

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		490	
GEF Agency project ID		P059869	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Kibale Forest Wild Coffee Project	
Country/Countries		Uganda	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP3: Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Uganda Coffee Trade Federation	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead Executing Agency	
Private sector involvement		One of the Beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		12-29/1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		2/23/1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		2/14/2002	
Actual date of project completion		2/14/2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.75	0.75
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	2.35	U/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	1.05 (Utah State University)	U/A
Total GEF funding		0.75	0.75
Total Co-financing		3.4	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.15	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date			
TE submission date			
Author of TE			
TER completion date		October 2014	
TER prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project, as stated in the Project Brief (PB), are to “conserve globally significant biodiversity in Kibale National Park (KNP) and in the agricultural landscape of Uganda” (PB, pg2). KNP covers 766 square km in western Uganda, and according to the PB, has long been recognized as an ecologically significant area. According to the PB, the biological resources of KNP are under threat from illegal wild coffee harvesting and poaching, which is said to accompany illegal coffee harvesting.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PB, the developmental objectives of the projects are to create a system for using income from the sale of Kibale Forest Wild Coffee to improve the management of Kibale National Park (KNP) and to provide an incentive to small coffee farmers sufficient to lead them to produce organic coffee in biologically diverse agricultural ecosystems rather than large scale monocultures as currently practiced. Coffee is Uganda’s primary export product. The project will create a system to certify the origin and quality of Ugandan coffee and to certify that income for the sale of “eco-labeled” coffee goes to support both the KNP and farmers in a selected district who choose to grow their coffee in biologically diverse agro-ecosystems.

Project objectives will be achieved through the following three “Activity clusters,” defined in the PB:

1. A sustainable management system – establish a system for the management of wild coffee from Kibale National Park’s buffer zones. Associated activities include:
 - a. Design and implementation of Community Management Agreements (CMAs) with local communities
 - b. Development of master plan for coffee resources
 - c. Design and implement KNP permitting and CMAs
 - d. Design monitoring, impact assessment and system to back claims
2. Preparation for certification – create a system that controls the processing, transport, and activities necessary for the certification of Kibale Coffee – both wild coffee and blended coffee, as organic, “fair trade” and meeting other standards.

- a. Create a system to control coffee post-harvest
- b. Assure readiness to meet likely international standards
- 3. A funding channel for benefits to make annual investments for a variety of purposes
 - a. Explore and design a channel for price premium

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

No changes to the GEOs, DEOs, or other activities where noted in the TE.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project is relevant to both the GEF and to the government of Uganda. For the GEF, project objectives are in-line with those of GEF Operational Program 3: Forest ecosystems, which seeks to protect globally significant biodiversity in forests. As stated in the PB, Kibale National Park (KNP) has long been recognized as an ecologically significant area harboring many endangered and threatened species including chimpanzee and African forest elephant. These resources are increasingly threatened by poaching and illegal, unsustainable harvesting of wild coffee and other forest products. For Uganda, PB states that the project supports implementation of both national policy and a principle mandate of the Convention on Biological Diversity, to which Uganda is a party, by promoting sustainable use of native plant species to create a sustainable source of revenue for KNP and the Uganda national park system as a whole. In addition, both the Uganda Wildlife Act and the National Conservation Strategy call for the creation of buffer zones as a key part of the strategy for national park management, and the project supports efforts to strengthen the local economy of buffer zones surrounding KNP.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	-------------------------------

According to the TE, the project was unsuccessful in achieving its primary objective, which was the generation of income from the sale of Wild Coffee Project blends and the allocation of those funds to biodiversity conservation and sustainable community development. Project design appears to have

vastly over-estimated the amount of wild coffee that could be sustainably harvested from the buffer zones of KNP, as well as the demand for this coffee. While PB states that harvests of wild coffee from villages living near the eastern boundaries of the Kibale Forest were on the order of 40 to 200 metric tons in the 1960s with an unspecified decline during the 1970s and 1980s (PB, pg 16), after project implementation commenced, it was revealed that no more than 1,500 *pounds* of wild coffee was available for harvest annually (TE, pg 5). In addition, project experience revealed low interest among international coffee buyers in robusta coffee (which KNP wild coffee is related to) and in Ugandan coffee in general, which had a poor reputation for quality. TE finds that achieving project objectives would require significant additional investment and sustained marketing efforts. The marketing expenses were estimated to be on the order of \$800,000 additional funding – an expenditure “...not anticipated when the project proposal was originally written” (TE, pg 2).

