

Document of
The World Bank

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Report No: 36464

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT
(TF-23658)

ON A

GRANT

IN THE AMOUNT OF US\$6.8 MILLION

TO THE

REPUBLIC OF BENIN

FOR A

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

June 30, 2006

Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development 3
Country Department 15
Africa Region

This document has a restricted distribution and may be used by recipients only in the performance of their official duties. Its contents may not otherwise be disclosed without World Bank authorization.

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective)

Currency Unit = CFA franc (CFAF)

CFAF 1.00 = US\$ 0.00167

US\$ = CFAF 600

FISCAL YEAR

January 1 – December 31

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ABE:	<i>Agence Béninoise pour l'Environnement</i> (Benin Environment Agency)
AFD:	<i>Agence Française de Développement</i> (French Development Agency)
ARDET-Atacora:	<i>Agence Régionale de Développement du Tourisme de l'Atacora</i> (Regional Agency for Development of tourism in Atacora)
AVIGREF:	<i>Association Villageoise de Gestion des Réserves de Faune</i> (Wildlife Reserves Management Village Association)
CBDD:	<i>Commission Béninoise pour le Développement Durable</i> (Benin Commission for Sustainable Development)
CENAGREF:	<i>Centre National de Gestion des Réserves de Faune</i> (Wildlife Reserves Management Center)
CFO:	Chief Financial Officer
EIS:	Environmental Information System
FFEM:	French Global Environment Facility
GEF:	Global Environment Facility
GIS:	Geographical Information System
GPS:	Global Positioning System
GTZ:	German International Cooperation
ICR:	Implementation Completion Report

IUCN:	International Union for Conservation of Nature
KAI:	Kilometric Abundance Index
KFW:	<i>Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau</i> (German Development Agency)
NEAP:	National Environment Action Plan
NPCMP:	National Parks Conservation and Management Program
PAD:	Project Appraisal Document
PAPN :	<i>Projet d'Aménagement des Parcs Nationaux</i> (National Park Management Project)
PGRN:	<i>Projet de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles</i> Natural Resources Management Project
RDS	Rural Development Strategy

Vice President:	Gobind T. Nankani
Acting Country Director:	Nils O. Tcheyan
Sector Manager:	Joseph Baah-Dwomoh
Task Team Leader/Task Manager:	Remi Kini

BENIN
National Parks Conservation and Management Program)

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Project Data	1
2. Principal Performance Ratings	1
3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry	2
4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs	6
5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome	15
6. Sustainability	18
7. Bank and Borrower Performance	19
8. Lessons Learned	22
9. Partner Comments	23
10. Additional Information	25
Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix	28
Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing	29
Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits	31
Annex 4. Bank Inputs	32
Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components	34
Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance	35
Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents	36

<i>Project ID:</i> P037580	<i>Project Name:</i> BJ-GEF Nat Parks Cnsv & Mgmt SIL (FY00)
<i>Team Leader:</i> Remi Kini	<i>TL Unit:</i> AFTS3
<i>ICR Type:</i> Core ICR	<i>Report Date:</i> June 30, 2006

1. Project Data

Name: BJ-GEF Nat Parks Cnsv & Mgmt SIL (FY00) *L/C/TF Number:* TF-23658
Country/Department: BENIN *Region:* Africa Regional Office

Sector/subsector: Sub-national government administration (44%); Central government administration (43%); Other social services (13%)

Theme: Biodiversity (P); Environmental policies and institutions (P); Participation and civic engagement (P); Rural non-farm income generation (S); Export development and competitiveness (S)

KEY DATES

	<i>Original</i>	<i>Revised/Actual</i>
<i>PCD:</i> 04/01/1995	<i>Effective:</i> 07/06/2000	07/06/2000
<i>Appraisal:</i> 06/24/1998	<i>MTR:</i> 11/19/2003	11/19/2003
<i>Approval:</i> 03/30/2000	<i>Closing:</i> 12/31/2005	12/31/2005

Borrower/Implementing Agency: GOVERNMENT OF BENIN/MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
Other Partners:

STAFF	Current	At Appraisal
<i>Vice President:</i>	Gobind T. Nankani	Jean-Louis Sarbib
<i>Country Director:</i>	Nils O. Tcheyan	Theodore O. Ahlers
<i>Sector Manager:</i>	Joseph Baah-Dwomoh	Hans P. Binswanger
<i>Team Leader at ICR:</i>	Remi Kini	Michel Simeon
<i>ICR Primary Author:</i>	Pacome Kossy	

2. Principal Performance Ratings

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HL=Highly Likely, L=Likely, UN=Unlikely, HUN=Highly Unlikely, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory, H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible)

Outcome: S
Sustainability: UN
Institutional Development Impact: SU
Bank Performance: S
Borrower Performance: S

QAG (if available) ICR
Quality at Entry:
Project at Risk at Any Time: No

3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry

3.1 Original Objective:

Sustainable environmental and natural resource management gained significant momentum in the 1990s in Benin, as the country emerged from two decades of a centrally planned economic and political system. The increased importance of environment and natural resource management objectives in policy statement was reflected in the Rural Development Strategy (RDS) and materialized in the 1993 National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP). In particular, biodiversity conservation featured prominently in both documents. The relevance of the objectives of the National Parks Conservation and Management Program (NPCMP) has to be assessed against this policy background.

By the time the Government initiated the preparation of the NPCMP in the second half of the 1990s, the sustainable management of biodiversity resources was hampered by (i) limited technical capacity, weak and poorly organized institutions for park and wildlife management, and limited national awareness of the importance of biodiversity conservation; (ii) widespread antagonism between local communities and the forest guards in and around the protected areas; (iii) inadequate scientific information on natural habitats, animal populations, endangered and endemic species; (iv) conflicting land use policies and practices in buffer zones - especially related to the expansion of the area sown to cotton; (v) inadequate control and management of transhumant pastoralism; (vi) poor control of poaching; and (vii) a lack of rationalization of rules and legislation pertaining to park and wildlife management.

In order to help remove these obstacles to the sustainable conservation of biodiversity resources, the NPCMP was designed to pursue the following objectives:

Overall objective: to ensure the sustainable management and conservation of regionally and globally important biodiversity of fragile ecosystems in northern Benin.

Specific objective: to create the capacity for sustainable wildlife management and biodiversity conservation at the local and national levels. The program targeted the development of sustainable wildlife management and conservation systems within protected areas and wildlife management zones. Through the development of an effective partnership with local communities based on the empowerment and increase in human resource capacity of local populations, the program sought to enhance local access to the benefits of protected areas and wildlife zones, and to encourage ecologically sound and economically viable land use and production practices in the surrounding areas.

Global environmental objective: to ensure the long-term conservation of Benin's globally important biodiversity resources in the face of competing economic pressures. Specific areas of concern included: (i) increasing the ecological security of regionally important species, including a number of endemics, through improved management of protected areas and associated zones; (ii) providing sustainable management of habitats and ecosystems which are of regional and global importance, and which are increasingly threatened by a range of anthropic factors; (iii) promoting in situ preservation, of genetic diversity, which includes species of ecological, cultural and economic importance, in their natural habitat and within their natural range; (iv) supporting the

involvement of local communities in the management of natural resources and the conservation of biodiversity; (v) supporting a coordinated response to the management of the tri-national transboundary ecosystem; and (vi) encouraging the sustainable management of fragile semi-arid savanna ecosystems.

The operational objectives of the national program were: (i) to increase the technical and managerial capacity of the local population, the Wildlife Reserves Management Center (CENAGREF) and other partners in protected area and wildlife management; (ii) enable the local populations to play a more active and profitable role in park and wildlife management; (iii) support locally identified rural development activities in the areas surrounding the park and wildlife management areas in order to improve the quality of life for the local population and diminish pressure on the parks; (iv) encourage sustainable systems of natural resource conservation, management and use; (v) improve the flow of information and the level of education on biodiversity conservation at both local and national levels; (vi) establish sustainable ecological monitoring systems, and support ecological research related to management; (vii) improve basic infrastructure within the parks; (viii) identify and prepare the steps for the establishment of an International Trust Fund to help finance future wildlife management biodiversity conservation operations; (ix) provide support for effective donor coordination; and (x) to ensure effective program management, monitoring and evaluation.

The operational objectives for which GEF support was requested were: (i) to provide institutional support and capacity building to national institutions responsible for biodiversity conservation; (ii) support training of staff working for partner agencies and to support improved communications; (iii) support studies and field trips necessary to improve scientific understanding of the ecosystems and identify and describe habitats, ecosystems and species of global importance; (iv) design a financial mechanism capable of providing sustainable financial support for the conservation of biodiversity; (v) support transboundary cooperation for the conservation of biodiversity in the region; and (vi) to support the review and update of legislation relating to National Park and Reserve Management, village and commercial hunting, and the development of local institutions for the management of natural resources.

In addition to the Government's own resources, the program's financial and technical assistance of this program was assured by a group of donors including (i) the European Union, (ii) Germany through GTZ and KfW, (iii) the Netherlands and (iv) France. The program was implemented by the *Centre National de Gestion des Réserves de Faune* (CENAGREF) with strong support from the *Association Villageoise de Gestion des Réserves de Faune* (AVIGREFs) at the local level.

