

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

Assignment: TF053085

## GEF3 MSP-GHANA:COMMUNITY BASED INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROJECT

### GEFIA - GEF-IBRD AS IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

Task Team Leader: 00000190613 - Nyaneba E. Nkrumah  
Approving Manager: 00000012577 - Marjory-Anne Bromhead

Summary Information	
TF Status	ACTV
Recipient Country	Ghana
Executed By	Recipient
Managing Unit	8107 - AFTEN
Grant Start Date / Closing Date	02/19/2004 to 02/19/2008
Program Manager	
Orig. Grant Amount	848,000.00
Grant Amount	848,000.00
Outstanding Commitments	0.00
Cumulative Disbursements	832,199.73 as of 06/30/2008
Disbursed 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008	832,199.73
Donor	TF602001 - MULTIPLE DONORS

*This GRM report includes the following sections: Overview, Outcome, Components/Outputs, Execution, Program(GEFIA), Completion, Processing, Attached Documents, Disbursements, Internal Comments.*

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

## OVERVIEW

### Overall Assessments and Ratings

#### Grant Objectives:

TO ENHANCE BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF RENEWABLE

#### Overall progress from 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008 with regard to Achieving Grant Objectives:

**Rating:** Satisfactory ( Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 12/31/2004 )

#### Comment:

The objective of the proposed project was to enhance biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of renewable natural resources in Okyeman through community-based integrated natural resource management approaches. At the outcome, biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources have been enhanced and the mechanism for sustainability is there within the traditional system. However, longer-term sustainability at the same level of quality brought by the project is not likely given the traditional authority's lack of financing. This is one of the key differences between running a project within a government ministry and running one in a community level institution which has little revenues. The attached closing document offers all the details of the project.

#### Overall progress from 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008 with regard to Implementation of Grant Financed Activities:

**Rating:** Satisfactory ( Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 12/31/2004 )

#### Comment:

The project is now closed and the activities largely successfully completed- see attachment for detail

### Grant follow-up and structure

#### Description and context of Grant:

**Expected follow up (if any):** Dissemination of new knowledge/technology/best practice

#### Comment on follow up:

Given that this project is one of a kind- implemented by the traditional chieftency authority- llessons learnt (see attached write up) have been written to outline some of the opportunities and pitfalls of using such an approach in community based NRM projects.

#### End Date of Last Site Visit:

#### Restructing of Grant:

### Activity Risk

**Rating:** Modest Risk

#### Comment:

The project is now closed. The procurement risk was improved over the life of the project.

### Critical Issues and Pending Actions for Management Attention

There are currently no issues and actions for Management attention.

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

## OUTCOME

### Comments on outcome achieved from 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008

See attachment

### Grant Outcome Indicators

Grant outcome indicators are listed below.

#### Management of forest and wildlife resources and Environment Protection by GWS

Baseline 0

Value:

Date: 02/10/2004

Progress to Management plans have been done with the communities in all identified areas but implementation was

Date: delayed till the rainy/planting season.

Date: 07/10/2006

Target Value: 3 Management plans implemented

Date: 12/30/2007

#### Rapid Biodiversity Inventories

Baseline 0

Value:

Date: 02/10/2004

Progress to All the inventories-flora and fauna- are complete

Date:

Date: 04/10/2006

Target Value: Inventories done and 4 high biodiversity sites or sites with high potential for recovery selected for further work

Date:

#### Regulatory Reforms

Baseline 0

Value:

Date: 02/10/2004

Progress to Bye laws complete

Date:

Date: 07/10/2006

Target Value: Bye laws complete and adopted but were not yet promulgated into law

Date: 06/10/2008

#### Environmental Education Campaigns

Baseline 0

Value:

Date: 02/10/2004

Progress to Several campaigns have been launched (8)

Date:

Date:

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

Target Value: 20 campaigns launched  
Date: 12/30/2007

## Sustainable Livelihood Options

Baseline 0  
Value:

Date: 02/10/2004

Progress to All the identification, selection of groups and training of groups is complete.  
Date:

Date: 04/10/2006

Target Value: 250 people are currently engaged in livelihoods- funds are received, and businesses are underway  
Date: 06/10/2008

## COMPONENTS/OUTPUTS

### Output and Implementation by Component

#### status of forestry/wildlife improved

Implementation Satisfactory

Rating:

Status: Completed

Planned Output: Management plans completed, environmental brigades in place and assisting to manage the protected area

Actual Output: Qualitatively, the environmental brigades are in place and are carrying out survey activities and the traditional authority has authorized an arm of the brigades which catches poachers.

#### Inventory of NRM resources

Implementation Highly Satisfactory

Rating:

Status: Completed

Planned Output: Inventory of NRM resources

Actual Output: All NRM resources have been inventoried. This was finished early and was excellently done. This was completed by Ghana Wildlife Society.

