

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		536	
GEF Agency project ID		293	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation Priority-Setting for the Upper Guinea Forest Ecosystems, West Africa	
Country/Countries		Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone	
Region		Regional	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP3-Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Conservation International (C.I.)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		No involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		5/8/1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		9/8/1998	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		3/31/2001	
Actual date of project completion		3/31/2001	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.742	0.631 (from WB trustee dataset)
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.207	0.207
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.742	0.631
Total Co-financing		0.207	0.207
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		0.949	0.838
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		11/1/2001	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Jason Cole	
TER completion date		11/02/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	N/A	N/A	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	N/A	L	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	UA
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	UA
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			S	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the PD (pg.2) the Global Environment Objective is to “improve the conservation of biodiversity in West Africa's critically threatened Upper Guinea forest ecosystem”.

The Upper Guinea (UG) forest ecosystem, extending from Ghana into Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea is one of the most biologically valuable rainforests in the world (PD, p. 4). At the time of project proposition, the Upper Guinea Forests ecosystem was not adequately protected, and remained one of the most threatened forest ecosystems globally. Little effort had been made toward integrating scientific information into a plan for a regional approach to conservation of Upper Guinea forest biodiversity. This project provides a framework for conservation planning and implementation through a consensus building process (PD. pg. 4).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project as given in the logframe is “to document the "State of knowledge" on the UG forest ecosystem, establish consensus on priority actions, catalyze collaboration at a regional level, integrate ecosystem-wide priorities into national planning, and mobilize actions to address priority issues”. (PD, pg.2)

This project aims at providing national and local decision-makers with access to accurate, up-to-date scientific information on the ecosystem’s biotic resources, and identify priority conservation actions at the national and regional level. This project should strengthen national level capacities, support human resource development and provide a framework for cross-national collaboration and regional integration.

The project involves Cote d’Ivoire, Ghana, Liberia, Guinea, and Sierra Leone. Togo was added later on.

According to the PD (pg.6), the immediate objectives are:

1. To document the “state of knowledge” on the Upper Guinea forest ecosystem and establish a regional baseline for monitoring biodiversity conservation progress.

2. To establish a consensus on priority biodiversity conservation actions and catalyze regional collaboration.
3. To integrate ecosystem-wide biodiversity priorities into national planning processes.
4. To mobilize specific actions that address priority issues for the Upper Guinea forest ecosystem.

The PD (pg.7) shows that the project is divided into three phases:

1. “From Building a State of Knowledge to Consensus Conservation Priorities”. This phase’s objective is to carry out the planning and execution of a West Africa Conservation Priority-Setting workshop involving representatives from the governments of the participating countries, prospective donors, scientists and conservation professionals.
2. “From Conservation Priorities to Sustainable Resource Planning”. This phase aims at creating a package of the workshop results with a series of products to be disseminated by national steering committees and incorporating them into National Environmental Strategies and Environmental Action Plans.
3. “From National Action to Regional Collaboration”, this final phase is meant to ensure sustainability of project through international financing.

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

The TE slightly changes the wording of the GEO to “maintain and restore the biodiversity of the UG forest ecosystem” (TE, pg.4). No specific reasons and /or explanations are given for this change.

The TE also presented a slightly different version of the Development Objective to “to assist stakeholders (national and local governments, donors, NGOs, communities, etc.) to integrated ecosystem-wide biodiversity priorities into regional and national planning and actions” (TE, pg. 4). No specific reasons and/or explanations are given for this change.

The project should have involved only five countries, but Togo was added later on (PIR, pg.1).

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

This project is relevant to the countries' priorities. Four of the five countries had ratified the CBD; Guinea in May of 1993, Ghana in August of 1994, Cote d'Ivoire in November of 1994, and Sierra Leone in December of 1994. Liberia had not ratified the CBD and therefore was not eligible for GEF funding. However, since Liberia contains some of the largest remaining blocks of Upper Guinea Forest, the executing agency (Conservation International) financed its participation (PD, pg.4).

All five countries involved in the project had either completed Tropical Forestry Action Plans, National Environment Action Plans and National Biodiversity Strategies, or were in the process of developing them. The project's objective to strengthen national level initiatives by empowering the conservation sector and promoting regional integration of biodiversity conservation is consistent with GEF's Biodiversity Operational Program for forest ecosystems (OP #3) (PD, p.4).