AVIGREF are organizations of adjacent villages and direct partners of CENAGREF in the management of national parks. Their missions are to (i) educate populations from adjacent villages on the necessity to preserve the fauna and its habitat, (ii) inform populations on regulations, (iii) help CENAGREF carry out control and surveillance (anti-poaching) activities, (iv) ensure the adherence to regulations related to hunting, (v) promote the sustainable management of fauna, which is profitable to local populations, (vi) take part in the management of the zone of controlled activities and buffer zones, and (vii) take part in the economic development of adjacent villages.

3.2 Revised Objective:

The original objectives were recognized as pertinent throughout implementation and therefore did not need to be revised.

3.3 Original Components:

In order to achieve its objectives, the program was implemented through the following components (from the PAD):

Component 1: Common actions at the national level (Cost: US\$2,850,000 all costs per component are GEF financing only)

This component consisted of two sub-components: (i) program management, and (ii) support actions:

- The program management subcomponent aimed at establishing the CENAGREF as an effective and efficient organization capable of supervising the implementation of the program, and operating an effective monitoring and evaluation system.
- The support actions sub-component included the following activities: (i) providing consultant services and studies for the design and implementation of a trust-fund that would ensure the program sustainability; (ii) strengthening capacity through the training of CENAGREF staff in other African countries and overseas, (iii) ensuring regional cooperation through coordination, organization of regional workshops and consultant services to provide decision-makers with relevant information and recommendations; (iv) enhancing Information, Education and Communication (IEC) activities through the organization of workshops to increase awareness on biodiversity issues, use of rural radios for disseminating information, develop cultural activities in border villages and use of didactic materials for community level education efforts; (v) providing institutional support for revising legal documents relevant to protected areas management, ensuring decentralized action of CENAGREF and developing a participatory approach as at the local level; (vi) setting-up a management information system for parks with particular attention paid to the geographical information aspects (GIS capabilities); (vii) establishing ecological monitoring for the implementation of an adapted environment information system (EIS), organizing surveys and studies for collecting ecological information and training national staff.

Component 2: Pendjari complex (Cost: US\$1,070,000)

This component included three sub-components: (i) Park and cynegetic areas management; (ii) sustainable tourism and hunting, and (iii) actions with villagers, particularly the sustainable development of the Siri area and actions on the Tanguieta – Porga and Tanguieta – Batia axes:

- The sub-component on park and cynegetic areas management focused on providing the field office of CENAGREF in Tanguieta with equipment and staff. Each of the 2 anti-poaching teams in the field office consisted of one chief, 6 officers from CENAGREF and 9 villagers. Each team had appropriate transportation means (motorbikes and bicycles) and equipment (GPS and radios). At the management level, the staff consisted of one director, 3 associates, 2 international experts and 2 national experts, and the appropriate support staff. The sub-component was also to provide the Tanguieta field office with office space, and to finance

the construction, rehabilitation and maintenance of paths leading to, and in the park.

- The sustainable tourism and hunting sub-component was divided into: (i) hotel infrastructure with the construction and restoration of rooms; (ii) tourist infrastructure with the construction of watchtowers for wildlife observation and paths for tourism purposes, the installation of signs for tourist orientation; and (iii) the development of a strategy for the promotion of wildlife/nature-based tourism.
- The sub-component focusing on actions with villagers was to be implemented in two different areas: (i) in the Siri area, the sub-component would have financed staff to work with villagers by supporting the unit in its operating costs (needed equipment for didactic purposes) and would also have supported the organization of workshops at a later stage; and (ii) in the Pendjari area, the sub-component was to finance socio-economic studies and training seminars for villagers, support institutional organization in associations, and support community development through the financing of micro-projects.

Component 3: “W” complex (Cost: US\$2,810,000)

This component consisted of three sub-components: (i) Park and cynegetic areas management, (ii) Tourism and hunting, and (iii) Actions with villagers:

- The sub-component on park and cynegetic areas management was envisioned to provide the decentralized office of CENAGREF in Banikoara with equipment and staff. The staff was organized in 4 anti-poaching teams each with one chief, 6 officers from CENAGREF and 9 villagers. Each team had to be equipped with the appropriate transportation means (motorcycles and bicycles) and equipment (GPS and radios). At the management level the staff consisted of a director, 3 associates, 2 international experts and the appropriate support staff. The sub-component was also to provide the office of Banikoara with office space and eventually finance the construction, repair and maintenance of paths.
- The Tourism and hunting sub-component was divided into: (i) hotel infrastructure with the construction and restoration of rooms. (ii) tourist infrastructure with the construction of watchtowers for wildlife observation and paths for tourism purposes, the installation of signs for tourist orientation; (iii) the formulation of a strategy to organize and conduct a commercial campaign for tourism promotion.
- The sub-component actions with villagers consisted of financing socio-economic studies, training seminars for villagers, production and dissemination of didactic materials, and the development of a social fund for demand-driven micro-projects.

3.4 Revised Components:

Although there was no formal revision of components, before the start of the program, the French Development Agency (AFD) which was financing Component 3, eliminated the sub-component on tourism and hunting for lack of funding. Activities planned for this sub-component were not implemented and the program indicators were updated accordingly.

3.5 Quality at Entry:

The program was not submitted to a quality at entry review. The program was approved on March 30, 1997. At that time, quality at entry reviews were not systematic for all projects. However, a brief assessment of the program design conducted during the ICR mission showed

that the program's overall development objective was reasonably clear and appropriate. The program's global objectives were also appropriate and in line with GEF's priorities under the operational program on biodiversity, which included (i) the in situ conservation and sustainable use of critical ecosystems and threatened endemic species, (ii) support for active involvement of local communities as managers and beneficiaries of improved natural resource and biodiversity management, (iii) the promotion of conservation and sustainable use through capacity building, economic incentives and alternative livelihood opportunities, and (iv) the sustainable management of fragile semi-arid savanna ecosystems.

The objectives were also consistent with the development strategies of the Government of Benin and with the Bank assistance strategy to the country.

Nonetheless, the ICR mission also found out that aspects regarding institutional, organizational and implementation set up were not clearly and/or thoroughly described in the PAD. First, although the PAD mentioned the design of a financial mechanism capable of providing sustainable financial support to conservation of biodiversity in Benin, nothing was said with regard to the types and the sources of funds to support this financial mechanism, thus leaving a void that resulted in interminable discussions among donors during project implementation. Second, a marginal attention was paid to the monitoring of the project. A comprehensive and rigorous monitoring and evaluation system was not set up during project preparation. In addition, the indicators identified at that stage were not appropriate, and were consequently changed during the Mid Term Review. Third, given the multi-donor characteristic of the program, a common financial framework should have been adopted in order to not only facilitate the preparation of financial reports and statements but also to give enough visibility and transparency to the overall financial mechanism.

4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs

4.1 Outcome/achievement of objective:

The NPCMP was a multi-donor program, involving the GEF, the European Union, Germany, the Netherlands, France and the Government of Benin. The arrangements agreed to by the donors during the preparation phase and at the beginning of the program were such that the Government of Benin and the GEF would finance institutional strengthening activities and operational costs incurred by the CENAGREF, the NPCMP implementing agency, while the other donors would finance field activities. Germany, through GTZ and KfW, financed activities implemented in the Pendjari National Park. The French Development Agency used GTZ as its implementing agency to carry out planned activities for the Pendjari National Park. The European Union intervened in the W National Park and Netherlands financed rural development activities around both parks. Thus, from the beginning, donors' interventions were interrelated. Consequently, the outcomes and outputs detailed below are those of the NPCMP as a whole, which include the GEF operation. The mid-term review of the NPCMP was delayed by a year (late 2003 instead of 2002) because the Program did not fully start in 2002 as scheduled. While the GEF grant became effective in the second half of 2000 (August 2000), the W component did not start until early 2001, and the Dutch financing was not put to use until early 2002.

The achievement of the NPCMP measured against the performance indicators included in the PAD was **Satisfactory**. Although the sustainable management of national parks is a long term

process that cannot be achieved in 5 years, the NPCMP implemented activities that allowed a very rapid recovery of the wildlife population. The Program established a strong institutional and operational framework for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in and around the two national parks, with the following key features:

Co-management as a viable alternative: Numerous co-management experiences have been undertaken in Gabon, Cameroon, and even in Benin (National Park Management Project) with mitigated results. The co-management arrangement implemented by the NPCMP generated tangible results because it understood and took into account population dynamic and expectations. In addition, a genuine partnership was established between the populations and the CENAGREF. In fact, the CENAGREF, which was perceived by the populations as a reliable interlocutor, supported local populations' effort to establish village associations (AVIGREFs) for the management of wildlife reserves. As a result, 100 AVIGREFs were created and played a catalytic role in (i) the disappearance of the previous antagonistic relations between the populations and the CENAGREF, (ii) the management and control of protected areas, (iii) the co-management of tourism and hunting zones, (iv) the decrease in poaching, (v) a reliable supply workforce for park management activities such as control and surveillance, and (vi) the building of social infrastructures using 30 percent of total revenues generated by hunting activities and retroceded by CENAGREF.

In the same context, actions with villagers were identified as local development activities around national parks to improve livelihood conditions while offering alternative sources of revenues and strengthening the co-management approach. These activities started in 2000 in the Pendjari National Park and in 2002 in the W National Park, and \$400,000 were injected in the local economy via micro-credits, grants and equipment. Approximately one household out of ten benefited from these actions.

Overall, even though the organization of AVIGREFs is in progress, these associations are self-sufficient in terms of mobilization of funding and management. In 2003 AVIGREFs counted 500 members, in 2005 that number grew up to 2,390 members including 389 women.

