A. BASIC TRUST FUND INFORMATION

Most basic information should be automatically linked to SAP TF Master Data and IBTF

TF Name: The Gambia Biodiversity Management and Institutional Strengthening Project
TF Number: TF098110
Task Team Leader Name/TF Managing Unit: Liba C. Feldblyum/AFTN2
TF Amount (as committed by donors): $945,000
Recipient of TF funds (Bank/Recipient, if Recipient state name of recipient government and implementing agency): The Republic of The Gambia/ Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM), Ministry of Forestry and Environment (MFEN)
Type of TF (Free-standing/ programmatic/ new TF for an ongoing program):
Single/Multi Donor: Multiple Donors
Donor(s) Name(s): Global Environment Facility
TF Program Source Code: GEFIA
Purpose of TF (Co-financing/Investment financing/ Debt Service/ Advisory Activities- Bank/Advisory Activities-Recipient, etc): Co-financing
TF Approval/IBTF Clearance Date: 10/29/2010
TF Activation Date: 03/25/2011
TF Closing Date(s): 05/31/2014
Date of ICM Submission to TFO:
Cost and Financing Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Project Preparation</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Agency Fee (10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>94,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Contribution</td>
<td>In kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO (WWF/WAMER/PRCM/ FIBA/FFEM)</td>
<td>Int'l NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,158,876</td>
<td>1,158,876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Co-financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,203,876</td>
<td>2,203,876</td>
<td>94,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ A Project Preparation Grant of $50,660 was approved in November 2010 to fund consultancies and software in support to the DPWM to prepare the project.
Actual Costs as of April 30, 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Project Preparation</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF (as of Jan 2014)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>945,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Contribution</td>
<td>In kind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO (WWF/WAMER/PRCM/FI BA/FFEM)</td>
<td>Int'l NGO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,334,540</td>
<td>1,334,540</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Co-financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,379,540</td>
<td>2,379,540</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2/ Actual costs are higher due to an underestimation of co-financing contributions at the design stage.

B. TRUST FUND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND DESIGN

1. Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Development Objectives

Provide original statement of objectives from the approved/cleared IBTF. If original objectives have been changed, explain the timing and nature of the revisions, their justification and approval authority given.

To improve the effectiveness and sustainability of biodiversity and protected areas management in two selected protected areas.

2. Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Activities/Components

Provide original activities/components to be financed by the Trust Fund. If original activities/components have been changed, identify them, and explain the nature of the revisions, their justification and approving authority.

The Trust Fund components and activities were not revised.

The original components were:

**Component 1**: Strengthened Field Effectiveness of Biodiversity and Protected Areas (PA) Management (GEF US$405,000).

**Component 2**: Development of Long-Term Sustainable Financing Vision (GEF US$250,000).

**Component 3**: Capacity Development for Management of PAs and Biodiversity (GEF US$200,000).

**Component 4**: Project Management Unit (GEF US$90,000).

3. Outcome Indicators

Provide original performance benchmarks to be measured in the assessment of outcome. If none were established, explain why not.

The original key performance indicators for the project were:
(a) Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score for the two protected areas (PA) increased; and

(b) Sustainable financing mechanism identified and tested in the 2 selected PAs.

4. Other Significant Changes in Trust Fund Design

Describe and explain the rationale for any changes made in design, scope and scale, implementation arrangements and schedule and funding allocation.

Soon after effectiveness, the Letter Agreement was amended to reflect a reorganization of the disbursement categories and the addition of eligible expenditures for operating costs, which was not included in the original legal documents due to an administrative oversight on the part of the Bank. Funds were reallocated once on July 17, 2013 from Category 3 to Category 1 to reflect the increased investment costs of implementing Component 1 and decreased costs for the other three components.

The original trust fund closing date was extended once in November 22, 2013, by about 4.5 months from January 15, 2014 to May 31, 2014 to allow for the completion of two activities: (a) the testing of two sustainable financing mechanisms in the two PAs (under Component 2); and (b) the finalization of the implementation of DPWM’s restructuring (under Component 3). A reallocation of funds between categories accompanied the request for extension of the closing date to reflect an increased amount of funding needed for implementing the activities under Component 1 and decreased costs for Components 2 and 3.