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

Overall, the project contributed to the conservation of biodiversity in the UG Forest ecosystems of West Africa by improving the baseline knowledge and reaching consensus on the conservation priority areas. Several regional consensus priorities were included in Guinea's National Biodiversity Strategy. The project was able to leverage some additional funds for the continuation of the project. However, the project results are not yet incorporated in the strategic action plans of the remaining 4 countries, as called for in the PD.

Phase I (the Conservation Priority-Setting Workshop) was according to the TE, a productive workshop (TE, pg. 7). It brought together more than 90 organizations and 150 experts. They developed a set of consensus conservation priorities. According to the TE, the success of the workshop was due to the fact that several participants were involved in the preparation process of the workshop. Not only the workshop defined conservation priorities, it also provided an opportunity for participants to network by meeting colleagues in the same field, and to share national expertise and knowledge (TE, pg.7).

Phase II (production of workshop results and integration of ecosystem-wide biodiversity priorities into national planning processes) was less successful. This phase, as planned in the original design, should have produced a conservation priority map, a Final Report, and a CD-ROM, to be disseminated among the participants and other key stakeholders in the region. The conservation priority map was produced and was according to the TE very useful and widely used by the stakeholders (TE, pg.9). However, both the final report and the CD-ROM took longer to be completed and therefore were not disseminated, nor translated into French (which limits the effect in the Francophone countries of the region) (TE, pg. 11). CI worked to provide national steering committees with information on biodiversity conservation areas, to stimulate planning. These efforts were most successful in Guinea, where a new national biodiversity strategy was developed. Efforts were started in Ghana and Liberia, but the outcome is still uncertain in these countries. Efforts in Cote d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone were limited by the conflict situations in those countries. Overall, it appears that the project may have promised too much in this regard given the

limited timing and funding available. As stated in the TE, "... the project came to a close when much of this stimulation effort was needed most. This is unfortunate as the response from those interviewed, almost across the board, is that the opportunity is still there to push the processes forward" (TE, pg 12).

Phase III (organization of a Donor Conference) was altered very early on in the project and stems from what was already mentioned in the discussion of donor engagement at the priority-setting workshop (TE, pg. 13). A Donor Conference should have been organized to review the results of the revised national plans and to highlight regional biodiversity opportunities. The product from the previous events was expected to stimulate donor interest and participation. However this did not happen, the project management decided not to implement this phase. The donors were reluctant to make commitments at the end of the workshop from Phase I. The TE indicates that donors prefer site-specific interventions as opposed to the regional approaches. The TE mentions that "many of those interviewed were clear to point out that more does need to be done to generate a broader understanding and perspective among the donor community" (TE, pg.13).

Finally, the social and political unrest in the region altered some of the project 'results; the Coup d'Etat in Cote d'Ivoire and the Civil war in Sierra Leone hindered the assistance efforts in both countries.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

The efficiency of the project is moderately unsatisfactory for several reasons: there has been disbursement of funds issues, and there have been delays in the delivery of some of the outputs (the Final Report and the CD-ROM).

According to the TE, there were problems with the disbursement of funds that created difficulties for CI to implement the project on schedule. The initial payment made by UNDP in October 1998 was smooth, however the following payments were irregular and difficult for the project team to manage. According to the TE (pg. 15), "the project team would submit the required reports that were then questioned back and forth in a cumbersome manner taking an unnecessarily long time to complete". The project team said that the second payment was made in the summer 1999, and after that there was no more payment until the last one in the first quarter of 2001. This last payment was the balance remaining on the total grant. The TE does not explain what, if any, were the issues UNDP had with the deliverables from the project team. The reason for this irregular schedule of disbursements seems to have been a misunderstanding of the terms for disbursement of funds, since the deliverables were questioned by UNDP. This led to delays and had negative impacts in the project implementation (TE, pg.15).

Moreover as mentioned above in the effectiveness section, there have been important delays in the delivery of the main outputs; the Final Report and the CD-ROM, and phase III was not implemented.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE rates sustainability of project outcomes as Likely. This TER assesses a slightly lower rating for sustainability, Moderately Likely, finding some socio-political and institutional risks.. Overall, the participatory nature of the entire process was very helpful in ensuring project sustainability. However, according to the TE (pg.19), “much more could have been done to ensure the projects long-term success”.