CENAGREF as the lead wildlife reserve management organization: The CENAGREF was created in 1996, and has since played a crucial role in the sustainable management of national parks in Benin, using a co-management approach involving AVIGREFs. As a result, Benin now has a strong institution in the conservation field, which is regarded in the sub-region as exemplary. As part of CENAGREF operational strategy, AVIGREFs have inspired several countries e.g. Burkina Faso, Senegal, Mali, and Ivory-Coast, interested to replicate this approach. Still, the long term durability of the co-management mechanism will depend on CENAGREF capacity to stay operational and efficient in the field as well as financially self-sufficient. In order to confer it an institutional durability, it was decided in 1998 that the CENAGREF would operate under an "Office d'Etat Autonome" status. This decision not only highlighted the political willingness of Benin authorities to establish a flexible and autonomous agency specialized in the management of protected areas, but also set biodiversity conservation as one of the development priorities. However, the financial sustainability of the CENAGREF has not been reached yet, although this process is underway.

From 2000 to 2005, major NPCMP achievements can be summarized as follows:

- increase in fauna and flora populations within protected areas; data generated by the ecological monitoring system show an increase of more than 20 percent in a 5 year-period; in fact some mammal populations such as elephants more than doubled and the latest census numbers show that the size of the population of roan antelopes, cob de buffoon and warthogs increased over 40% between 2000 and 2005;
- building of infrastructures included in management plans; more than 1,300 km of paths (target in the PAD was 700 km), 9 watchtowers, 15 surveillance posts and 10 ponds were built for water supply to wildlife;
- establishment of CENAGREF as the major player in the country in terms of park management and as an example to be replicated in the sub-region;
- support of CENAGREF in developing business plans not only for the central office but also for field offices; these business plans include strategies to reduce costs and increase revenues, marketing strategies and plans to develop and improve touristic products;
- effective involvement of local populations in the management of national parks through co-management activities and partnerships by empowering AVIGREFs and giving them the possibility to play a central role in park management activities; 100 AVIGREFs are active in the field;
- increase of revenues from national parks, thus increasing populations' incomes; tourism and cynegetic activities generated about US\$889,000 from both parks and 30 percent of this amount, representing US\$226,000 was retroceded to populations living around the parks;
- increase in national awareness on conservation issues and benefits through communication campaigns, talk shows and documentaries; and
- provision of rural populations with alternative employment opportunities by hiring them as supplemental workforce to conduct park management activities; 60 park rangers headed households of 5 to 8 people were hired for both parks, and about 1000 people were hired for punctual tasks.

4.2 Outputs by components:

The current costs of components are different from those assigned at project appraisal because of the reallocation of the GEF grant resources in 2004 to better reflect needs expressed by stakeholders. Total financing of GEF did not change.

Component 1: Common actions at the national level (Cost: US\$3,670,000)

This component was intended to support activities common to both parks (W and Pendjari) and to carry out other activities necessary for the effective implementation of the project (procurement of goods and services, financial management, personnel management, etc.). This component is rated **Unsatisfactory** mainly because it was unable (i) to set up a sustainable financial mechanism for biodiversity and conservation in Benin, (ii) to construct a building planned to house CENAGREF headquarters, and (iii) to set up a comprehensive and integrated monitoring and evaluation system covering all activities of the project, although it did produce well monitored annual work plans.

Nonetheless, through the proceeds of the GEF grant, the component not only strengthened

CENAGREF's technical capacities, but also created an enabling environment for biodiversity conservation and park management in Benin. In particular:

- with the support of the program, the CENAGREF has become the lead institution for protected areas management and biodiversity conservation in Benin (it joined IUCN membership in 2003), and is considered as a model that many countries in the sub-region are trying to replicate in their protected area management framework;
- under this component, the CENAGREF acquired a GIS-based ecological monitoring system enabling to not only store and process data generated by the systems used in parks, but also to track changes in fauna and flora populations, and consequently to help decision makers in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of biodiversity conservation policies and interventions. At the same time, equipment were acquired to support CENAGREF's interventions in the field, including 6 vehicles, 13 desktops, 4 laptops, 13 printers, 3 servers and 5 copy machines used at the national and regional levels;
- the scientific and general knowledge of park resources as well as the knowledge of ecosystem interactions and dynamics were reinforced through a series of 17 studies in fields such as biodiversity, wildlife conservation, sociology, finance, and law; the findings of these studies helped to strengthen the ecological monitoring systems;
- at least 50% of the 2,390 members of the AVIGREF are well trained and have the skills needed to carry out most park management activities (e.g., surveillance and control of poaching), and infrastructure maintenance and basic conservation activities (protection and sustainable use of resources);
- from 2002 to 2005, five thousand (5,000) high school students spent 2-3 nights in the parks (education center located in the W national park) as part of the environmental education program; each year 4-5 theses dealing with various aspects of protected area management are produced by graduate students from Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger and some European academic institutions; each year about 15 interns work on the Program (in field offices and in CENAGREF offices in Cotonou);
- another series of studies as well as workshops were financed to support the elaboration of the law on the "Regime de la Faune", which was promulgated in 2004 and constitutes the reference framework for fauna management in Benin. In addition, to diversify means for increasing awareness of Benin globally important biodiversity resources, a website www.cenagref.firstnet.bj was developed under this component;
- for 5 years, under this component, CENAGREF paid park rangers' salaries as well as the rent of the building temporarily housing its headquarters, and;
- several dozens CENAGREF staff were trained in Benin and abroad (other African countries, Europe and Canada) on topics such as project management, procurement, monitoring and evaluation, financial management, and GPS and GIS software operation to strengthen their capacities in their respective fields of specialization and improve CENAGREF's performance. The Ecological Monitoring Officer assigned to the Pendjari National Park, who was trained under the program, has become a national reference in environmental and ecological monitoring systems.

Under this component, the Netherlands financed community development activities in the areas adjoining the two national parks. These community development operations were implemented by

IUCN through a sub-project (“Projet Eco-développement et Gestion de l’Espace des Zones d’Influences des Parcs Nationaux” - PEGEI) that supported community development initiatives in the villages located around the national parks in order to help populations develop alternative sources of livelihood. Through its 3 antennas, the PEGEI was active in 80 villages. In the villages of Séri, Sampéto, Gori, Pédé and Kérérou the project built 3 classrooms, with an office and a storage room. A total of 90 women and 90 beekeepers were trained and received equipment, for farming and bee keeping activities. Women from Sinasinrou and Dokosuan who were trained and equipped are now making a net revenue of US\$20 per day of market (there are 4 days of market weekly) compared to US\$6 before the program. The sub-project also financed study tours and exchanges in Burkina Faso, Senegal, Mauritania and South Africa.

Component 2: Pendjari complex (Cost: US\$1,460,000)

This component is rated **Satisfactory**. However, it is worth mentioning that the sub component on tourism was not implemented because AFD changed the focus of its financing at the beginning of program implementation. Under this component, the program established a strong and equitable partnership between CENAGREF and the populations living around the two protected areas. The rights of populations to use resources in designated areas were recognized and materialized through contract arrangements giving access to a controlled use zone. Between 2002 and 2005, 136 contracts were signed, including 29 with women and 9 with mixed groups. The contracts focused on farming, fishing, hunting and bee keeping activities conducted by populations for commercial and subsistence purposes. The new climate of trust resulted in a better conservation of biodiversity and an increase of populations’ incomes.

Even though it is not easy to assess results of biodiversity conservation in only 5 years, one can notice that the relative decrease of poaching between 2001 and 2005 led to an increase of certain mammal populations. In 2005, 9000 Cobs de Buffon were numbered against 2000 in 2000. In 2003, 800 elephants (representing a fourth of the elephant population presents in the whole ecosystem, which includes almost 4 national parks) were numbered against 400 in 2000. The number of farms within the park decreased during program implementation. In 2004, 15 farms were counted within the boundaries of the park against only 2 farms in 2005, for a total of 23 villages and 15,000 inhabitants. The indicators above are monitored with a sustainable ecological monitoring system that produce quarterly dashboards and whose parameters and baseline data were established in 2003. In addition, a sustainable management plan for Pendjari was elaborated in 2004 and adopted through a decree signed on August 31, 2005.

During the process of establishing sustainable biodiversity management techniques, populations from adjacent villages were fully involved via AVIGREFs on one hand and park rangers on the other hand. Twenty three AVIGREFs were established in the Pendjari area and regularly received 30 percent of total earnings from hunting activities. From 2001 to 2005, they received 94,965,500 CFAF (US\$178,000). In addition, the commercialization of game meat obtained from international hunters, who are only interested in trophies, represented a total of 5,197,000 CFAF (US\$10,000) from 2001 to 2005. AVIGREFs used their financial resources as follows: (i) 27 percent is used to support the functioning of their organizations, including the preparation of meetings, and the control of hunting, and (ii) 73 percent is distributed among villages. The

resources intended for villages were divided into resources allocated to communes (20 percent) to finance local development, participation of members in conservation law and control activities (25 percent), and social activities such as the restoration of pumps and the payment of school teachers' salaries. In addition, 37 training sessions and workshops were organized to improve the managerial capacities of villagers. About 1,005 people, including 741 women, were trained. Twenty one park rangers were recruited within neighboring villages. One hundred and nine micro-projects were financed, representing 89 million CFAF (US\$178,000) in credit and 58 million CFAF (US\$116,000) in grants. In the absence of a specific study, the impact of those micro-projects on populations cannot be determined with certainty.