#### Enhanced local policies and regulation

Implementation Satisfactory

Rating:

Status: Completed

Planned Output: Local bye laws and a land use plan to feed into district level planning

Actual Output: A study was done of local natural resource laws. In addition, the project has involved the district planning officers and finally, a land use plan is complete to assist local planning.

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

## Environmental Awareness

**Implementation Rating:** Satisfactory  
**Status:** Completed  
**Planned Output:** Year 2-3  
**Actual Output:** This has been generally well done and the communities are well aware of the project. A formal training plan was initiated and launched and billboards were placed in over 20 localities

## Local Economic/livelihood development

**Implementation Rating:** Satisfactory  
**Status:** Completed  
**Planned Output:** Year 3  
**Actual Output:** Communities were trained, received equipment, built their structures, started their livelihoods and some are already receiving revenues

## Project Management Coordination

**Implementation Rating:** Moderately Satisfactory  
**Status:** Completed  
**Planned Output:** Year 3  
**Actual Output:** The new PMU operated relatively well except during the last few months when the accountant took another job and the financial documentation was delayed.

## Comment on planned and actual Output

## Comment on component implementation progress

## EXECUTION

### Bank project related to the grant

**Project ID / Name:** P085734 - GH-GEF Com Based Integ NRM (FY04)  
**Project Status:** Lending  
**Global Focal Area:** Biodiversity  
**Product Line:** GM - GEF Medium Sized Program

### Implementing agency and contact details

**Agency:** OEF- Okyeman Environmental Foundation  
**Contact:** Nana Tsumasi  
**Address:** N/A  
**Phone:** 23321271112  
**Website:**  
**Email:** OEF@ghana.com

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref.	TF053085	Reporting Period:	02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008
Printed On:	09/15/2010	Report Type:	Completion
		Report Status:	Approved

## Implementation performance ratings from 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008 with regard to:

**Project Management:** Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 12/31/2004)

**Brief Comment:**

Project management improved significantly after the first 18 months of project implementation after significant changes were made in the team

**Financial Management:** Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 12/31/2004)

**Brief Comment:**

This had improved but then the accountant left for another job a few months before project close and had to be coaxed back to do some of the unfinished work, resulting in delays

**Counterpart Funding:** Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 12/31/2004)

**Brief Comment:**

GWS has provided some counterfunds in the form of work, staff and vehicles.

**Procurement:** Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 12/31/2004)

**Brief Comment:**

A procurement review has been done and was found satisfactory

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 12/31/2004)

**Brief Comment:**

The M&E system is set-up and was shared with one of the supervision mission-there were some deficiencies but it was functional

## Additional Comments on Implementation Performance:

### PROGRAM

#### Program Specific Ratings

1. Please rate public involvement - Satisfactory
2. Please rate government commitment - Satisfactory
3. Please rate safeguard performance - Satisfactory
4. Please rate arrangements for sustainability - Moderately Satisfactory

#### Program Specific Questions

**1. Please comment on additional resources leveraged**

Other than funds from GWS, there were no additional resources leveraged.

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

## COMPLETION

### Overall Assessments and Lessons Learned

#### Main lessons learned:

1) Implementation of the Livelihood Component. The project document did not spell out the way to implement the project and so this was devised during implementation. The design used quickly ensured that all participants had the equipment and training they needed in a very short time-frame. A) The trainers for the beekeeping mushroom raising were local experts in the field who also run their own businesses in mushroom raising, beekeeping etc and made significant profits. They provided, at verified competitive costs, the equipment for the participants. Participants could also make or obtain their own equipment only if they met the standards required and this was verified. Most chose to have the project purchase the equipment and deliver the equipment and breeding stock. All equipment was given to a particular group at the same time ensuring that all group members could start together. This method was superior to one used in another project that gave participants the funds to get their own equipment and breeding stock- the lesson learnt from that project was that materials and breeding stock were substandard because participants used the funds for themselves and spent the least they could on equipment. This resulted in a lot of loss and this project learnt from this experience and ensured an improved design.

2) Directly Funding Communities through Traditional Authorities: Another lesson learnt is related to directly funding communities through traditional authority instead of a government institution as occurs with most Bank projects.

Giving funds directly to any traditional authority must come with checks and balances and strong financial and procurement oversight because a) these groups are not used to receiving these large sums and b) they may not be clear that the Bank has stringent requirements in terms of use and accountability. Therefore sensitization (strong) is needed. In addition, the interests of these political powers may not necessarily be first and foremost the community. For many, individual motivations will take precedence over the community. As such, the project has to be designed so that procurement and financial risks are minimized and so that the community members directly receive the bulk of the grant/funding without channeling it through higher traditional authorities who may wish to divert funds or line their pockets. For example, with the livelihood fund, the funds were managed by two local banks rather than by the traditional authority. This allowed for some continuity after the project ended- the banks would continue to monitor, report to the OEF on the successfulness of the projects, and ensure the funds would be paid back over time. Having this external oversight is very important. Another option could be to use an international NGO # this has been done in other projects where the local bank network is not as well developed.

