

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		8/25/05
GEF ID:	47		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Environment and Information Management Project (REIMP)	GEF financing:	\$4.01	\$4.08
Country:	Regional - Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, and Gabon - with Chad joining in 2001	Co-financing:	\$15.85	\$14.04
Operational Program:	3	Total Project Cost:	\$19.86	\$18.12
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	12 multi- and bilateral cofinanciers	Work Program date		05/01/97
		CEO Endorsement		11/03/1997
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		04/21/1998
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2003	Actual: 06/30/2003
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 5 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 5 years	Difference between original and actual closing: - 0 -
Author of TE: Pacome Kossy		TE completion date: 6/25/04	TE submission date to GEF OME: 5/12/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 year

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	N/A	N/A	
2.2 Project outcomes	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	Unlikely	Unlikely	Moderately unlikely
2.4 Monitoring	N/A	N/A	N/A	Satisfactory

and evaluation				
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No. It did not properly assess the big picture objective of what the project was intended to accomplish, focusing mostly on the assessment of the development objectives and activities. However, the project M&E system can be considered a good practice.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

To improve planning and management of natural resources in the Congo Basin, with specific focus on biodiversity conservation, by providing the various stakeholders with appropriate information on the environment in response to the needs they identify. No changes during implementation.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

More specifically, the project had the following five objectives:

- Ensure the circulation of environmental information and optimize benefits from existing initiatives;
- Foster involvement of decision-makers in environmental information use and facilitate sound land use planning in the Congo Basin;
- Provide users (Public and private sectors, NGOs, sub-regional and international organizations) with environmental information meeting their demands;
- Strengthen national capacities for environmental information management;
- Implement a Regional Fund for Local Initiatives (REFLI).

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

The OED review indicates that the project improved awareness among stakeholders on the importance of reliable, accessible environmental information. Specifically, the project contributed to:

- Establishing a regional organization (ADIE) to coordinate and cross-fertilize national efforts in environmental information management
- Initiating of networks between governmental, NGO and private sector users of information, together with databases, libraries, catalogs, audiovisual materials, and a web site
- Establishing of a Central Africa Forest Observatory
- Building the capacity of network members and training of staff
- Leveraging considerable co-financing (though the ICR does not report on the outcomes of the co-financed activities)

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Are the project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes and impacts (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?

Rating: S

In terms of effectiveness, the OED review indicates that satisfactory progress was made as the sub-objectives were substantially met, however the overall objective was too sweeping to be met in a first operation because the targets were rather ambitious.

OED indicates that the self-financing goal was not realistic and was not achieved. However, the important principle of government contributions to ADIE's - Congo Basin Association for Environmental Information Development - core running costs has been established.

The ICR indicates that, while the project has not yet improved the management of natural resources in the Congo Basin, it has put in place a process and established a basis for a better

management of information related to natural resources. The project collected, organized and set means to disseminate information used in decision-making processes.

The achievements of the project measured in terms of its objectives are essential to achieve the global environmental objective of improving the planning and management of natural resources in the Congo Basin, with specific focus on biodiversity conservation. However, as the ICR indicates, this has not been achieved yet and there are funding issues that compromise the sustainability of the outcomes. Therefore, the effectiveness of the project to achieve and sustain its global environmental objective is questionable. Other issues, in addition to those addressed by the project, may also need to be addressed to achieve the global environmental objective (e.g., legal frameworks and enforcement, economic incentives, etc.) but this is more of a project design issue.

In terms of efficiency, OED indicates that the estimated project costs and implementation schedule were reasonable. The ICR indicates that GEF funds served to finance activities that would not have been financed otherwise, such as the development of project management tools and support to the regional coordination.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: 2 (MU)
OED indicates that long-term sustainability is unlikely, as ADIE will probably not be able to survive in a meaningful form without further long term donor support. However, short-term sustainability could be attained if the countries follow through on their commitment to contribute core operating funds and discussions for a follow-up donor-funded project are successful.	
B Socio political	Rating: 5 (L)
The ICR indicates that throughout implementation, beneficiaries' involvement remained strong and was reflected in the ADIE board where public and private sectors as well as NGOs from each sub-regional country were represented. The ICR also indicates that the network of environmental actors established within the sub-region is likely to remain established and grow within and beyond the Congo Basin given the new status of the ADIE.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 4 (ML)
The ICR indicates that REIMP implementing agency, the ADIE, has been set up as a permanent institution and its status has been improved as described previously. In addition, in the context of its new mission the ADIE is going to use the tools and methodologies developed during the REIMP implementation in particular, the meta-database, the web site, the environmental libraries, the methodology for the production of Environmental Impact Assessments, the methodology for the implementation of observatories and the different information systems. However, according to the ICR, a number of additional activities such as those related to secure financing, as well as consolidation of what was done in the first phase would be necessary to strengthen ADIE further.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating:
N/A	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating:
None provided.	

4.3 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?	Rating: 5 (S)
The REIMP project put in place early in the preparation phase an integrated financial and M&E system. The ICR indicates that monitoring and evaluation was one of the strengths of the project and served to monitor project activities as well as micro-projects financed by the Regional Fund for Local Initiatives (REFLI). The system was established at regional and national units. Each country hired an M&E person who was trained	

by the regional expert. A monitoring and evaluation implementation manual was produced to describe the functioning of the system and present the indicators that would be used during the project.
B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management? Rating: 5 (S)
The ICR indicates that the system allowed the frequent production of monitoring reports that permitted the supervision teams to assess the evolution of activities and to correct shortcomings that occurred during project implementation.
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?

4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?
<p>1. Even in a region beset by poverty and civil strife, progress on cooperation in environmental information is possible, when there is full commitment from the major stakeholders and some coordination of donor efforts. Promoting development by providing information proved to be a good way of bringing people together in a region that was lacking a common tradition. In addition, involving every active stakeholder from the very beginning was a key element of success. A regional approach is an effective platform to avoid duplication of initiatives.</p> <p>2. Establishing the principle of modest cash contributions from the partner governments is an important first step towards eventual sustainability of a regional organization.</p> <p>3. The model of a lean regional organization coordinating a decentralized network of specialist agencies is preferable, especially in the information field, to the traditional model of a centralized body with high overheads, non-participatory management and low sustainability.</p>

4.5 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.
n/a

4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The ICR does a sound job of summarizing the project's implementation history, achievements and shortcomings. However, the ICR covers only the GEF financed components, therefore the achievements and shortcomings of the co-financed activities were not addressed. For example, a discussion on whether the Regional Fund for Local Initiatives improved its award transparency was missing and specially whether the World Bank had a right to review proposed awards prior to their disbursement.</p>	4 (MS)
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Yes but the ICR does not report on the outcomes of the co-financed activities.</p>	5 (S)

C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? yes	5 (S)
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes, the lessons presented in the ICR were comprehensive and generally useful	5 (S)
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes	5 (S)
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes	5 (S)

4.6 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes: X	No:
---------------	------------

Explain: It would be interesting to assess whether ADIE was able to become financially viable in the long term as it intends to extract lessons for other projects.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No

4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

OED evaluation summary, ICR, project document