Project achievements are detailed further along the outcome indicators provided in the PB¹:

- *Effective management of buffer zones around KNP reflected in the percent of area of KNP buffer zones that are under sustainable management according to the buffer zone management plan* – TE states that the project can claim to have impacted nearly 50% of buffer zones along the northeastern area of the park. However, the impact that the TE cites appears to be limited to anecdotal observations of community members exhibiting “an elevated appreciation for the biodiversity of KNP,” with no assessment provided of any changes in land management practices (TE, pg 3).
- *Number and acreage of small farms that are certified organic* – the project expected small farms in the area to benefit from the certification program developed for wild coffee. However, TE states that the certification was not able to reach the small farms that are all located in the buffer zones, as all wild coffee was currently being harvested from the core conservation zone – a practice that the project sought to change.
- *Number and acreage of small farms that are certified as producing coffee in mixed agricultural systems* – TE states that this indicator was rendered irrelevant as project experience revealed that international coffee buyers were not presently interested in the kind of coffee grown in these areas.
- *Volume of Uganda coffee exports that are certified as either wild, organic, or produced from small farm ecosystems* – TE states that while the percentage of Ugandan coffee exports that are certified organic has increased, the project cannot take credit for it. TE does however state that the project was successful in raising the awareness of specialty coffees from Uganda based on participation in two major trade expositions, and through the work of the Wild Coffee Project in the Specialty Coffee of America Association conventions.
- *Flow of income from sustainable harvest into park management* – This was not achieved. The project conducted three harvests and developed a marketing program to bring the Wild Coffee Project blends to the market. However, TE states that “the project has not and does not expect

¹ Note - the Project Brief does not provide targets for indicators. In addition three sets of overlapping indicators are provided for in the PB for project objectives, outcomes, and activities. TE only reports on outcome indicators, which are shown above in section 4.2.

to channel any significant income to park management until the project itself achieves financial self-sustainability. Key to achieving that level of financial independence is investing in marketing” (TE, pg 4). Those investments in marketing were beyond the scope of the project’s funding.

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

TE does not rate nor directly assess project efficiency. However, the TE narrative implies that project efficiency was overall satisfactory, with no significant delays or other issues noted in the TE. TE states that all project funds were disbursed in the intended fashion (TE, pg 9).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unlikely
--------------------	-------------------------

TE states that additional investments are needed to execute a marketing plan which, if successful, may ultimately deliver conservation benefits to KNP. However, to date, no funding has been secured and the project did not make additional investments in capacity building, infrastructure, or other outcomes that can be expected to continue post project. Sustainability of project outcomes is therefore rated as unlikely.

Project sustainability is further assessed along the following dimensions:

- *Environmental (U/A)* – Insufficient information is provided in the TE to assess any environmental risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.
- *Financial (U)* – TE states that additional investments along the order of \$800,000 are needed to execute a marketing plan that, if successful, would allow for continued pursuit of the project’s approach and objectives. However, to date, no funding has been secured.
- *Socio-Political (U/A)* – Insufficient information is provided in the TE to assess any socio-political risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.
- *Institutional (U/A)* – Insufficient information is provided in the TE to assess any institutional 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?

TE does not provide any information on the degree to which promised co-financing materialized, or the extent to which co-financing affected project outcomes and/or sustainability.

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?

TE does not note any incidences of project delays or extensions.

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:

TE provides insufficient information to assess the level of country ownership and its effects on project outcomes and sustainability. Government of Uganda pledged \$3.4 million in co-financing to the project, but the TE provides no assessment on realized co-financing or other contributions for the GoU.