3. Role of Traditional Rulers: traditional rulers do have a key role to play at the highest levels. In our project, whenever we met a difficult problem, we went to the paramount chief, called the King in this area, who was very clear that this project had to be a success for the kingdom. A number of times we needed his assistance and He was instrumental in being the force that helped move the project forward and in checking the excesses of others and in ensuring that the communities knew that the GEF/Bank were there at the #invitation# of the King. Therefore, the highest level of the Kingship, not the smaller chiefs who reside over the villages, should always be involved in the project, if his reputation is a good one.

4. Role of NGO#s When dealing with the communities, and not with a Government institution, as was in our case, an NGO who can organize, and put structure into implementation is key. GWS was an exceptional asset in the implementation of this project.

5. Direct Control of Forest Resources: A final key lesson learnt is that communities will be more likely to protect those resources for which they have direct control. Smaller, tighter knit communities closer to the resource were more likely to have great enthusiasm for protection of their forest and water resource, once trained. In more urban communities, where control by local authorities was looser, there was less interest and the project lagged in these communities. Choosing sites and communities is therefore important farming after a period of 2 years- this agreement took more than 9 months to achieve- too late for the project.

#### Overall outcome (and its Sustainability): Rated Likely

##### Comment:

The outcome of the project was satisfactory- key areas of biodiversity were quantified and protected through local bye laws,

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref.	TF053085	Reporting Period:	02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008
Printed On:	09/15/2010	Report Type:	Completion
		Report Status:	Approved

chieftency and community agreements, environmental brigades, and local teams that coordinated the pillaring and boundary planting.

The risk to development outcome is Moderate.

There is some sustainability due to:

a) The Okyeman Environmental Foundation, (OEF), the environmental arm of the Okyeman traditional authority, is located in the community and, if funding is available, the mobile brigades will continue to do their work in the communities.

b) with the livelihood fund, the livelihoods funds were managed by two rural banks rather than the traditional authority even though fees were charged for the management of these funds. We also made sure that the funds were disbursed and that the participants had received all their funding prior to project close. This allowed for some continuity after the project ended- the banks would continue to monitor, report to the OEF on the successfulness of the projects, and ensure the funds would be paid back over time.

However, the risk is only moderate because of the short 3 year implementation period which does not allow the various trainings and lessons to take root. In addition, even though the OEF is still there, in reality, it has very little funds. The King is always looking for funding sources to continue this work and therefore continuity depends on funds available. Second, capacity is very weak within the OEF and clearly, an NGO is needed to assist with implementation or implement on behalf of the OEF. The OEF is comprised of a mix of capacities- some members that are not literate while others that sit on its board are very well educated but have jobs in the capital city and rarely make it to meetings. Even though OEF capacity was strengthened under this project, and some tasks can continue unabated, capacity strengthening in procurement and financial management is required for the OEF to fully be able to sustain the work that has already been done. Once finances are available, and procurement and financial management has been fully strengthened, the risk to development outcome will be low.

## Bank Performance: Rated Satisfactory

### Comment:

The bank performance was satisfactory- missions were held twice a year, with some missions undertaken by the country office environmental staff to reduce costs associated with such a small project. The delay of implementation in the first year was quickly assessed and steps were put in place to reduce the procurement risk that caused delay in the first 18 months of the project, and a change in the PMU staff was key to putting the project back on track. A key mission at the end of the first year was instrumental in changing implementation arrangements and putting the focus and resources 100% at engaging the local communities. This priority, stated in the aide memoires and technical annexes, began to pull the project into action. By the 3rd and 4th years of implementation, the project activities were being implemented rapidly and yet with quality.

## Additional Assessment

### Development / strengthening of institutions: Rated Modest

#### Comment:

The traditional institution was strengthened - the king and the key members of the OEF do have an increased awareness of project management and the stringent requirements of the bank with regard to procurement and financial accountability. In addition, GWS strengthened some members of the OEF team with regards to community engagement. However, the OEF still requires further strengthening as an institution and focused capacity building for all OEF staff would have been of benefit over the longer-term. However, this was not a significant aspect of the project's design.

### Mobilization of other resources: Rated Modest

#### Comment:

GWS provided funds- both in cash and in kind.

### Knowledge exchange : Rated Modest

#### Comment:

GWS taught the OEF aspects of community engagement, community training and organization.