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

Financial Sustainability: Likely

The project outcomes include several catalytic impacts such as the stimulation of new conservation actions and investments; the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) committing \$4.3 million dollars to conservation efforts, and the European Union funding 1 million Euros for the Liberia Forest Reassessment. The priority-setting process provided focus for the investment. Several projects are funded and many more are in the pipeline (TE, pg.19). However, sustainability could have been improved by increasing international financing (this should have been done with Phase III).

Sociopolitical Sustainability: Moderately Likely

The workshop in Phase I used a participatory approach to set priorities for conservation of the UG. A consensus was achieved among the 90 institutions and 150 experts that were involved in the process. The participatory nature of the process is very promising to ensure sustainability.

However, the project should have facilitated the coordination of information networks that could have been developed and that would provide a good avenue for sustaining the early impacts of the project and advocating further impacts. There was so many participants and stakeholders that met during the workshop, the opportunity to facilitate the continuation of interaction among this diverse group was not realized (TE, pg.19).

Institutional Sustainability: Moderately likely

The project resulted in the integration into National Biodiversity Action Plans of the results gotten from the priority-setting process, some of these have been revised and others are underway. However, sustainability could have been improved by working more closely with governments to ensure adoption of National Biodiversity Plans.

Environmental Sustainability: Unable to Assess

There is no information in the TE about environmental sustainability.

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 TE indicates that Conservation International contributed \$207,000 in co-financing to allow Liberia to participate in the project, since Liberia had not ratified the CBD and therefore was not eligible for GEF funding (TE, pg.14). All other components were financed solely with GEF funding.

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?

There was no extension given to the project. However, the delivery of some outputs was delayed. Both the Final Report & CD-ROM took longer to complete, and have not been disseminated to the field and been put to use. According to the TE, the report and data elements for these products were completed a year before, however, it took a full year to publish the two (TE, pg.10). The delayed delivery of these products was due to the thorough process of reviewing drafts of the report with key stakeholders. According to the TE, they recognized the importance of gaining consensus on these products and this consensus was given priority over the timing of their completion. This delay resulted in the delay of possible impacts that could have been realized by many of the stakeholders that participated in the workshop (TE, pg.10).

In Cote d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone the reasons for the delays are different. They were due to the conflict situations. In Cote d'Ivoire, preliminary work had started but the coup hindered a lot of the process in that the national steering process could not get underway. In Sierra Leone, the war hindered the majority of the process. The project has not been able to do much other than invite a few participants from Sierra Leone to join in the initial workshop (TE, pg.12).

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 country ownership was very strong in this project and led to a very successful workshop. This was mainly due to the involvement of several participants in the preparation process. Many participants played a role in the preparation process, either by gathering data, or by verifying data to be used. According to the TE (pg. 7) "there seems to have been a great sense of ownership of the process and the eventual products to come as a result".

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 M&E design at entry is Moderately satisfactory.

There is a detailed logical framework in the PD, however, it is repetitive. It gives the performance indicators, means of verification, and assumptions for the GEO, DO, the expected outcomes and the outputs. the logical framework tries to cover all grounds and therefore some of the indicators are the same, making it redundant. According to the TE, this did not have impact on the project activities. (TE, pg.4).

Most of the indicators are SMART indicators, however, the logframe does not contain targets..

Moreover, the responsibility of the M&E is given to the Steering Committee; and there is a budget allocated for the M&E activities (PD, pg.12)

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

There is very little information in the TE about the M&E implementation.

The TE mentions that there was adaptive management during the course of the project implementation. The project adapted to local circumstances. For example, national steering committees should have been created to review National Biodiversity Strategies and Environmental Action Plans according to the information collected during the workshop. However, no formal arrangement has been developed, CI actually adjusted its plan and rather than creating new structures for the steering processes in each country, they decided to tap into existing structures (TE, pg.11).

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

Project implementation was done by UNDP. TE however only discusses UNDP’s performance at two points:

On one hand, there have been irregularities in fund disbursements, as explained in the efficiency section. This has had an impact on the project implementation schedule. Apparently the reports submitted by the executing agency were questioned back and forth by UNDP, taking a long time to complete. The TE believes that “the burden most likely falls on both parties” (TE, pg. 15).