C. OUTCOME

1. Relevance of TF Objectives, Design and Implementation

Discuss how the Trust Fund objectives, design and implementation are proved relevant to current global/regional/country priorities and the Bank’s sector strategy

The BMIS remains relevant to current global, regional, and country priorities today as it did at design. The project was developed as part of the West Africa biodiversity program and was within the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area. Through its achievements, the project supports the Biodiversity Program’s second objective: To Catalyze the Sustainability of Protected Area Systems, and fulfilled the eligibility criteria of Strategic Program 2: Increasing Representation for Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas by strengthening the ongoing efforts to improve the management effectiveness of government and community-managed system of protected areas. The project also contributed to Strategic Program 1: Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level through achievements under Components 2 and 3 which supports the development of a long-term vision for sustainable conservation financing and associated activities.

In terms of country priorities, The Gambia’s long-term strategic goals were articulated in its Vision 2020, which aimed at “... guaranteeing a well-balanced ecosystem” in order to
achieve middle income status by 2020. The project is also consistent with the Second Joint Partnership Strategy for FY13-16 (March 2013), between IDA, AFD and The Gambia, which outlined the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) in 2007, which provides a policy framework to address the impact of climate change at national and local levels. Within this framework, the key national adaptation measures includes support to the forestry sector in terms of “enhanced community participation in the management of forests and protected areas.” The project continued to support the Government’s Tourism Master Plan developed in 2005 within which an ecotourism strategy was defined. The strategy envisioned the contributions to be made by the protected areas and biodiversity conservation areas to the country’s economic growth and poverty alleviation.

In the sector, the project built on the successes of the Integrated Coastal Area and Marine Biodiversity Management (ICAM) Project (closed March 2008) which put in place the foundation for future conservation and management of coastal and marine protected areas in the country. The BMIS continued to support the innovative participatory approaches to conservation with local communities and local site committees, the community sub-projects for biodiversity friendly alternative livelihood activities, participatory management plans (PMP), data collection and analysis and the development of national data base for species monitoring, and institutional and human capacity building at various levels.

2. Achievement of TF Development Objective

Discuss and rate the extent to which the Trust Fund development objectives have been met, with linkage to outcome indicators. This includes an assessment as to whether the actual output/deliverables were successfully completed, compared to the expected output, for each activity/component of the Trust Fund. For activities where the output is a report or a dissemination event such as a workshop, conference, training, or study tour, discuss and rate the Quality, Presentation and Dissemination. Applicable reports and/or documents are to be attached to the ICM.

The trust fund objectives have been met satisfactorily. All project activities have been completed successfully for the two protected areas (PAs), and key performance indicators for the project have been met. Overall, the national capacity for PA management and biodiversity conservation has been strengthened through improved institutional structures and evaluation methods for measuring institutional performance and management effectiveness. Prospects for sustainable use of resources are improved through the involvement with affected communities in the management of the PAs, the introduction and piloting of sustainable financing mechanism to fund conservation efforts in the future.

Key Project Outcome Indicator 1: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) scores for the two PAs increased.

This indicator has been met and targets were exceeded. METT scores collected to gauge overall management effectiveness of the project sites have shown a steady increase year
by year, exceeding targets set for each of the selected PA until end of project (EOP) (see table below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Area</th>
<th>METT Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanji</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiang West</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Project Outcome Indicator 2:** Sustainable financing mechanism identified and tested in the two selected PAs.

This indicator has been substantially met. By EOP, sustainable financing mechanisms had been identified and tested for each PA. An eco-tourism package was proposed for Tanji National Park and has been identified and tested. Crocodile hunting was proposed for Kiang West National Park and the consultant recruited for the study; however, the study could not be completed before EOP. The National Biodiversity Trust Fund was been established and seed funding ($40,000) available in trust fund account.

**Outputs by Component:**

**Component 1: Strengthened Field Effectiveness of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management.**

The Participatory Management Plans (PMPs) for both Tanji and Kiang West national parks were finalized in Nov. 2012. Activities implemented under these PMPs include the purchase of educational equipment, waterholes constructed, maintenance of boats and engines, anti-waste dumping campaigns (Tanji), community sub-projects in both parks, financial sustainability survey review. The PMPs are rendered operational through annual work plans and budgets prepared by each PA team and tracked through quarterly progress reports.