To conduct anti-poaching enforcement activities in the park an original system was set up with the following objectives: (i) improve the mobility of teams, (ii) reinforce the presence within the park, and (iii) set-up a system to strategically position teams in the park. A total of 9 teams consisting of 3 agents and 2 villagers (members of AVIGREFs) are used in Pendjari. The involvement of villagers in anti-poaching teams reinforced mutual trust, ownership, provided independent observers at no additional cost, fostered professionalism and the respect of rules, and limited and prevented corruption cases. In 2005, 14 percent of AVIGREF's budget was dedicated to anti-poaching activities, which involved more than 200 villagers. The performance of anti-poaching teams was stimulated through the establishment of an adaptive incentive-based system linking the payment of salaries to the achievement of specific targets.

In terms of awareness campaigns and communication, 4 talk shows were aired weekly on local radios. In addition to brochures and posters, a specific web site was developed, www.pendjari.net. Two documentaries were realized and aired on national and international TV stations such as French TV5.

In the Pendjari National Park Hunting area concessions were attributed after an international competitive bidding process. In addition, villagers managed particular hunting areas included in controlled use zones. They provided international hunters with helpers who were paid about US\$5 (2,000 CFAF) per day. Earnings from these special hunting zones, through hunting permits and fees, enabled villagers to maintain hunting paths. Moreover, they constantly received game meat to fill unmet needs for animal protein. These hunting areas had the benefit to reinforce trust, financial independence and food security.

It should be mentioned however, that the performance of the infrastructure component was delayed to a significant degree due to the failure of the selected contractor to complete the works. In addition to the delay in construction work (buildings and tracks in the park), the contractor also did not comply the recommended environmental safeguards contained in the guide that was prepared and adopted at the MTR. The Bank was not directly involved in the procurement and the supervision of the works. This sub-component was financed and supervised by KfW. The contract was eventually cancelled. The works will be completed before the end of the year 2007 (participating donors have different closing dates for their grants).

Component 3: “W” complex (Cost: US\$1,600,000)

This component is rated **Satisfactory**. Because of issues related to the recruitment of personnel, activities in W National Park started in January 2002. Numerous achievements both in terms of biodiversity conservation and in terms of local development are visible.

A GIS-based ecological monitoring system was developed in 2002 and enables to track parameters related to fauna and flora conservation. A baseline study was also conducted in 2002. In 2005, after 3 years of conservation and control activities, the ecological monitoring system revealed some improvement in the kilometric abundance index (KAI: number of contacts points - physical observations - over a distance of one kilometer divided by the sampling rate, with a confidence interval of 95%.) for some mammals like Buffalos (0.006 in 2002 and 0.012 in 2005), Roan gazelles (0.034 in 2002 and 0.071 in 2005), Cob de Buffon (0.010 in 2002 and 0.015 in 2005), Warthogs (0.020 in 2002 and 0.044 in 2005). Although exhaustive numberings have yet to be conducted, the KAI shows a reconstitution of some mammal populations.

The improved management of the park also resulted in a noticeable decrease in the pressure on natural resources. In 2005, (i) the number of illegal farms was numbered at 2 against 54 in 2001, (ii) the number of cows grazing on the park's resources was 3000 (with 24 pastures) against 25 000 (with 115 pastures) in 2001, and (iii) the number of poaching cases recorded was 18 against 56 in 2001.

These results were achieved with the participation of local populations from the 78 villages around the park, representing more than 200, 000 inhabitants. In fact, local populations, through their 78 AVIGREFs, were thoroughly involved in management activities. To facilitate the process, 12,000 people were trained in various fields such as participatory management, management of associations, basic accounting, and modern harvest techniques. From 2002 to 2005, AVIGREFs received 30 percent of total earnings from hunting activities, which represents 46,823,935 CFAF (US\$88,000). The commercialization of game meat obtained from hunters earned them an additional 1,449,000 CFAF (US\$2,800) from 2003 to 2005.

AVIGREFs used the money received from 2002 to 2005 to co-finance the building of 15 wells, 14 classrooms, 2 hospital rooms, build a storage room, make 100 school desks, contribute to the payment of school teachers' salaries and finance the participation of villagers (AVIGREF members) in anti-poaching patrols.

Moreover, populations living around the park received 500.000 Euro of grants from the European Union and implemented 75 micro-projects; the impact of which on the local development, has not been determined yet. From 2002 to 2005, 33 contracts were signed to gain access to the controlled use zone.

For anti-poaching missions, 40 park rangers (heading families of about 8 people) were recruited among the local population. Control teams were composed of 3 park rangers regularly employed by CENAGREF and 3 AVIGREF members. As in the Pendjari National Park, this combination

enabled to foster trust, accountability and ownership.

As far as communication and awareness are concerned, since 2003, 2574 talk shows have been aired on local radios, using 12 different local languages. Additionally, from 2002 to 2005, 5000 school boys and girls had as a reward for academic excellence, the opportunity to visit the park for 3 days.

The W National Park has a sustainable management plan produced in December 2005. The exploitation of hunting areas was attributed after an international competitive bidding process. In this park, like in Pendjari National Park, populations managed their own hunting areas included in the controlled use zone.

4.3 Net Present Value/Economic rate of return:

The nature of the investments and the conservation of biodiversity are not amenable to the traditional approach of cost-benefit analysis. The surrogate economic analysis used at the appraisal of the project was based on any incremental benefits that would accrue to the local communities as a result of the improved management and conservation of the two protected areas, and their buffer zones. The analysis identified:

- direct proceeds from eco-tourism, hunting permits and sale of game meat, and employment generated by a better management of parks, and
- indirect incomes generated by local economic activities.

During the 1997-1998 season, ecotourism revenues amounted to about US\$29,500 for a number of tourists of 2,500 to 5,000. At appraisal it was estimated that the investments in tourism infrastructure and promotion would double the number of visitors in the Pendjari National Park (given the high level of resource degradation in the W National Park, it was not envisaged that this park would attract many tourists during the program's implementation period). Based on the expected increase in the number of tourists, yearly tourism revenues were to be in the range of US\$60,000-120,000. The expected improvement in wildlife management was to increase hunting-related revenues of about US\$50,000 every year. Therefore, approximately US\$110,000-170,000 were to be generated through tourism and cynegetic activities. Of this amount, local populations were to receive between US\$50,000 and 90,000 (i.e., about 45-53% of total revenue) annually.

From 2001 to 2005, tourism and cynegetic activities generated about US\$594,000 in Pendjari and US\$295,000 in W, thus a total of US\$889,000 between the two parks, representing an average of US\$177,800 per year, over a five-year period. Although the targeted share of this revenue accruing to the local populations was to be between 45-53%, the performance indicator included in the project appraisal document retained 30%. More precisely, it was expected that the share of revenues distributed to local populations would reach at least 30% in the fifth year of the program. The negotiations that occurred between CENAGREF and the representatives of the local populations at the beginning of the implementation resulted in the adoption of 30% as the share of the tourism and safari hunting revenue accruing to the AVIGREFs. It was emphasized however, that this percentage may rise as the scope of the revenue generating activities increased. Based on this arrangement, the AVIGREF of the villages in the Pendjari complex area received US\$178,000 in 5 years, while those living around the W complex received US\$88,000. Overall,

local communities received US\$226,000 in 5 years, i.e., an average annual revenue of US\$45,200. It should be mentioned that while the revenue generated by tourism and hunting activities are slightly above the range set at the appraisal of the program; the amount received by local populations, on the other hand is slightly below the range predicted. This is due to the fact that the relative size (i.e., the percentage) of the revenue accruing to local populations was lower than the one which the appraisal estimates were based on (30% instead of 45-53%). It should also be emphasized that the expected increase in the number of visitors did not materialize. The number of tourists visiting the Pendjari national Park was about 4,000-6,000 every year.

It was also determined at appraisal that the sale of meat game would bring an additional US\$8,000 annually. However, the analysis did not take into account consumption needs. In fact, an important part of game meat was consummated by populations and the remaining part was sold and generated approximately US\$2000 per year in Pendjari and US\$933 per year in W. It is estimated that these amounts represent about one fifth of the total value of the game meat. Consequently, it is estimated that the total value of game meat was about US\$15,000 (on average US\$3,000 yearly). Finally, total income from new employment was estimated to reach US\$18,000 annually. Over a five year-period in Pendjari park rangers' salaries reached approximately US\$73,000 annually, while in W complex, over a four-year period, park rangers' salaries were approximately US\$118,000 per year.

4.4 Financial rate of return:

The Project Appraisal Document did not include an estimate of the financial rate of return. Financial sustainability of the Program was to be achieved through the establishment of a conservation trust fund during the first two years of program implementation.