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref.	TF053085	Reporting Period:	02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008
Printed On:	09/15/2010	Report Type:	Completion
		Report Status:	Approved

## Client's policy / program implementation : Rated Not Applicable

### Comment:

This is not applicable

## Efficiency : Rated Satisfactory

### Comment:

The efficiency of the implementation is satisfactory. In terms of economic and financial returns, we estimated that the loans taken by the communities for the livelihood ventures will be repaid in 3 years. Some participants already were receiving some cash from the ventures immediately. Unfortunately the project was only 3 years and therefore stopped short at a stage where these livelihood participants could be monitored over time and their returns followed. 3 years is too short a time since these 250 participants would need continued training and coaching as is with any new venture. At project close, optimism was high since some were already receiving cash flows from their ventures and trainees were dedicated to making their ventures work.

## Replicability: Rated Likely

### Comment:

This project is replicable though the design should be improved to incorporate lessons learnt.

## Main recommendations to stakeholders:

The positive impact of the project, apart from the studies done, was the mobilization of the communities to protect their resources. Another positive impact was the role of the NGO, Ghana Wildlife Society, which was instrumental in assisting the OEF with the project. Without this NGO, which partnered to provide technical assistance in kind, the project could not have moved forward because the OEF totally lacked experience in project implementation, planning etc. GWS worked as a team with the OEF to move the project forward and taught the OEF the basics of community engagement. This would not have been possible without the grant.

## Main recommendations to Bank Management:

The main recommendation to bank management is to continue to support these non-traditional approaches but ensure certain safeguards- the use of an NGO, highly reputable, to provide technical expertise and to do some of the implementation is important since capacity is extremely low. The time-frame of a project such as this should be extended to obtain a better result- 5 years minimum. Financial accountability needs to be ensured because traditional authorities/chiefs, are not used to being accountable for detailed levels of expenditures, and probably most importantly, sustainability needs to be ensured-perhaps by linking the project up more closely with a government or local government institution that can continue to fund the ventures. Despite the difficulties associated with implementing such a project, the participation of the communities largely ensures that elements of biodiversity protection will continue once it is engrained in the fabric of the community's bye-laws. The poverty reduction benefits through the livelihood fund are probably the most successful part of this project, providing real alternatives to communities and this should be continued as an essential part of biodiversity conservation. One issue the GEF should decide on is what form the livelihoods package should be delivered to these poor communities-loans, grants or low interest loans. The problem with using current interest rates is that they are often so high that one wonders whether the cost of the livelihoods will ultimately cause more poverty rather than less. Bank's are less likely to want to manage a project's funds and recover those funds if no interest is used. This issue needs to be discussed, with a clear approach articulated, for biodiversity livelihood ventures in poorer countries.

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

## PROCESSING

### Manager's comments on this GRM report:

Date:03/04/2009 User ID:WB12577 Name:Ms Marjory-Anne Bromhead Operation performed:Approved by Manager  
This was an interesting and carefull supervised activity.

### GRM report history - Requested on 02/18/2009, due on 07/31/2008

Action	Name	Status	Date
Created	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Changed	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Draft	02/23/2009
Submitted for Approval	Nyaneba E. Nkrumah	Submitted	02/23/2009
Approved by Manager	Marjory-Anne Bromhead	Approved	03/04/2009

## DOCUMENTS

### List of documents attached to this GRM

1) Closing Report CBINRMP

## DISBURSEMENTS

### Disbursements Summary in USD

Date From	Date To	Planned Cumulative	Planned Period	Actual Cumulative	Actual Period
01/01/2004	06/30/2004	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
07/01/2004	12/31/2004	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
01/01/2005	06/30/2005	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
07/01/2005	12/31/2005	0.00	0.00	212,861.64	212,861.64
01/01/2006	06/30/2006	0.00	0.00	282,832.32	69,970.68
07/01/2006	12/31/2006	0.00	0.00	463,826.12	180,993.80
01/01/2007	06/30/2007	0.00	0.00	525,146.70	61,320.58
07/01/2007	12/31/2007	0.00	0.00	704,122.53	178,975.83
01/01/2008	06/30/2008	0.00	0.00	747,199.73	43,077.20

# World Bank - Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report

---

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Ref. TF053085  
Printed On: 09/15/2010

Reporting Period: 02/19/2004 to 06/30/2008  
Report Type: Completion  
Report Status: Approved

---

## INTERNAL COMMENTS

Date:03/04/2009 User ID:WB12577 Name:Ms Marjory-Anne Bromhead Operation performed:Approved by Manager  
This was an interesting and carefull supervised activity.

Date:02/23/2009 User ID:WB190613 Name:Ms Nyaneba E. Nkrumah Operation performed:Submitted for Approval  
Christophe has looked over the attachment and his comments were incorporated.