Two action plans for two endangered species (hippos and sitatunga) were completed in Dec. 2012 and were being implemented at EOP. Teams of technicians (staff members, community members, and key stakeholders) conducted bi-monthly field monitoring and baseline data collection activities, not only the project pilot sites but also of other PA and ecologically-sensitive areas. In addition to the two targeted species of hippos and sitatunga, the teams were also collecting data on other species including manatees, crocodiles, and marine turtles. The collected data relating to species abundance, distribution, threats (indices), and other relevant information, are subsequently used to populate the national species database.

Other activities which were completed under the species database subcomponent included the development of: (a) a small set of key indicators needed for monitoring
endangered species and/or park health status (e.g., population size, habitat ranges,); and (b) a consistent monitoring and evaluation (M&E) method with a clear data collection protocol, including standardized forms and periodicity of measurement for each species/ecosystem indicator.

Strengthened field effectiveness of biodiversity and PA management also included capacity building and training of staff in the following areas: (a) the staff of the two pilot sites were introduced to the techniques of preparing and developing a business plan; and (b) surveillance field staff in the PAs were introduced to the Biodiversity/Wildlife Act of 2003 and trained on conducting patrols, arrests, reporting and prosecution. These training events enabled the DPWM to attract participants who only attended a project workshop for the first time.

The construction, rehabilitation and equipping of park offices, information centers, and basic infrastructure in the two parks of Tanji and Kiang West, such as ranger outstations, signs and notice boards, and the upgrading of management and visitor infrastructure (ranger outstations, guard posts, trails, bird hides, water holes, etc.) were all completed successfully by September 2013 and were implemented ahead of schedule. Both facilities were confided to the PMU and respective Site Management Committees the same year. Boreholes have been dug and offices are equipped with solar panels to supply electricity in the headquarters of the two pilot sites. The project was also able to add two new infrastructures, a ranger post and a resting shelter for visitors in Kiang West national park.

**Sustainable alternative livelihood sub-projects**, selected with the participation of communities in and around the PAs, included beekeeping and agro-forestry. Implementation of these sub-projects was well-received by the communities and continued to benefit the communities in and around the parks. With regards to beneficiaries reached, it was estimated that about five thousand people in the five villages in and around the parks benefitted from the woodlot gardens established by the project, and more than a hundred people were engaged in beekeeping activities at EOP. With the establishment of beekeeping program, and the woodlot gardens in the reserve buffer zone, it was estimated that the percentage of the population benefitting from the programs would have increased as the production of honey is increased and sold on the market.

Participating communities also reported that many of the hides in woodlot gardens were successfully colonized by bees. However, woodlots did not fare as well as they were subjected to periodic uprooting in Kiang West by baboons searching for sapling and new foliage, as well as from grazing cattle, and had to be replaced.

**Component 2: Development of Long-term Sustainable Financing Vision**

Identification of one source of sustainable revenue from PAs and a sustainable financing mechanism established.
A study on long-term sustainable conservation financing options was carried out and the report “Development of Sustainable Protected Area Revenue Study,” was finalized and submitted in October 2013. The report included a road map for public/private partnership.

The study on the identification and piloting of one source of sustainable revenue from the PA has also been completed. Among the report’s recommendations was a proposal to combine four different business ventures into one eco-tourism package for testing in Tanji, which would include working with tour operators, establishing a tourism package with an existing reptile farm, the existing Tanji museum, and eco-lodge. In Kiang West, the recommendations included establishing crocodile hunting as a revenue-generating investment.

The proposals have been tested and a website has been made available for the public to consult and book field trips at the following website address: http://www.gambiawildlifeculturaltours.com. The associated road map included the following stages which have been implemented:

- Training staff in data collection;
- Proposing a species management plan;
- Determining the annual species harvest quota; and
- Liaising with the Convention on International Trade in endangered Species of Wildlife and Flora (CITES) for management of the program.

