, the quality of project implementation is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

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

The executing agency for this project was the IUCN's Central and West Africa Program on African protected Areas and Conservation (PAPACO) based in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. The Final PIR rates the quality of IUCN's project execution along five parameters - project management, financial management, procurement, counterpart funding and monitoring and evaluation- all rated Satisfactory. (Final PIR p.7-8)

The project was completed within budget. It seemed the delay in project completion was due to a project revision to enable the training of more protected area managers. (Summary of Achievements p. 1) The project was successful in all of its expected outputs, and achieved its general objective. The IUCN provided a Summary of Achievements document that contained much of the information available to the TER reviewer, and on which the Final PIR draws heavily. Finally, the IUCN actively pursued strategies to ensure the sustainability of project achievement beyond the life of the project, and to replicate the project activities in other regions in Africa. The quality of project execution is rated Satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

The TE does not report any changes in environmental stress or status.

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 in general, but does report improved self confidence and power over decision making on the part of trained PA managers. (Summary of Achievements p. 5)

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 conducted an important study in order to assess the effects of the training (Masters and University Diploma) on the students’ career paths and on the conservation even though longer term impacts are yet to be seen. The main changes observed are an improvement in knowledge in the protected area field, changes in professional attitudes and personal development (generally shown by greater self- confidence). In addition to these changes, the courses have helped to generate a regional network of French-speaking experts. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)
- A study to identify and document the different types of governance of protected areas in West Africa by analyzing the roles of the different stakeholders and characterizing the main governance modes. This study also published a Directory for Local and National NGOs involved in PA management in the sub-region. (Summary of Achievements p. 3)
- A study to assess the feasibility and relevance of a distance learning programme in West Africa for PA managers. The study concluded that exclusive distance learning courses should not be envisaged at the moment also given the issues related to equipment and internet access in the region. However we could envisage it as a complementary course to the courses delivered traditionally. (Summary of Achievements p. 3)
- A study to conduct an inventory and assessment of small grants in West Africa, to develop a comprehensive understanding for the scaling potential for “small grants to NGOs” model, and improve the design and/or targeting of future investments in conservation. (Summary of Achievements p. 3) Following the study on the inventory and impacts of Small grants, the MAVA Foundation is willing to invest \$40,000 to finance a meeting on the conditions of the implementation of small grants and the way that the impacts should be measured, two aspects that have been highlighted in the study. (Summary of Achievements p. 4)
- A translation into French of the publication “Sacred Natural Sites”, and the production of 400 copies. (Summary of Achievements p. 3)
- The IUCN PAPACO published a monthly newsletter, distributed to more than 1,500 conservation stakeholders in Africa and the world. The newsletter included information on the project, especially on the training program. (Summary of Achievements p. 3)
- IUCN Best practices tools are distributed to partners and students who attended the training programs. Best practices guidelines translated to French were distributed to 97 participants of the University Diploma. There were 485 publications distributed. The publications include: Guidelines for Management Planning of Protected Areas; Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing the Management of Protected Areas; Sacred

Natural Sites: Guidelines for Protected Area Managers; Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories; Analysis and identification of key biodiversity areas.

(Summary of Achievements p. 3)

- An operational training program has successfully trained PA managers and their partners in all aspects of effective PA management. Six editions of a modular professional training course “University Diploma ” aimed at young professionals with relevant experience were organized. 116 PA management professionals were trained, from Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo. Among them, there were 22 female professionals. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)
- A specialized Master’s Degree on PA management was held to enable young graduates to specialize in this field. During the first session of the Master (2011-2013), 17 students were enrolled during the first year, 26 students during the second year. During the second in 2013-2015, 13 students enrolled in year 1 and in year 2. Students came from Burkina Faso, Cote d’Ivoire, Mali, Senegal and Togo. Students from other regions came from Central African Republic, Cameroon, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo and Madagascar. Among all students, there were 8 female graduates. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)
- A roster of biodiversity experts was established, containing more than 500 experts. (Summary of Achievements p. 3)
- A regional meeting for West Africa Program’s partners was held in 2013 to review the experience in implementing the West Africa strategic programme. The meeting helped share West African experience in implementing GEF’s Strategic Programme for West Africa projects. It was attended by forty participants, from sixteen countries and included: GEF/Biodiversity Conservation project national coordinators, key staff from national institutions in charge of Protected Areas or Biodiversity, Protected Area managers, and representatives from regional institutions and civil society organizations. The meeting discussed many issues including sustainable and efficient funding of biodiversity conservation, Greater Integration of landscape Approach in West Africa, and sustainable management of PA systems. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)
- The project conducted an important study in order to assess the effects of the training (Masters and University Diploma) on the students’ career paths, even though longer term impacts are yet to be seen. The main changes observed are an improvement in knowledge in the protected area field, changes in professional attitudes and personal development (generally shown by greater self- confidence). In addition to these changes, the courses have helped to generate a regional network of French-speaking experts. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)
- An e-platform information and knowledge sharing tool was established to provide an interface for knowledge sharing. The e-platform was not fully operational, as it required staff specifically recruited to facilitate the discussions on the forum. (Summary of Achievements p. 3)
- The project supported the participation of two IUCN staff members involved in the project to two important IUCN events. At the 2012 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Jeju, South Korea, IUCN co-facilitated a side event on capacity building activities, including the work done by the this project. The event included a presentation on the University Diploma and Masters programme, and a poster on the activities of the Protected Areas programme, including this project. At the 2014 IUCN World Parks Congress in Sydney, Australia. The results of the study on the assessment of the effects of the training program were presented, and discussions were held on the possibility of future financing of these programs. (Summary of Achievements p. 3-4)

