Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	5439
GEF Agency project ID	P144902
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-5
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	World Bank
Project name	Fighting Against Wildlife Poaching and Illegal Trade in Africa – the Case of African Elephants
Country/Countries	Global
Region	Global (focused on AFR)
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	BD-1: Improved management effectiveness of new and existing protected areas
Executing agencies involved	World Bank
NGOs/CBOs involvement	As project partners
Private sector involvement	As project partners
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /**Approval date (MSP)**	8/27/2013
Effectiveness date / project start	10/1/2013
Expected date of project completion (at start)	UA
Actual date of project completion	2/28/2017

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		2.00	2.00
Co-financing	IA own	1.80	-
	Government	-	-
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	-	-
Total GEF funding		2.00	2.00
Total Co-financing		1.80	
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.80	2.00

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	8/2017
Author of TE	World Bank (no author credited)
TER completion date	1/28/2019
TER prepared by	Cody Parker
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Neeraj Negi

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Project documents do not specifically outline a GEO, but it can be taken to be the same as the Development Objective: "to enhance a shared understanding of how to effectively address elephant poaching and illegal ivory trade in Africa and develop a regional collaborative program to combat it."

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective was "to enhance a shared understanding of how to effectively address elephant poaching and illegal ivory trade in Africa and develop a regional collaborative program to combat it" (Approval Request, p. 1). This was to be achieved through three project components:

1. Support Analytical Studies and Regional Strategies to Combat Elephant Poaching and Ivory Trade
2. Building Alliances to Combat Elephant Poaching and Ivory Trade
3. Program Development

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

There were no changes to the Objective. There were some minor changes to Component 1:

Output 1, "Value chain analysis of supply and demand for ivory to identify entry points for action", was cancelled due to an agreement regarding the ivory trade signed by the US and China in 2015 which changed the international policy situation of the ivory trade and rendered the study irrelevant. Output 4, a Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytical Toolkit to be applied to two countries (Gabon and Tanzania), was carried out for Gabon, but not Tanzania, as the government chose UNDP to perform this activity instead. Two new activities were added: an assessment of the economic contribution of nature-based tourism in Africa and an analysis to improve the evidence base for nature-based tourism policy development in Botswana (ICM, p. 2).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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 ICM does not rate relevance. This TER rates relevance as Satisfactory.

The project was well-aligned with priority objectives of the African Elephant Action Plan developed at the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species Conference of Parties in 2010. It was consistent with GEF's Strategy for Biodiversity and contributed to sustainable forest management, as improved species conservation can contribute to the sustainability of terrestrial protected area networks (BD SP3) as well as to mainstreaming biodiversity in large landscapes (BD SP4) by strengthening policy and regulatory frameworks.

The project complemented efforts by key stakeholders that have prepared elephant action plans and strategies for Africa. The World Bank and GEF had already contributed considerable funding towards conservation in Africa through protected areas projects and other natural resources management projects, but never under a coordinated programmatic approach focusing on iconic African species such as the elephant. The project's aim to consult and collaborate with key stakeholders to provide a common platform and framework for regional cooperation on African elephant conservation therefore aligned it well with Bank and GEF priorities.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The ICM does not provide a rating for Effectiveness, but assigns an Implementation Rating of Satisfactory to all three project components. Direct impacts of project activities are difficult to assess at this point, as the project was aimed more at improving institutional capacity to address elephant poaching; this TER rates effectiveness as Satisfactory, due to achievement or overachievement of nearly all the project's output targets.

At the Development Objective indicator level, the project was highly successful, overachieving all its targets but one (which was also achieved.) Six studies to improve understanding of the economic impacts of illegal poaching and ivory trade were completed, against a target of one; six alliances were formed to combat elephant poaching and illegal trade, against a target of two; five of a targeted four approaches to address elephant poaching were developed and piloted; one long-term program was

designed, as targeted; and the project reached 300 beneficiaries against a target of 100, with 50% being female.

Component 1: Support Analytical Studies and Regional Strategies to Combat Elephant Poaching and Ivory Trade. A value chain analysis of supply and demand for ivory, as well as numerous background studies for a Flagship Study on the impacts and economic costs of elephant poaching and trafficking, were completed, although the final policy recommendations were cancelled by high-level World Bank management due to changes in the international political environment around the ivory trade (cf. section 1.3). The Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytical Toolkit was successfully developed for Gabon, while in Tanzania the government transferred this activity to the auspices of UNDP. An awareness plan was designed as targeted.

