1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	4494
GEF Agency project ID	
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-5
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	IFAD
Project name	Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Conservation in the Buffer Zones of the Obo and Principe Natural Parks
Country/Countries	São Tomé and Príncipe
Region	AFR
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	Special Climate Change Fund
Executing agencies involved	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR)
NGOs/CBOs involvement	MARAPA and Alisei
Private sector involvement	None
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	June 26, 2012
Effectiveness date / project start	December 6, 2012
Expected date of project completion (at start)	June 12, 2015
Actual date of project completion	June 6, 2016

Project Financing			At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		0	UA
	Co-financing		0	UA
GEF Project Grant			2.418	UA
Co-financing	IA own		8.0	UA
	Government		0.292	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		0.1	UA
	Private sector		0	UA
	NGOs/CSOs		0	UA
Total GEF funding			2.418	UA
Total Co-financing			8.392	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)			10.81	1.736

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	September 2016
Author of TE	UA

TER completion date	January 4, 2019
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Ritu Kanotra

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to "promote the integration of biodiversity and integrated ecosystem management in the buffer zones of the Obo Natural Parks of São Tomé and Príncipe" (TE Summary Report pg 4).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to increase "revenue streams through biodiversity-friendly production and sustainable activities" (TE Report pg 4). The project aimed to achieve its objective through two components:

    a) Institutional support for biodiversity mainstreaming; and

    b) Integrated ecosystem management for biodiversity conservation in Obo and Principe National Park and their Buffer Zone.

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

The TE summary report does not mention changes to the objectives or activities during implementation.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability
Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE summary report stated the project and its activities were relevant "as they respond to the priorities of preserving natural resources and biodiversity in a country where natural parks are threatened by the growth of agricultural areas" (TE summary report pg 4). The project was also consistent with country priorities on the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper of São Tomé and Príncipe (STP), the National Strategy and Action Plan for Biodiversity, and the Fourth Biodiversity Report (2009). The project was also aligned with "the UN Conventions on the Sea, Biological Diversity, Climate Change and Convention to Combat Desertification signed by the Government of STP since the late nineties, which provide the framework for the development of the country's environmental legislation body and the baseline and rationale for the preparation of the NBSAP and the Biodiversity Report" (CEO Endorsement Document pg 5). Additionally, the project was aligned with GEF-5 biodiversity focal area and its strategy to "Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors" (PD pg 20). Thus, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating to the project's relevance.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: UA

The TE summary report rated the project's effectiveness as Moderately Unsatisfactory and critiqued that the objectives were very ambitious, the project faced significant delays, strategic products did not align with expectations and the activities were not structured in a way to achieve the objective of preserving the environment and biodiversity (TE summary report pg 5). The report also stated that very few indicators were fully achieved, and the quality of products was not as expected. However, there is not much information available in the in the English TE summary report to provide an assessment and rating for project effectiveness.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Unsatisfactory

The TE summary report gave an Unsatisfactory rating to the project's efficiency due to bad financial management of the project's resources. There were issues with project's overall coordination and financial implementation rates of technical components. The report stated that the coordination costs exceeded the forecasted costs by 30%, and although the disbursement rate of the M&E component was 86%, the M&E system did not produce enough data that could have helped to improve project

performance (TE summary report pg 5). Furthermore, the project also experienced delays but the report does not give the reasons for the delays. However, it mentioned that the "additional 6-month period allowed the completion of many activities that were still in the start-up phase at the date originally planned for the completion, but did not reinforce the achievements of the Project. This allowed to increase the disbursement rate, but the benefits of these expenses raise questions" (TE summary report pg 5). Therefore, the efficiency rating is Unsatisfactory.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: UA

The TE report summary gave Moderately Satisfactory rating to sustainability and stated that the project "did not pay particular attention to the appropriate transfer of achievements to the concerned entities which should and could ensure the continuation and sustainability of the many processes and actions incurred" (TE summary report pg 6). However, the report does not have enough information for the TER to assess and provide rating for the sustainability of the project.

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 report did not provide information on materialized co-financing amount.

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 report mentioned that there were delays in project implementation and a six-month extension was given to the project, however, it did not provide reasons for the delay.

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 report noted that the project had shortcomings in ownership of institutions and management committees, and the project did not involve relevant institutions during implementation "so they can fully appropriate the institutional changes envisaged" (TE summary report pg 6).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system
Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E

component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project document made provision for an M&E system that included a baseline survey, results framework with indicators, evaluation reports, and additionally develop a National Biodiversity Database System for the collection, storage, analysis and sharing of information related to the conservation of biodiversity. However, the TE summary report noted that "many outcome indicators of the logical framework were not quantified (7 out of 13) initially, nor during the project's implementation" (TE summary report pg 5). Thus, the rating for the M&E design at entry is Moderately Satisfactory.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: UA

The report assigned an Unsatisfactory rating to the M&E system overall but did not provide enough information for the TER to assess 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: UA

The available TE summary report doesn't contain enough information to assess or provide a rating to the quality of implementation.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: UA

The available TE summary report doesn't contain enough information to assess or provide a rating to the quality of execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The report does not mention any environmental changes.

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 report noted "through the implementation of micro-project, the Project has directly contributed to increase the assets of about 1,060 households, but the real impact of these investments remains uncertain. Studies, awareness-raising and trainings have contributed to a change of vision of the institutional and field actors on their environment" (TE summary report pg 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: The report does not provide information on capacity changes.

   b) Governance: The report does not provide information on changes to 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.

No unintended impacts have been reported.

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 report does not mention GEF initiatives being adopted at scale.

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 main lessons provided by the TE summary report are (TE summary report pgs 6-7):

a) Communities have highly appreciated the project's participatory and inclusive approach and its institutionalization, and this can significantly improve sustainability;

b) Project's design should concretely consider environmental constraints and risks, and overly complex projects should be avoided in unstructured contexts;

c) In micro-project approach, the following must be taken into account: (i) easily reproducible micro-projects adapted to the environment; (ii) micro-projects of a technical level responding to the request of the beneficiaries; (iii) micro-projects promoting the learning and progressive mastery of technical and economic parameters of the activity, and (iv) an effective support system; and

d) National institutions which are relevant to the project should be involved in activities aimed at improving the institutional framework. Projects need to build their capacity and institutions and projects can mutually benefit by working closely together.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations are (TE summary report pg 7):

a) In order to finalize the completion process, the project must conduct impact study, and evaluate and share the achievements and effects of the project in a participatory manner.

b) Scale up of training courses in sustainable agroforestry practices to reduce soil erosion should be done within the framework of this Participatory Smallholder and Artisanal Fisheries Development Program (PAPAF/PAPAC) or other government projects by involving the agriculture delegations and professional organizations.

c) Study of micro-projects financed by this project should engage PAPAC to establish actual operating accounts and draw lessons for future interventions.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?		**UA**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?		**UA**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?		**UA**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?		**UA**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		**UA**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:		**UA**
Overall TE Rating	As only the summary report was available in English, the full TE cannot be evaluated.	**UA**

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

The TER used only the terminal evaluation summary report as a source.