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 Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

Design of M&E at entry had several key weaknesses. PB states that “the essence of this project is to create a self-sustaining system that monitors its own activities because that monitoring is key to its success and growth” (PB, pg 13). However, PB fails to provide the project with design for a robust monitoring system. No targets are provided in the PB or an implementation table detailing when project activities are expected to be completed. PB provides three sets of overlapping indicators for Objectives, Outcomes and Activities. Indicators provided do not meet criteria for SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timely) indicators (not a requirement at the time, but indicative of best practices). For example, the first indicator for Activities - *master plan for forest management in coffee buffer areas prepared and reviewed by scientific community* - provides no guidance for what such a master plan should include, how scientific review is to be achieved, and whether or not such review is even possible given the time constraints of the project. Another indicator for Objectives - *scope and scale of protection of forest biodiversity within Kibale National Park* – does not appear to be sufficiently linked with project activities, nor is any guidance provided on how it should be measured and assessed. PB does include a detailed listing of activities that fills in the gaps in M&E targets to some extent.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

TE provides insufficient information to assess the quality of M&E implementation. Final PIR notes that the project has established a monitoring program and baseline survey of biological diversity in the coffee areas, and established a system to assure that all wild coffee harvesting is done under “tight management control.”

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: Unable to Assess
--	---------------------------------

Insufficient information is provided in the TE to assess quality of project implementation. Project design failed to adequately assess the demand for Ugandan wild coffee or the level of sustainable supply – both key elements for project success. However, TE provides no assessment on the level of support provided by the World Bank during project implementation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	---------------------------------

Insufficient information is provided in the TE to assess quality of project 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 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.

No changes in environmental stress or status are reported to have occurred by the end of the project.

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.

No changes in human well-being are reported to have occurred by the end of the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities – No changes in capacity are reported to have occurred as a result of the project.

b) Governance - No changes in governance are reported to have occurred as a result of the project.

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 are reported to have occurred as a result of the project.

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.

No adoption of GEF initiatives at scale are reported to have occurred as a result of the project. At project completion project activities were not generating any income or additional benefits for KNP or stakeholders that would provide an incentive for replication and scale up.

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.

TE does not provide any lessons or recommendations. However, a 2010 paper² published in the journal *Conservation Biology*, and that detailed project experiences states that:

Chief among the lessons learned from this project is that for many wild-grown products, the value of “the story”—in both human and conservation terms—is likely to far exceed actual product values. This value differential should be captured through high-value niche markets to avoid low commodity pricing and subsequent pressures to improve financial returns through over harvesting. In addition, local producers should hold significant assets in whatever brands are developed, creating a shared-equity approach that serves social responsibility goals, fosters project sustainability, and ensures a steady stream of positive stories for use in marketing to build brand value. Shared equity—in this case ownership interest in the intellectual property embodied in the brand—provides a second incentive beyond transactional profits that can only be realized if resource conservation is maintained.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

No recommendations are provided in the TE.

² Lillieholm and Weatherly, 2010. *Kibale Forest Wild Coffee: Challenges to Market-Based Conservation in Africa*. *Conservation Biology*, May 2010. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01527.x/abstract>

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?	TE provides an overall assessment of the degree to which the project achieved its overall objective. However, insufficient detail is provided about the progress of key activities including development of a management plan and Community-Management Agreements, and their affects (if any) on land management practices in and around KNP.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE does not provide ratings as they were not a GEF requirement at the time. TE is consistent with regard to its narrative. Insufficient information is provided with which to judge quality of project implementation and execution.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE does not adequately assess sustainability of project outcomes or the project's exit strategy. TE states that nearly \$1 million is needed for a marketing strategy to continue advancing project objectives, but does not assess the likelihood of success in raising additional funding or in achieving project objectives going forward. Other aspects of project sustainability (political, institutional) are not discussed at all.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	TE includes a section on "lessons learned" that provides a narrative of project experiences. However, TE does not provide any coherent lessons learned or recommendations. No discussion is provided on weaknesses in the project's design, including failure to adequately assess both supply and demand for Kibale wild coffee.	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE states that project funding was disbursed as planned. However, no account is provided on actual project expenditures or co-financing	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not discuss M&E.	HU
Overall TE Rating		MU

Overall TE rating = $(0.3 * (8)) + (0.1 * (2+2+2+1)) = 2.4 + 0.7 = 3.1 = MU$

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