Component 2: Building Alliances to Combat Elephant Poaching and Ivory Trade. Action plans and training to improve legislation around wildlife in five countries were delivered as planned. 150 local staff were trained in law enforcement against a target of 50, and one regional strategy/meeting was supported as targeted. The ICM reports that output 2.6, "At least one community of practice established and trained in controlled deliveries and anti-money laundering", was completed, but it is not clear what the achieved target number of 50 refers to.

Component 3: Program Development. All eight targeted reports were completed, and a long-term strategy was developed: the Global Wildlife Program was designed and submitted to GEF for approval. The first phase with 11 child projects in 10 countries and second phase with 9 additional countries were approved by GEF in June 2015 and June 2016 respectively; taken together, the Global Wildlife Program is one of the largest funding programs targeting illegal wildlife trade, with $130M in financing.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The ICM gives very little information on efficiency and does not assign a rating, but notes no major delays or concerns related to disbursement. The project was implemented per budget and work plan, and grants were awarded to NGOs and consultants in a timely manner (ICM, p. 17). The project was granted a one-year extension for reasons that are not clear, but additional funding was not needed, and all project outputs were achieved within budget and as planned. Given this result, and with no efficiency problems reported in the ICM or PIRs, efficiency is rated as Satisfactory.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The ICM rates risk to project sustainability as Substantial but does not discuss it in depth, noting simply the "complexity of the problem and the fact that an ambitious program will be required in the long run" (ICM, p. 18). This evaluator assesses that the long-term Global Wildlife Program successfully developed by the project addresses the need for an ambitious program, and partially mitigates difficulties raised by the complexity of the issues involved. However, with no additional information on risks to the sustainability of project impacts, this TER is Unable to Assess project 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 Approval Request shows anticipated co-financing of $1.8M from the World Bank. This sum is not mentioned anywhere in the ICM and judging from the financial tables presented therein does not seem to have materialized. However, this is not noted as affecting project outcomes 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?

The project's closing date was extended by one year. The ICM provides no information on why this extension was needed beyond noting that it was "necessary to ensure that the project outcomes and activities would be duly completed" (ICM, p. 9). The yearly financing table shows that only Component 3 received disbursement in the final project year (2017), so it can be assumed that the design of the long-term Global Wildlife Program took longer than expected and this led to the extension.

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:

Given the global, supranational nature of the project, the question of country ownership is not applicable and is not addressed in the ICM.

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 ICM does not rate or discuss project M&E design. This TER rates M&E design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory, due to problems with the results framework despite outputs being tracked.

No M&E plan is laid out in the Project Document. The Approval Request provides one brief paragraph on M&E, explaining that the World Bank will be responsible and that the results framework will "form the basis on which the project's Monitoring and Evaluation system will be built", but offers no additional detail. This is to be expected, given the nature of the project, which included few "on the ground"

activities and was more aimed at creating an enabling environment through alliance-building and institutional strengthening.

Output-level results were tracked and are reported in the ICM. Nonetheless, the measurement of some indicators in the results framework is incongruent and confusing (e.g., Output 6 "At least one community of practice established and trained in controlled deliveries and anti-money laundering" has an end-of-project target of 50, but it is not clear what this number refers to.) Overall, despite the nature of the project largely rendering a detailed M&E plan unnecessary, the results framework has slightly hindered assessment of project outcomes.

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

No information on M&E implementation is provided in the ICM, and therefore this TER is Unable to Assess this aspect of the project.

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: **Satisfactory**

The World Bank served as both implementing and executing agency for this project. The ICM does not rate Bank performance in either of these roles. This TER rates quality of project implementation as Satisfactory, mostly due to reportedly strong support from the Bank throughout the project.

Project design was appropriate; although changes were necessary, these were minor and due to unforeseeable external circumstances. The ICM notes that the Bank's task team, led by a qualified and experienced task team leader, was effective in guiding implementation during the project, providing timely and constructive feedback. Furthermore, regular meetings were held within the Bank and the GEF secretariat to ensure the project incorporated input from both, and thus that the design of the Global Wildlife Program was of a high standard.