4.5 Institutional development impact:

The program had a strong institutional development impact. The CENAGREF (created in 1996) was a lethargic institution before the program. Under the NPCMP, CENAGREF evolved into an effective organization that developed effective protected area management tools based on co-management mechanisms that empower local populations for the conservation and sustainable of biodiversity resources. CENAGREF is now a key policy advice provider to the Government in the area of protected area management and biodiversity conservation. Today, CENAGREF is considered across the sub-region as model to be replicated in community-based biodiversity conservation in the neighboring countries. The establishment of AVIGREFs as strong and credible stakeholders for the effective protected area management and for the implementation of local development initiatives is a very important achievement. The network of 100 AVIGREFs and their 2390 members constitute dependable community-based organizations that not only show strong natural resource stewardship, but also play an important role in village and local development planning. The program also supported CENAGREF and the Government in the drafting and adoption of the law on wildlife management (loi sur le Régime de la Faune), and its implementation decrees. This law aims to regulate the protection and exploitation of wildlife in a manner that makes wildlife management compatible with the educational, scientific, and socioeconomic needs of society, in particular with the needs of populations living near wildlife sanctuaries. It is important to stress the fact that this strong institutional impact is undermined by the weak financial sustainability of CENAGREF. The planned mechanism for ensuring the financial sustainability of CENAGREF was not established in time. Arrangements for supporting

the operating costs in order to ensure the most critical functions of CENAGREF in the short term (12 -16 months) are underway. These arrangements may involve both donor (the interventions of two of the participating donors in the program are still on-going) and Government resources. It is expected that the conservation trust fund will be established and resources secured in order to take over the financing of part of the recurrent costs of CENAGREF after this interim period.

5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome

5.1 Factors outside the control of government or implementing agency:

Two main factors, both related to the financing of the program affected adversely the implementation of the program. The first one is the suspension of the financing from the Dutch cooperation. The amount of financing included in the appraisal document was US\$2.1 million. This amount was to finance the “Actions with Villagers” which include all the community development initiatives through the support to micro-projects and multi-purpose training (business management, natural resource management, etc.). The resources were channeled through the Benin Commission for Sustainable Development (CBDD). CBDD then recruited IUCN to implement the planned activities around the two national parks. IUCN then prepared a small project (with its own logical frame) that tried to link the two protected area management with the socioeconomic development of the local communities by financing small production equipment and livelihood activities. For reasons that are related to the poor performance of CBDD and to a shift in the areas of emphasis in their development assistance, the Dutch cooperation suspended the financing from March 2003 to September 2004. Consequently, the project that was supposed to last 5 years was implemented in 28 months, considerably reducing the scope of the planned activities, and the disbursement rate of the allocated resources. During the suspension period, the Government of Benin provided a small amount of funds to support some of the critical activities that started before the suspension. The late start (July 2002) of the activities financed through this grant and the suspension resulted in a disbursement rate of about 50 percent. Since the “Actions with the villagers” was an important element of the program, the 50 percent reduction in the financing may have had significant consequences in terms of lost socioeconomic development opportunities and welfare gains, and in terms of improved relationship between the targeted communities and CENAGREF.

The second element outside the control of the Government is the significant reduction of the funding for development of eco-tourism. As already mentioned, the design of the multi-donor program included an ecotourism sub-component that was to be financed by the French Development Agency (AFD). Before the start of implementation, the AFD cancelled a significant amount of the funding allocated to this sub-component. As a result of this reduction in funding some of the key investments that aimed to upgrade the tourism infrastructure in order to increase its quality and the attractiveness of the two parks to visitors were not undertaken. This decrease in financing was a source of shortcomings in the achievements of the program because tourism revenue was expected to make a significant contribution to the financial viability of the protected area co-management system.

5.2 Factors generally subject to government control:

The effectiveness of implementation and the development outcome of the Program could have been improved by a better management of at least three factors that were under the control of the

Government. The first factor was persistent political interference in the management of the Program. For example, there seemed to be some evidence that the heated discussions that delayed and ultimately prevented the construction of the CENAGREF office building (in Cotonou) were the result of regional politics. Also, when it became obvious that the contractor for the construction of the roads and other physical infrastructure in the Pendjari National Park was no longer capable of completing the works, political considerations seemed to have delayed the cancellation of the contract, resulting in an increase of the sunk costs to the program.

The second factor was the failure of the Government to allocate sufficient resources to finance the operating costs of CENAGREF. Despite the strong recommendation of the mid-term review mission to increase Government budgetary contributions to the Program in order to sustain the program achievements following the closing of the GEF grant, no action was taken to secure these resources. The failure of the Government to provide these resources jeopardized the financial and institutional sustainability of CENAGREF, as the lead institution in protected area management and biodiversity conservation.

The third factor was the ineffective management of lodging infrastructure in the Pendjari National Park. The unreliable supply of water and power, and the lack of adequate sanitation in hotels and lodges remain a key obstacle to the increase in the number of tourists in the Pendjari National Park. The Government which still plays a key role in the management of these lodging facilities failed to hold the managers accountable for the quality of the service provided to visitors. Most importantly, the revenue generated by the facilities located within the park does not contribute to the financing of the park management because this revenue is collected by the Ministry of Tourism that does not make any attempt to improve the living conditions in the lodging facilities. The MTR recommended that the Government take the necessary steps to remedy this lack of alignment and consistency in its ecotourism promotion policies. The cabinet reshuffles and the changes at the head of CENAGREF that followed occurred in 2004-2005 did not allow any progress in this area of policy realignment.

5.3 Factors generally subject to implementing agency control:

The implementing agency could have done a better job in (i) cost control and procurement of goods and services, and (ii) program coordination and management. The poor performance of the implementing agency on these aspects did not have any significant effect on the outcome of the Program. However, a better handling of these aspects could have improved the management effectiveness of CENAGREF, thereby increasing further its operational and institutional capacity.

In retrospect, the implementing agency could have achieved higher economy and efficiency by adopting more efficient personnel management measures, and assuring a higher standard of procurement services. One year after the start of the Program it became obvious that CENAGREF could function well with less personnel than what it had at that time. The overstaffing situation had an impact on GEF funds, which financed operational costs (including salary cost), and partly forced a reallocation of funds. There was a strong push by donors to have CENAGREF reduce the size of its staff. Eventually, the donors commissioned an organizational audit that recommended three alternative organizational charts corresponding to three different personnel size for CENAGREF. By the end of the Program, the personnel salary cost was reduced by 20% thanks to job changes by some staff and the non-renewal of expired employment

contracts for others.

Economy of financial resources could have also resulted from better procurement of small goods through increased competition among suppliers of such goods. The quality of procurement was average too low, although there was some improvement starting in 2003 following the training of the procurement specialist. Despite this improvement, the procurement audits of 2004 and 2005 noted some weaknesses in the procurement of small items (mostly office supply), and recommended the recruitment of a new procurement specialist. The scarcity of skills in procurement in the local job market, and the learning time required for a new specialist to operate efficiently led the CENAGREF management to favor the continuous training of the existing staff.

Communication between the CENAGREF management located in Cotonou (capital city) and the field offices was deficient in many respects. The weakness of the Program approach (i.e., separation of financing, relative autonomy of operations on each site, etc.) played a role in this deficiency of communication. But it should be mentioned that the lack of strong leadership as well as untimely political interference in the management of CENAGREF also hampered the establishment of effective communication channels between the field offices and CENAGREF management in Cotonou. Most importantly, the weakness of the managerial skills and decisiveness in coordinating and handling strategic operational issues, such as donor consultation, especially during the first year of the Program created some uneasiness and poor work atmosphere in the Program. In order to remedy this situation, an institutional and organizational audit was commissioned by donors in 2001. The implementation of the recommendations of this audit led to the replacement of the three top managers of CENAGREF during the same year.

5.4 Costs and financing:

Total program costs (i.e., GEF contribution of US\$6 million) were within the amount forecasted at Appraisal. Adjustments had to be made in the cost composition because of the reallocation among categories. The program was not extended from its original five-year period. The GEF funding was almost fully disbursed (95%).

Table 1: Financial Planning: GEF Grant and Co-financing

Co financing (Type/Source)	GEF Grant (mill US\$)		Bank: IBRD/IDA (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	6.756	6.456	NA	NA	4.097	1.132	13.391	18.292	24.244	25.88
Loans	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Credits	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Equity investments	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
In-kind support	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Totals	6.756	6.456			4.097	1.132	13.391	18.292	24.244	25.88

6. Sustainability

6.1 Rationale for sustainability rating:

The program sustainability is rated Unlikely. By mandate, CENAGREF will carry on the activities that the program helped to initiate and implement. During the implementation of the Program, CENAGREF gained and developed substantial technical capacity that should help execute its mandate successfully. The field offices are well equipped to provide the technical support needed to ensure the sustainable management and protection of biodiversity in the two national parks. However, CENAGREF does not currently have the financial means required to sustain the investments made under the Program, and to carry out its institutional mandate successfully. The conservation trust fund that was supposed to be established within two years of the program implementation in order to help finance the operations of CENAGREF is yet to be created. Substantial work has been accomplished toward the creation of the trust fund, but still needs to be done. International experts and practitioners who helped to establish conservation trust funds in other countries (e.g., Peru) were hired to help the CENAGREF identify and execute the measures and actions needed for the creation of a conservation trust fund. This help led to the creation of a multi-disciplinary Working Group to spearhead the preparation work. The lack of adequate national know-how in terms of the technical, administrative and legal requirements for creating this financial instrument delayed the work of the Working Group. These difficulties led the Government's decision to start with the creation of a public association which would subsequently become a foundation after the adoption by Parliament of the regulations pertaining to the establishment of foundations. The Working Group has made significant progress, and drafted a proposal for the creation of the "association" for the conservation of wildlife and biodiversity. The draft awaits comments and/or approval from the Ministry of Justice.