- More than 60% of the people interviewed during the impact study are currently working in a protected area or in a surrounding area, which indicates that the training meets a real need. The graduates hold important positions. For example, Niger's current director of fauna and hunting is a former Master's student. The graduates have developed and improved their knowledge, and have improved their professional attitudes and self-confidence, which increase their capacity to influence decisions. An example of this is the case of Niger, where the Directorate for Wildlife, Hunting and Protected Areas has quadrupled its budget for protected areas following "lobbying" by course graduates. (Summary of Achievements p. 5)

b) Governance - The TE did not report 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.

The TE does not describe 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.

- **Mainstreaming- Adopted.** The 10th edition of the University Diploma in West Africa is benefiting this year from a small grant from Lux-Development in Burkina Faso of 7,000 euros to especially contribute to supporting the participation of participants from Burkina Faso. The project Steering Committee members and staff have been thinking about how to continue running the University Diploma, and have proposed various options. (Summary of Achievements p. 4)
- **Replication- Adopted.** The University Diploma training gained interest from other partners who replicated the course in Central Africa (Wildlife Conservation Society) with financing from the European Union and the Agence française de développement (AFD). The course has been adapted to the challenges and needs of PA managers of the Congo Basin. The first edition started in 2012 and subsequent editions took place in 2013, 2014. As a result, 58 practitioners were trained in this sub region. A fourth edition will be organized in April-May 2015. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)
- **Mainstreaming- Adopted.** The training program (Masters and University Diploma) helped to generate a regional network of French-speaking experts. (Summary of Achievements p. 2)
- **Mainstreaming- Adopted.** In general, the courses lead to a better understanding of the "protected area" concept, including the need for an up-to-date management plan, the formulation of priority objectives, and the involvement of all stakeholders in participatory protected area management planning. The students declared that they have a better understanding of the tools for evaluating protected area management effectiveness. In Benin, for instance, the skills acquired were used to improve the ecological monitoring system at the Pendjari National Park. In Burkina Faso they carried out wild animal and bird

census at the Classified forest and partial wildlife reserve of the Comoé-Léraba, and in Senegal, they set up an antelope monitoring protocol at the Gueumbeul special wildlife reserve. (Summary of Achievements p. 5)

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 does not list any lessons learned.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not list any recommendations.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

The Final PIR and the Summary of Achievements are treated jointly as the project's TE.

| 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 TE contains an assessment of the relevant outcomes, especially of the impacts of the project. The TE adequately describes the project's progress towards achievement of objectives. | S |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | The report is internally consistent. However, many ratings are missing (World Bank implementation, M&E Design), key information is missing (co-financing, final amounts spent). | MU |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The TE discusses sustainability issues, but not in a deliberate way. Sustainability risks are not explicitly discussed. The evidence for sustainability was collected piecemeal by the TER reviewer. | MU |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | The TE does not provide any lessons learned. | U |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The TE does not provide actual project costs, costs per activity, or co-financing amounts. | U |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | The TE does not evaluate the project's M&E systems, and does not justify its ratings for these. | U |
| Overall TE Rating | | MU |

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(8) + 0.1(9) = 2.4 + 0.9 = 3.3$$

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 PD.