At EOP, a study was ongoing to establishing a population estimate of the crocodiles but was not yet completed. The DPWM was also implementing a field monitoring program on the crocodile species to identify critical hotspots and secured the services of an international expert to assist in carrying out an in-depth survey of the crocodile and examine prospects for establishing hunting to boost revenues for the area. Unfortunately, although the consultant was selected, the work could not be completed before project closing. Subsequently, the DPWM has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with The Gambia Tourism Board to look into institutionalizing a bird fair in Tanji Bird Reserve consistent with biodiversity and conservation goals.

The guidelines for private sector involvement was completed and validated in a national workshop; key stakeholders provided comments which were incorporated into the final report. The report is a milestone for the DPWM and provides a valuable guide for future investments in biodiversity and wildlife management in The Gambia and is meant to attract potential investors. The report was also widely disseminated to various stakeholders, companies and individuals with an interest in investing or participating in the management of wildlife in the country. As a result of disseminating the guidelines to interested parties, the DPWM was able to establish a partnership with a private conservation agency and charity, Eagle Heights, one of the largest Birds of Prey Centers in the United Kingdom. Eagle Heights also operates an animal sanctuary, rescue operations, and conservation education and building programs. The conservation agency is currently investing in The Gambia, based on the guidelines developed by the project,
by building a facility in the Abuko Nature Reserve near the DPWM’s headquarters, to house and display various animals for visitors in aid of generating revenues for the management of PAs. The center will also contain educational/teaching facilities and is expected to be operation by July 2014.

**Component 3: Capacity Development for Management of PA Network Supported.**

As part of the institutional strengthening objective under this component, the DPWM has been successfully reorganized from the seven subsections to a more streamlined structure with two main divisions. Relevant documentation such as Terms of Reference of staff, administrative manuals, and organogram have been completed to accompany the restructuring and the staffing of the DPWM at EOP reflected the new organizational structure and as of January 2014, the finalized annual work/business plan for the new divisions, sections, and individuals were being implemented.

With regards to targeted training funded under the project to build human capacity, all of the identified training needs of DPWM staff and key stakeholders have been met and at EOP this reached the targeted 100 percent of persons trained. Training targets were consistently exceeded year by year during the implementation period.

A study to develop a business plan and develop a fund-raising strategy which matched biodiversity and protected area goals with likely sources of financing was completed in July 2013. The final report made the following recommendations as revenue generating options: (a) establish a Biodiversity Trust Fund (BTF) to help increase the national parks’ financial autonomy; and (b) impose “green taxes” for conservation, e.g., airport fees, green taxes on vehicles, hotel and fuel tax for conservation.

Subsequently, the BTF was approved and established in September 2013, following which a bank account was opened and US$40,000 has been deposited from the project as seed funding. An operational manual has also been prepared.

**Component 4: Project Management Unit Support.**

The Project Management Unit (PMU) was established and fully staffed early in implementation with a Project Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Procurement Specialist, Financial Management (FM) Specialist, and an Administrative Assistant. The recruitment of the FM specialist was instrumental in improving the quality and timeliness of interim financial reporting required by the Bank. During implementation, the PMU carried out its management mandate effectively, maintained close collaboration with the affected communities on conservation activities.

The Project Steering Committee, selected during the first year of implementation, held its first meeting in April 2012 and operated satisfactorily. It was chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Forestry and Environment and had the mandate to review project progress, approve work plans and budgets, and the proposed sub-projects throughout implementation.
The DPWM/PMU maintained close collaboration with the affected communities in and around the project sites to develop and implement Participatory Management Plans (PMPs) and community sub-projects in support of finding alternative livelihood and income generating activities for the communities.

3. Efficiency
Describe the degree to which the Trust Fund activities have been efficiently implemented, in terms of their associated costs, implementation times and economic and financial returns.

The project uses the existing structures in country which includes various committees, working groups and associations, from the national, regional and local levels as partners in project implementation. It also collaborates with the WWF-WAMER/PRCM project by using the same groups in coordinating project activities, e.g., the Coastal and Marine Environment Management Group and the Project Steering Committee.