The Government's approval of this proposal would not mean that the newly created "Association" has the financial resources required to support CENAGREF' operations. In fact, the source of funding for this future Association remains uncertain. In sum, the lack of the trust fund or any other financial means to carry on the activities of the Program remains a serious threat to the sustainability of the Program's achievements. CENAGREF is very active in preparing a follow-up operation that would constitute the second phase of the NPCMP. In addition to supporting key investments in the area of biodiversity conservation, this second operation would focus on raising fund for establishing a long-term financial instrument for biodiversity conservation. However, before donors can support a new intervention the Government will need to show strong financial and political commitment to sustaining the achievements of the first Program. In particular, it is important that the Government allocate sufficient budgetary resources to support the operating costs of CENAGREF in the interim period. There seems to be some positive signs, as the amount of resources that the Government allocated to CENAGREF in 2006 increased six-fold from the 2005 allocation (50 million CFAF as opposed to 300 million CFAF). However, due to liquidity constraints no transfer from the treasury to CENAGREF has taken place.

6.2 Transition arrangement to regular operations:

All the activities supported by the NPCMP fall under the institutional mandate of CENAGREF created to help manage the wildlife and biodiversity resources of Benin. CENAGREF is therefore technically well equipped to carry on and sustain the achievements of the NPCMP, and from a purely technical perspective all the NPCMP activities become regular operations of CENAGREF.

In this sense, little was needed in terms of arrangement in order to ensure the continuation of these operations. However, there are some concerns from a financial perspective. Based on the slow progress in the preparation work leading to the creation of the conservation trust fund, the MTR mission made strong recommendations on the need for the Government to provide increasing budgetary resources to support the operating costs of Program, starting in 2005. This recommendation was not implemented in 2005. As mentioned above, the Government did increase significantly the amount of resources allocated to CENAGREF in 2006 in order to help finance the operating costs. However, due to the country's difficult financial situation during this election year, the disbursement of these resources has been slow. It is expected that next year's budgetary allocations will at least match the 2006 level.

The European Union and the German Cooperation Also, level Because these recommendations were not implemented, the closing of the GEF grant resulted in severe financial stress for CENAGREF. The continuation of the operations is due to the fact that the closing dates of the grants from Germany (KfW/GTZ) and the European Union are 2007 and 2008 respectively. It is hoped that the efforts by CENAGREF to establish a conservation trust fund will be successful before the end of the remaining donors' support. If provided with the required resources, this trust fund will help finance the operating costs in the long run.

7. Bank and Borrower Performance

Bank

7.1 Lending:

The Bank's performance during program identification, preparation and appraisal is rated as **Unsatisfactory**. The Bank provided adequate resources (staff weeks and budget) that enabled the task team to carry out the preparation in a cost-effective and timely manner. During the lending phase, the missions were adequately staffed (appropriate mix of technical skills) with Bank and non-Bank staff, including staff from participating donors, Government representatives, and representatives from the NGOs (e.g., ARDET-Atakora, CBDD, IUCN). The skills, knowledge and experience of these stakeholders enhanced the design of the Program. This design reflected the lessons learned from conservation endeavors in Africa and other parts of the world by building on the right hypothesis that successful biodiversity conservation in rural and impoverished areas must integrate livelihood and long-term development needs of local populations. The Program's development objectives were consistent with the Government's development strategy as described in the NEAP and in the rural development, and with the Bank assistance strategy at the time.

However, there were some weaknesses in Bank performance during the lending phase. The first shortcoming was the lack of an effective implementation coordination mechanism given the number of donors and the complexity of the financing arrangement of the NPCMP. GTZ and KfW (Germany) and AFD (France) resources only financed interventions in the Pendjari National Park (i.e., component 2), while the EU financing supported investments in the W National Park (i.e., component 3). In fact, the interventions in the W National Park are part of a regional cooperation program managed by a tripartite commission (Benin, Burkina Faso, and Niger) based in Ouagadougou. The GEF grant proceeds were to finance most of the recurrent costs of the NPCMP. Each donor had their own grant agreement with the Government, and their planned operations had their own logical frame, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and financial

management procedures. Given these design features, the PAD should have included an effective mechanism in order to coordinate implementation among donors. The PAD addressed the coordination issue on page 33 in the section dealing with "programming, monitoring, and evaluation". In this section it is stated that the three operational directorates of CENAGREF will prepare an annual work program that is endorsed by the board of CENAGREF before implementation. It was assumed that this procedure will ensure the coherence of the activities and consolidate the programming. On "monitoring" the PAD stated that "the directorate of each park, and the technical directorate will monitor their activities with a set of performance and impact indicators". These two measures, i.e., agreed annual work program, and collaboration between the head of each park and the technical directorate do not provide any specific guidance on how actual coordination among site-specific interventions financed by different donors will take place. To sum up, the clear division of labor among the participating donors was not matched by a clear mechanism to coordinate the interventions. This lack of a clear coordination mechanism agreed upon at appraisal weakened the leverage of CENAGREF to effectively coordinate donors' interventions. Although there is no evidence this lack of strong control by CENAGREF hurt the results on the ground, it did undermine the national ownership of the Program.

The second shortcoming of the design is the weakness of the M&E system. In particular, the section on "Programming, Monitoring and Evaluation" needed more elaboration on the M&E tools, methods, integrated (multi-donor) framework, and implementation arrangements. Finally, the issues pertaining to the sustainability of CENAGREF and the program's achievements were not well handled. In fact, an exit strategy with regard to operational costs supported by the GEF, and a clear definition of activities to be implemented in order to not only establish a trust fund but also to identify the potential financiers of this trust fund were not thoroughly discussed during the preparation phase. Most precisely, the difficulty to establish such a fund and to endow it with sufficient resources was somehow underestimated.

7.2 Supervision:

Although the GEF grant resources financed mostly the operating costs, Bank supervision missions covered the full spectrum of the Program. Every attempt was made to ensure the participation of donors' representatives during Bank missions. In any case, the field technical advisers provided by the donors were always part of the supervision teams. In fact, the Bank maintained close coordination with the co-financiers of the Program, and carried out joint supervision missions, including the Mid-Term Review. In addition to the technical activities and issues related to conservation effectiveness, the Bank supervision missions also covered the fiduciary safeguards and strategic issues such as the management effectiveness and leadership of CENAGREF, and donor coordination. Supervision missions were carried out regularly, and the skill mix given the scope of the tasks were adequate. These conditions ensured adequate assessment/reporting, and diligent monitoring of reporting and auditing. It should be mentioned however that much of the follow up on the recommendations of the Mid-Term Review did not require field visits because the most important physical works that remained were handled by other donors. Nonetheless, while on different missions in Benin twice in 2004, the TTL visited the implementation agency to follow up on the implementation progress. The ESSD staff who was stationed in the field at the time also assured the follow up of the implementation from that end. These follow-up, though not formally recorded helped to update the Implementation Support Reports (ISRs).

It ought to be mentioned however that while the supervision missions were successful in handling routine monitoring of the Program activities, they were not effective in curbing the high level political interventions in the management of the Program. Although these interventions that were frequent, untimely and unnecessary did not disrupt the implementation of the field activities, they did weaken the leadership and effectiveness of CENAGREF's senior management, and hampered their ability to manage efficiently and effectively. Although there some progress was made in the procurement of goods, the post reviews conducted near the end of the of Program uncovered some residual weaknesses.

7.3 Overall Bank performance:

Despite the shortcomings noted during both the lending and supervision phases of the Program, the rating of the Bank's performance is "Satisfactory". This rating is based on the fact that these shortcomings did not have any serious adverse effect on the achievements of the Program. This is due mainly to the fact that these shortcomings tended to be associated with peripheral issues rather than the core investments and operations management in the field directorates.

Borrower

7.4 Preparation:

The borrower performance during Preparation is rated **Satisfactory**. During the preparation phase the Government of Benin mobilized and assigned its experts to prepare the program. When needed, decisional or political level actors contributed successfully to the preparation process. The project took too long to develop, but much of the delay was due to the mobilization of donors' resources.

7.5 Government implementation performance:

The performance of the Government is rated **Unsatisfactory**, mainly because it let regional politics and interests prevent the construction of the building that was supposed to house the CENAGREF's offices in Cotonou. It also was at the origin of frequent turnovers among CENAGREF's managers, which did not foster the building of a coherent and long term vision. Untimely political interventions also weakened CENAGREF's leadership and hampered the advisory and control role of CENAGREF's board in which all the key stakeholders, including the private sector are represented. There have been instances where the implementation of the board recommendations was unnecessarily hindered by the host ministry.

7.6 Implementing Agency:

The implementing agency performance is rated **Satisfactory** in light of the results achieved by the program. CENAGREF was very successful in creating the technical, institutional and social conditions that allowed the consolidation and rationalization of Benin protected area system. It designed an effective co-management scheme that is compatible with and supportive of the livelihood of the communities living around the two national parks. The implementing agency provided timely inputs (equipment, office supply, training, etc.) and technical oversight that contributed to the effectiveness of field operations. Based on a thorough understanding of its key constraints and opportunities, CENAGREF developed a flexible management and business plan for each national park. These plans will help to ensure the long-term sustainability of the protected area system through the sustainable use and conservation of the biodiversity resources. The implementing agency was able to reinvest part of the revenue generated by the parks into the management of the protected area system. Finally, as the GEF granted closed in 2005, the

implementing agency was able to secure 300 million CFAF (about US\$600,000 as opposed to the usual US\$100,000) from the national budget in order to help finance the operating costs.

Despite these good results, it is worth mentioning that CENAGREF could have done better in terms of cost control by reducing the size of its staff at the beginning of the Program (limiting recruitment to the minimum number of staff required to run the organization). The need to reduce the staff and to improve the quality of communication between the headquarters and the field offices was mentioned in two organizational audits whose recommendations were implemented timely. To a limited extent, lack of leadership played a role in failure to complete the steps to creating the conservation trust fund.