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

As noted, the World Bank was both the implementing and executing agency for this project. No comments on execution performance by the Bank are given in the ICM beyond those outlined above.

Nonetheless, given project's strong results and lacking any evidence of significant execution problems, a rating of Satisfactory is justified for 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 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.

No changes in environmental stress or status are directly attributed to project activities.

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.

As this was more of a high-level project supporting studies and alliance formation at a regional and global level, no direct impacts on socioeconomic aspects are noted. The project did support a study to analyze data on nature-based tourism in Botswana and recommend improvements, which may help increase income and sustainability in the tourism sector going forward (ICM, p. 33).

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

150 local staff were trained in law enforcement. An awareness plan including a high-level dialogue series with African and Chinese business, policy and civil society leaders was carried out to increase consciousness of conservation issues and reduce demand for African elephant products; participants are planning to continue work and discussion under the new designation of a "China-Africa

Wildlife Conservation Council" (ICM, p. 25). Also, an Anti-Money Laundering Training Module was developed which will be used to help criminal justice stakeholders including law enforcement agencies, judiciaries, prosecutorial staff, banking institutions, and other major actors to utilize certain tools and resources to gather evidence and follow criminal activity through financial flows (ICM, p. 27).

b) Governance

As part of the project, an intelligence systems expert consultant produced a report proposing a networked, intelligence-led strategy at national, regional, and transnational levels to more effectively control, reduce, and prevent the killing of African elephants. The report also outlines the individual requirements for designing and implementing a long-term sustainable elephant crime intelligence system, including the required governance arrangements, and proposes the roles and functions that key organizations could play at the national, regional, and transnational levels (ICM, p. 24). Furthermore, the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytical Toolkit implemented in Gabon has increased understanding of overall criminal justice capacity issues to encompass comprehensive recommended reforms, forming a roadmap for an increasingly responsive government situation on which conservation investments can build (ICM, pp. 24-25).

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 affecting ecological or social aspects are noted.

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.

As noted above, the China-Africa Wildlife Conservation Council is continuing dialogue to improve awareness about conservation. Most importantly, the project supported the consultation process and all the technical work for the development of the Global Wildlife Program, a vast coordinating partnership which will build upon and scale up this project's wildlife crime prevention activities and promote pro-conservation sustainable development across 19 countries.

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.

- Many of the activities, tools and approaches that came out of the project were utilized in designing the various national projects in the Global Wildlife Program. For example, the "Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit: Lessons Learned" were shared with GWP stakeholders and will guide toolkit activities.
- Data gathered during the project was used to help refine areas of interest (i.e. wildlife-based tourism, community engagement) and approaches for GWP (both for analysis, program management, and use of tools – GIS to help map projects in key program areas).
- High-level participation from the World Bank in key conferences helps move the political agenda and provides an opportunity for staff members to understand priorities of governments and collaborate with partners effectively.
- The project allowed the Bank team to assess what had worked or not with respect to governance, funding modalities, technical assistance, knowledge exchange, communications, monitoring and evaluation, etc. in preparation for the larger Global Wildlife Program (ICM, p. 19).
- Further knowledge exchange and scientific analysis in the wildlife sector is required to improve the ability of government and NGO partners to do work and project implementation on the ground.
- More successful coordination mechanisms are needed to prevent replication and duplication of work to combat wildlife crime, especially for donor coordination.
- Regional programs such as the Global Wildlife Program are vital to combating wildlife crime since the issues are transnational in nature and the response requires countries and partners to work together (ICM, p. 18).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

No recommendations are explicitly provided in the ICM.

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?	The ICM assesses achievement of project outcomes and impacts mostly adequately. Notably, for two outputs (5 and 9) the ICM erroneously shows mid-project targets as end-of-project targets in its framework, causing it to falsely report overachievement.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The ICM is consistent and convincing, but some sections are lacking ratings and detail.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Discussion of risks is limited but mostly appropriate given the nature of the project.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The ICM includes actual project costs by component and activity. Some discussion of co-financing ($1.8M not materialized from WB) would have been appreciated.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	M&E is not addressed in the ICM.	**U**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.