On the other hand, the TE mentions that UNDP is making great use of the project outputs (especially the map) to determine its own investment in the region. However, the data to be provided in the CD is needed. UNDP has been able to determine some priorities and actions, but they would need detailed data to be clearer on their decisions.

No other information is given in the TE to be able to assess the quality of UNDP performance.

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

Conservation International (CI) is the executing agency of this project. Their performance is rated Moderately Satisfactory. CI faced some unexpected internal challenges during the course of the project and they also faced disbursement issues that created added difficulties to project execution.

One of these challenges is that by the project’s end, all the member of the CI team, except one person, was new in their position, including the senior director of CI’s West Africa division. This was due to institutional issues and had a negative impact on implementation. During the same period of time, CI changed its working focus from site-specific interventions to larger scale efforts. This led to institutional adjustments that hindered the team’s ability to implement effectively the project. Moreover, at the end of 2000 CI moved its headquarters and this caused some delays in producing the final report and CD-ROM. However, according to the TE, “the majority of the project deliverables have been completed and there clearly are signs of impact already” (TE, pg.15).

One of the other challenges was the financial management of project funds by the project team that was not very strong. The financial reporting was behind schedule almost from the beginning. According to the TE, it was a weakness of the execution team but it was also an issue with the reporting format that was difficult to understand and unclear. CI could not follow the guidelines and consistently submitted incorrect reports to UNDP. According to the TE, the “final agreement was that CI would receive a lump sum payment to cover all outstanding and anticipated expenses” (TE, pg.15)

However, even facing those difficulties, CI was able to deliver quite a lot in this project and reach most of the project's objectives.

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 environmental changes are reported in the TE, however the last PIR (pg. 5) mentions that the project if continued could have strong long-term benefits for conservation.

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.

In Ghana, GWS used the map produced by the project to introduce conservation priority concepts to around 20,000 kids in 200 schools (TE, pg.18).

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

Several activities showed a change in capacities.

A workshop happened as an output of the project, and from this workshop a map was produced. The workshop provided a good example of participatory priority setting that generated many of the

expected results such as consensus agreements, enthusiasm, commitment, information-sharing, networking, etc. The outputs of the workshop were a map with priority areas for conservation, as well as a report and a CD-ROM with specific data about the UG forest ecosystem (TE, pg.10).

The map included information on forest cover, population density, birds, biogeography, reptiles and amphibians, insects, protected areas, freshwater aquatic and marine ecosystems, land uses, areas of extractive industries and areas with civil conflict etc. 3,000 maps have been disseminated in participating countries and have been used for planning purposes by WWF, European commission, the World Bank, International and Local NGOs, UNDP, and some of the governments (TE, pg.12)

b) Governance

This project developed the first-ever coordinated set of regional priorities for conserving biodiversity in the Upper Guinea forest ecosystem (TE, pg.17).

The project was based on strong stakeholder participation from the initial data collection, to the workshop preparation, the workshop participation, and the dissemination of information products. This led to the development of National Biodiversity Strategies in some countries and additional follow up activities (TE, pg.14).

In Guinea, the project led to the development of a new National Biodiversity Strategy, which included the design of 70 projects based on the priorities identified in the workshop (TE, pg.17).

In Ghana, CI is proposing to finish the development of a National Biodiversity Strategy with funding from the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (TE, pg.18).

In Liberia, Management of the Sapo National Park has resumed, including the establishment of community forests, and the carrying out of new surveys of methods and bio-monitoring (TE, pg.19).

In Cote d'Ivoire the priority-setting project established a framework for managing the protected areas. Such a framework takes into account the local needs and knowledge and is playing an important role in the formulation of a revised national action plan (TE, pg.17).

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 in the TE and/or PIR.

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 TE does not indicate if the project had any specific replication plans. However, it says that the priority-setting approach and the lessons learned from the West Africa experience have been shared outside the region. These approach and lessons have been used for the development of new GEF Medium Sized Programs (i.e. in Guatemala, Brazil and Papua New Guinea). In addition, Guinean participants used the UG forest map from the workshop at another priority-setting workshop held in Mali focusing on the Niger Basin (TE, pg. 13).