7.7 Overall Borrower performance:

The overall Recipient (Implementing agency, Governments) performance is rated **Satisfactory** by taking into account the results achieved both in preparation and implementation phases. Despite the shortcomings noticed, the willingness and the technical ability of regional and local teams as well as of the Government were key in the accomplishment of program objectives.

8. Lessons Learned

Co-management: The achievements of the NPCMP confirm the critical importance of involving local communities in the development of effective biodiversity conservation systems. By adopting a co-management approach that empowers local populations to play an active role in the management of wildlife and other genetic resources, the Program increased its legitimacy at the local level. The direct and indirect benefits that accrued to the local communities because of their active involvement in the park management activities allowed the Program to secure the effective collaboration of the Village Associations for the Management of Wildlife Reserves in the control of poaching and other environmentally harmful activities, and in the maintenance of park infrastructure. This situation reduced significantly the cost of surveillance and control activities for both parks.

Integrated conservation and development: The effective integration of conservation and development has always posed great challenges to the conservation community. These challenges are often due to the difficulty in demonstrating and maintaining a direct link between these interventions and the conservation activities and outcomes. To a significant degree, the NPCMP seemed to have achieved this integration by combining a set of activities that had a clear and positive impact on the living conditions of the local populations. These activities consisted of: (i) a transparent mechanism for sharing the revenues derived from hunting and tourism, (ii) direct employment of local populations in park management activities, (iii) controlled access to and use of natural resources following an agreed upon sustainable use plan, and (iv) financing of targeted community development initiatives, including the provision of social infrastructure, and small grants for income generating activities.

Effective multi-donor financing: The financing arrangement of the Program was based on the sharing of burden among donors. In the agreed scheme of burden sharing, the GEF incremental resources were to finance most of the operating costs of the Program including institutional building and capacity strengthening, while the other donors focused their support on site-specific

priority investments for effective protected area management. This arrangement allowed the GEF to leverage additional funding beyond and above the financing level agreed at appraisal (about 30% additional funding for the EU, and almost 80% for the German contribution). This additional funding will allow the Program activities to continue twenty four months following the closing of the GEF grant.

Effective coordination mechanisms are key requirements for multi-donor interventions: The NPCMP had five donors each with its grant agreement, its own financial management and reporting requirements, and logical frame. Component 3 “W” National Park Complex funded by the EU was part of a regional program (Benin, Burkina Faso, and Niger) managed by a tripartite commission based in Burkina Faso.

Yet, the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) did not include any specific coordination mechanism other than stating that “..all Program activities would fall under CENAGREF, and coordination of donors’ contributions would take place through an annual programming process resulting in yearly work plans that will ensure that no activities are financed twice by two different donors”. The PAD also lacked specific guidance for a consolidated monitoring and evaluation system. This lack of a clear coordination mechanism agreed upon at the appraisal weakened the leverage of CENAGREF to effectively coordinate donors’ interventions. Although there is no evidence this lack of strong control by CEANGREF hurt the results on the ground, it did undermine the national ownership of the Program.

Ensuring financial sustainability of biodiversity conservation agencies is key: While the Program was able to identify the procedural, administrative and legal steps towards the establishment of an international trust fund, very little is known at this stage about the origin of the funds that would be deposited in this trust when it is created. Since the core activities supported by the NPCMP consist of long-term measures aimed at achieving the pursued global environment objectives, the uncertainty associated with the materialization of this trust fund and the lack of any credible alternative means for supporting the recurrent costs constitute a serious threat to the sustainability of the Program’s achievements. This undesirable outcome could have been avoided had the design of the Program included a clear phase out strategy for the financing of the recurrent costs. A clear exit strategy during the implementation of the Program would have accelerated the identification and securing of a viable alternative means for financing the recurrent cost of the Program.

9. Partner Comments

(a) Borrower/implementing agency:

The Government judged the project Satisfactory and was pleased with the catalytic role played by the CENAGREF in promoting the importance of better management of protected areas to reach a sustainable management of biodiversity. The key role played by the Bank in bringing other donors around the table was recognized. Moreover, the financial support of the GEF that permitted the functioning of the CENAGREF and the flexibility of the Bank in reallocating GEF funds were very much appreciated.

The Government asserted that substantial issues (poaching, fires, farms, cotton culture, etc.) that

were threatening the parks have been controlled. The project supported the CENAGREF on the following aspects:

- Institutional support and capacities building of institutions involved in protected areas management: the NPMCP helped the CENAGREF to (i) develop a system based on short term trainings to strengthen staff capacities, (ii) acquire equipments such as transportation means, computers, GPS and cyber trackers, (iii) develop a quite innovative system of control and surveillance in the parks, which proved effective in reducing poaching and enabling the reconstitution of mammal populations and (iv) build surveillance infrastructures such as roads and watchtowers. However, the end of the GEF project put the central office of CENAGREF in a precarious situation and left it with very limited means to play its coordination and support role.
- Improvement of communication: in 2002 a communication strategy developed in 1998 was implemented, and in 2003 a communication strategy covering the period 2003-2006 was developed. Several workshops and forums involving local NGOs, the civil society, the private sector and local populations were organized. In addition, 3 web sites were developed and/or maintained: www.cenagref.firstnet.bj, www.pendjari.net, and www.ecopas.org.bf. Under this window, local populations were thoroughly involved in the project, particularly through the PEGEI, which worked with women and precarious groups. The CENAGREF regretted, however that, despite all the efforts made, the frequentation rate of National Parks remains low, and the ministry of tourism does not take the initiative of attracting tour operators and taking advantage of the touristic products available.
- Involvement of local populations in park management activities: the use of a co-management approach involving local communities was one of the most satisfactory aspects of the program. A network of 100 AVIGREFs is active in the field and plays a central role in helping CENAGREF manage wildlife reserves and acting as rural development implementing agencies. Nonetheless, credit recovery rate for micro-credit grants are very low and the impact of those micro-credits is yet to be demonstrated.
- Studies on Ecosystems and habitats: more than 15 studies were financed by the GEF project to support the production of the law on the “Regime de la faune” and provide GIS-based ecological monitoring systems with baseline data. The systems are operational and the law was promulgated in 2004.
- Establishment of sustainable financial mechanism: the establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism to finance biodiversity conservation in Benin has not been done yet. The legal framework and lack of competencies were among the reasons that hampered the setting-up of a trust fund as planned.

(b) Cofinanciers:

Not available.

(c) Other partners (NGOs/private sector):

Not available.

10. Additional Information

GEF Review Criteria

Implementation Approach

The logical framework of the NPCMP did not change during project implementation. The implementation approach that was adopted relies on the co-management of resources. This approach was efficient due to the fact that not only did it reduce the anthropic pressure on natural resources, thus favoring biodiversity conservation and regeneration, but it also helped local populations improve their livelihood conditions. Important lessons were drawn from PGRN and PAPH during the program preparation phase, and the encouraging results achieved re-enforced the relevance, effectiveness, and attractiveness of the co-management or community-based approach to biodiversity conservation.

Country Ownership/Driveness

The Bank and the Government of Benin supported the development of a National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP), and the subsequent establishment of a National Environmental Agency (*Agence Béninoise pour l'Environnement*) to monitor the implementation of the NEAP. The effective management of national parks and other protected areas for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity was an important objective of the NEAP. Country ownership was strong throughout the preparation and implementation, although the Government's financial stance did not allow the allocation and disbursement of the budgetary resources needed to support part of the operating costs of the Program during the last two years (counterpart resources were fully paid during this period). It is important to mention that the activities supported by the Program fall under the CENAGREF's mandate, and will therefore be carried out by this permanent agency. The contribution of the Government's own budgetary resources to support partly the continuation of these activities is still a key ownership and driveness test for the Benin.

Public involvement

The active involvement of local populations in the Program's activities is a key feature and contributor to its achievements. The AVIGREFs were the key partners in the co-management scheme, and played a crucial role in activities such as control and surveillance by providing human and financial resources. They also provided labor for the control and management of bush fires. In the Pendjari complex, the AVIGREFs dedicated up to 14 percent of their annual budget to covering the costs of surveillance activities. In the same area, more than 200 villagers were involved in control and surveillance teams. In addition, AVIGREFs played a critical role in disseminating and explaining regulations pertaining to wildlife conservation and its benefits not only from an ecological perspective but also from an economical and social stand point. Today, 100 AVIGREFs comprising 2,390 members are active and play a valuable intermediary role between populations and the wildlife management administration.

Replication approach

Based on its achievements, the NPMCP can be considered a successful Program. Many factors contributed to this success, but there are two features of the Program that made a significant contribution to this success and that are worth replicating elsewhere. One of these features is the institutional development represented by the emergence of CENAGREF. Despite financial durability issues, CENAGREF is seen in the sub-region and beyond as good model to replicate. The second feature that is worth replicating is the successfully implemented a co-management scheme that empowered the AVIGREFs to execute a wide array of conservation and non conservation activities. Wildlife conservation professionals from Ivory-Coast, Burkina Faso and Niger regularly visited Benin to take stock of the strengths and challenges emerging from these two and other features of the NPCMP.

Financial planning

Identification of co-financing sources

With the support provided by the Bank, CENAGREF was able to identify and mobilize additional sources of co-financing funds as presented in Table 1(see page 17).