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), bringing together funding from the World Bank, GEF, CI and the MacArthur Foundation, has committed \$4.3 million towards a set of strategic themes derived directly from the results of the priority-setting project and began funding project activities at the beginning of 2001 (TE, pg.17)

The workshop map showed the biological importance and regional significance of protecting the largest remaining blocks of mature forest in Liberia. This has helped leverage 1 million Euros from the European Commission. These funds should be used in a new Forest Re-assessment project in Liberia, a collaboration between the Forestry Development Authority, CI, Forest Frontiers Initiative (FFI), the Environmental Commission, CEPF, and other institutions (TE, pg.17).

Bird Life International is now involved in a large GEF Regional Program that should be making use of the products to ensure that their strategy conforms to the priorities set from the Priority-Setting Process (TE, pg.10).

The African NGO-Government Partnership for Sustainable Biodiversity Action Program. This is another initiative underway that would otherwise be able to make use of the data provided in the products from the project (TE, pg.10).

One of the catalytic impacts is that the map and its recommendations and priorities are being referenced by donors and governments in their planning and project designs (TE, pg.18).

More examples of replication, mainstreaming and up-scaling are available in the TE from page 16 to page 19.

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 Following lessons are given in the TE (pg.22):

- (1) The project established a regional identity for conservationists in the countries of the Upper Guinea ecosystem. However, without some continuity to stimulate regional work and regional the momentum of this initial effort will not be sustained.

- (2) While the region's identity has been strengthened, work remains to be done to promote the entity of the Upper Guinea Forest ecosystem among donor agencies and intergovernmental bodies. Reinforcing this notion is essential if trans-frontier areas are to be effectively conserved.
- (3) The project's databases and products are baseline documents that will be outdated as additional projects, research, and conservation advances are undertaken. Periodic updates to the project's information will be most efficiently made and distributed by web-based technologies, rather than physical distribution of products such as reports, CD-ROMs, etc.
- (4) The project served very well to identify many dedicated and capable professionals who can further a biodiversity agenda in the region. However, the pool of financial resources to undertake recommendations for the region continues to be inadequate in proportion to the appetite and ability in the region.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE (pg.22):

- (1) GEF should capitalize on this enthusiasm to continue working in the region, particularly to achieve government commitments through the approval of National Environmental Actions Plans that incorporate the priorities identified in this project
- (2) Project deliverables should follow agreed deadlines. This is particularly important for projects that aim at reaching consensus regarding the management of resources because many decisions will be pending on the proceedings and data presented during the meetings/workshops.
- (3) Drawing on local knowledge and capacities to develop a conservation priority setting workshop was a very effective approach. Given the differing levels of information and capacity within the UG Forest region countries, projects should use the strengths of those with greater capacities to assist those with less
- (4) The conservation priority setting workshops should clearly identify specific activities to be presented at the end of these workshops to stimulate proposals for funding and increase donors' willingness and interest.
- (5) The project demonstrated the great potential for continued collaboration and networking to provide an opportunity for constructive follow-up work.
- (6) There is a need for clearer guidance to develop the logical frameworks. Good logical frameworks are those necessary to achieve the objectives (environmental and development objectives), and the activities should have deadlines, responsible entities, and budgets allocated for each activity, as well as performance indicators.
- (7) There is a need to standardize project accounting and the disbursement procedures for projects.

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	The report contains an assessment of the project outcomes	MS

contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	and outputs. The achievements and failures are given with details, however it does not give any information about the relevance of the project to the countries' priorities. This information had to be taken from the PD.	
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and evidences are complete and convincing. Lots of examples and quantitative data are given to show the project achievements. However there are no ratings given, except for sustainability.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report properly assesses project sustainability, and gives a detailed project exit strategy, as well as the risks if no measures are taken to follow on the project.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidences, and the TE also gives very useful recommendations for future projects.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE provides the amount of total costs including co-financing from CI. However, the actual cost breakdown per activity is missing. Therefore, it is difficult to assess if these are the actual costs (since they are the same as the initial costs indicated in the project brief).	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is no assessed. There is no information about the M&E at entry, and no information about the M&E implementation. There is very little information on adaptive management.	U
Overall TE Rating		MS

$$0.3*8 + 0.1*16 = 2.4+1.6= 4$$

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