The Program did leverage a significant amount of resources including approximately US\$150,000 from the Government of Benin to support the PEGEI component when the Netherlands put its participation to the project on hold between March 2003 and September 2004. The EU added 923,000 Euros to the initial 3,000,000 Euros, whereas the German Technical and Financial Cooperation increased their initial financing by at least 45%. In addition, the project generated US\$889,000 from tourism and hunting activities. These resources helped to finance the operating costs and served to pay operational expenses and to support AVIGREFs. Most of the EU and German leveraged resources will finance investments and operating cost until 2008.

Financial control

Even though external auditors issued favorable opinions on financial statements without any reserve, financial management during project implementation was not as effective as one would like it to be. The lack of technical capacity in financial management, financial dashboard, skills required to use the financial management software, and the frequent personnel turnover within the financial management team are the main causes of the weak performance in financial management. However, it should be mentioned that the complex financing arrangement of the Program due to the number of donors and the differences in their financial management procedures and reporting format made things even harder for the financial management team.

Cost-effectiveness

In agreement with the incremental cost criterion, GEF resources supplemented with funds from other donors as shown in Table 1. The GEF resources were used to finance activities that would not have been financed otherwise, such as the development of biodiversity management tools, and the support to management and capacity building activities that would allow the achievement of

the global environment benefits. However, one could question the appropriateness of using GEF funds to pay salaries and other operational costs during 5 years. The fact that this course of action was taken without the adoption of an exit strategy may hurt the sustainability of the Program's achievements after the closing of the GEF grant because of the lack of resources to finance the recurrent costs.

Completion of planned activities

The GEF project was completed on time. It lasted 5 years and almost 95% of the GEF funding of US\$6.8 million was disbursed at closing.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Despite the production of activity reports based on the implementation of agreed upon annual work plans, the monitoring and evaluation system was one of the weakest aspects of the Program. In fact, no formal monitoring and evaluation activities were carried out during project implementation. The CENAGREF explained that situation by the fact that donors' logical frameworks were incompatible. While the limited flexibility of these logical frameworks could have played a role, it was the view of the ICR mission that the lack of leadership and adequate competencies also hampered the establishment of an effective and integrated M&E system. This being said, each national park had relatively good M&E plan that allowed the tracking of the implementation results, and the undertaking of remedial actions when needed.

Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix

Outcome / Impact Indicators:

Indicator/Matrix	Projected in last PSR ¹	Actual/Latest Estimate
Each national park has prepared and adopted a medium-term business plan for sustainable wildlife management and conservation	Yes	Yes

Output Indicators:

Indicator/Matrix	Projected in last PSR ¹	Actual/Latest Estimate
CENAGREF has prepared and adopted a comprehensive medium-term business plan	Yes	Yes
Self-financing ratio:DPNP=45%; DPNW=33%; CENAGREF= 27%	50%	DPNP=45%; DPNW=40%; CENAGREF=NA
Increasing of abundance index of buffalo,hippotrague, cobe de buffon and wart hog living in protected areas	Pendjari National Park: Buffalo:0.0175; Hippotrague:0.0358; cobe de buffon:0.0477; wart hog:0.0350 W National Park: Buffalo:0.010; Hip potrague:0.054; cobe de buffon:0.018; wart hog:0.040	Pendjari National Park: Buffalo:0.0175; Hippotrague:0.0358; cobe de buffon:0.0477; wart hog:0.0350 W National Park: Buffalo:0.012; Hip potrague:0.071; cobe de buffon:0.015; wart hog:0.044
Improved park infrastructure for better patrol, wildlife management, and tourism development	700 km of roads, 3 main bases and 12 secondary posts	1,300 km of roads, 9 watchtowers, 15 surveillance posts and 10 ponds
Increased park generated income to neighboring populations	30% of park revenue paid to the AVIGREF	30% of park revenue paid to the AVIGREF (representing US\$178,200)
15 out of 26 AVIGREF in Pendjari and 30 out of 75 of AVIGREF in W are viable organizations and are technically equipped to participate effectively in co-management schemes for wildlife resources.	100	100
At least 2 hunting areas are created and managed by local population with the CENAGREF assistance	3	3
Number of illegal activities is low in parks and hunting areas	0 farms	4 farms
A conservation trust fund is created by the end of the project	No	No

¹ End of project

Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing

Project Cost by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate US\$ million	Actual/Latest Estimate US\$ million	Percentage of Appraisal
Common actions at the national level	2.87	3.69	128.6
Pendjari complex	1.08	1.47	136.1
W complex	2.81	1.60	56.9
Total Baseline Cost	6.76	6.76	
Total Project Costs	6.76	6.76	
Total Financing Required	6.76	6.76	

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Appraisal Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method ¹			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	0.00 (0.00)	6.73 (0.46)	1.19 (0.08)	0.00 (0.00)	7.92 (0.54)
2. Goods	2.22 (0.62)	0.56 (0.16)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	2.78 (0.78)
3. Services	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	8.54 (2.69)	0.00 (0.00)	8.54 (2.69)
4. Operating costs	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	5.00 (2.75)	0.00 (0.00)	5.00 (2.75)
5. Miscellaneous	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
6. Miscellaneous	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Total	2.22 (0.62)	7.29 (0.62)	14.73 (5.52)	0.00 (0.00)	24.24 (6.76)

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Actual/Latest Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method ¹			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	0.00 (0.00)	6.73 (0.00)	1.19 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	7.92 (0.00)
2. Goods	2.22 (0.11)	0.56 (0.30)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	2.78 (0.41)
3. Services	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	8.54 (1.05)	0.00 (0.00)	8.54 (1.05)
4. Operating costs	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	5.00 (5.30)	0.00 (0.00)	5.00 (5.30)

5. Miscellaneous	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
6. Miscellaneous	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Total	2.22 (0.11)	7.29 (0.30)	14.73 (6.35)	0.00 (0.00)	24.24 (6.76)

^{1/} Figures in parenthesis are the amounts to be financed by the Bank Loan. All costs include contingencies.

^{2/} Includes civil works and goods to be procured through national shopping, consulting services, services of contracted staff of the project management office, training, technical assistance services, and incremental operating costs related to (i) managing the project, and (ii) re-lending project funds to local government units.

Project Financing by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate			Actual/Latest Estimate			Percentage of Appraisal		
	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.
Common Actions at the National level	2.87	0.56	0.11	3.69			128.6	0.0	0.0
Pendjari Complex	1.08	1.40	8.48	1.47			136.1	0.0	0.0
W Complex	2.81	3.35	14.14	1.60			56.9	0.0	0.0

Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits

It was not possible or practical to calculate the economic costs and benefits for such a project which by nature does not aim directly at economic benefits. Therefore, no economic analysis was prepared.

Annex 4. Bank Inputs

(a) Missions:

Stage of Project Cycle	No. of Persons and Specialty (e.g. 2 Economists, 1 FMS, etc.)		Performance Rating		
	Month/Year	Count	Specialty	Implementation Progress	Development Objective
Identification/Preparation					
	09/15/1997	2	MISSION LEADER (1) AGRI-ECONOMIST (1)	S	S
Appraisal/Negotiation					
	06/24/1998 (Appraisal)	5	MISSION LEADER (1); AGRI-ECONOMIST (1); SENIOR ECONOMIST (1); SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST (1); CONSULTANT (1)	S	S
	10/05/1998 (Negotiation)	4	MISSION LEADER (1) LAWYER (1); AGRI-ECONOMIST (1); DISBURSEMENT SPEC (1)	S	S
Supervision					
	09/23/2000	3	PROJECT ASSIST., KFW (1); PROJECT MANAGER, KFW (1); TASK TEAM LEADER (1)	S	S
	06/04/2001		MISSION LEADER (1) KFW REPRESENTATIVES (2)	S	S
	01/14/2002	2	TEAM LEADER (1); RURAL DEVELOPMENT SPEC (1)	S	S
	11/28/2002	3	TTL (1); SR. FINANCIAL SPECIALI (1); DISBURSEMENT ANALYST (1)	S	S
	11/03/2003 (MTR)	6	MISSION LEADER (1) SENIOR AGRI-ECONOMIST (1) FINANCIAL SPECIALIST (1) PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST (1) DISBURSEMENT SPECIALIST (1); ECOLOGIST (1)	S	S
	03/31/2005	3	MISSION LEADER (1), FINANCIAL SPECIALIST (1), PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST (1)	S	S
ICR					
	04/08/2006	2	MISSION LEADER (1) MEMBER (1)	S	S

(b) Staff:

Stage of Project Cycle	Actual/Latest Estimate	
	No. Staff weeks	US\$ ('000)
Identification/Preparation		366
Appraisal/Negotiation		155
Supervision		262
ICR		56
Total		839

Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components

(H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible, NA=Not Applicable)

	<u>Rating</u>				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Macro policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Sector Policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Physical</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Financial</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Institutional Development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Environmental</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<i>Social</i>					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Poverty Reduction</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Gender</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Private sector development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Public sector management</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA

Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory)

6.1 Bank performance

Rating

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lending | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supervision | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |

6.2 Borrower performance

Rating

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preparation | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government implementation performance | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input type="radio"/> S | <input checked="" type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation agency performance | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |

Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents

- National Parks Conservation and Management Program – Appraisal Report, February, 24 2000, WB
- Project Status Reports from 2001 to 2005
- Supervision aide-memoirs from 2001 to 2005
- Rapport synthèse de fin de projet, CENAGREF – April 2006