With regards to rates of return calculations, the BMIS was a grant which did not have a cost recovery aspect. Funds were transferred directly to the implementing agency, PMU/DPWM which handled the procurement of equipment and materials for community sub-projects. Project investments were for public benefit designed to protect natural resources and strengthen institutions and therefore rates of return analysis would be difficult to quantify. However, benefits relative to costs would be of a global nature and benefits from PAs management and biodiversity conservation have demonstrated positive results for communities and the public, and carried a larger impact than anticipated in terms of institutional strengthening for the government institutions in The Gambia.

4. Development Impacts, including those that are Unintended/Unrelated to TF Objectives
Discuss all other outcomes and impacts achieved under the Trust Fund (including unintended, positive and negative). Where relevant, discuss how the Trust Fund has contributed to the development/strengthening of relevant institutions, mobilization of other resources, knowledge exchange, recipient policy/program implementation, replicable best practices, introduction of new products, New Forms of Cooperation with Other Development Institutions/NGOs, etc., which would not have been achieved in the absence of the Trust Fund.

Under the project, the DPWM has been strengthened further to be able to implement all project activities efficiently, with positive results. An important outcome of the project is that the DPWM was able to establish an MOU with the Gambia Tourism Board in support of new business proposals supported by the project. It was also able to form a new partnership with a private conservation foundation, Eagle Heights, based on presentation of proposals and guidelines developed with the support of the project.

A positive indicator of project ownership was found in the activity on species data collection. In addition to collecting data on the two species (hippos and sitatunga) targeted under the project, the technical teams began collecting data on other species...
including manatees, crocodiles, and marine turtles to be fed into the national species data base.

5. Overall TF Outcome

Justification for overall outcome rating, taking into account the Trust Fund’s relevance, achievement of each TF development objectives, efficiency and development impact. (Rating Scale would be consistent with the six point scale used in ISR/ICR: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU))

The overall TF outcome rating is Satisfactory. The project achieved most of its stated objectives and output targets and consolidated the gains made under the ICAM Project. As a result of the project, the development impact compared to the investment costs are substantial: the DPWM has been restructured and strengthened, new public/private partnerships have been launched, and the participatory approaches being put into practice closely involve local communities greatly enhance the country’s prospects for sustainable PA management. In addition, training and technical assistance have: (a) built the capacity of local site committees, key stakeholders, and community groups for developing business ventures; (b) reinforced the national capacity for species data collection, monitoring and analysis, and enhanced the integration of a national species data base; and (c) improved the prospects for financing PA management and conservations efforts through the testing of sustainable sources of financing.

D. Risk to Development Outcome

1. Follow-On Results and/or Investment Activities

Identify and provide a description of the role played by this TF that led to those follow-up activities or investments checked below. (Check all that are applicable):

Currently, there are no follow-up activities planned.

Activity/Investment:
_____ Recipient/Other Investment; _____ Grant Project/Program; _____ Bank Project; _____ IFC Financial Project/Activity

2. Replicability

Describe and rate the extent to which the Trust Fund has generated useful lessons and methodology that are replicable in other sectors and/or regions.

The BMIS has demonstrated that continued donor support is needed over the long-term to consolidate the gains made from institutional strengthening, but that the support should be designed with a realistic progression of development stages to be measured against achievable indicators.

The National Biodiversity Trust Fund, if successfully managed, will be a strong indicator of political will and country ownership of environmental resources management
objectives, and would send a positive signal of political stability which could attract the investments in tourism that the Government of The Gambia has envisioned.

3. Overall Risk to Development Outcome
Rate how likely, and for how long, the outcomes will be sustained after completion of Trust Fund activities, and the likelihood that some changes may occur that are detrimental to the achievement of the TF development objectives. These may include factors such as technical, financial, economic, social, political, environmental, government ownership/commitment, other stakeholder ownership, institutional support, governance and natural disasters exposure. (Rating Scale would be consistent with the four point scale used in ISR/ICR: Negligible to Low (L), Moderate (M), Significant (S) and High (H))

Overall Risk is rated as Moderate.

The DPWM has been restructured and further strengthened to continue its successful collaboration with partners in the private sector, government, and local communities, ranging from establishing and developing financing options such as eco-tourism to finance future operations, to maintaining the national species data base and related monitoring and data collection requirements, and strengthening partnerships with communities for alternative livelihoods. In further support of long-term institutional strengthening, the Project Management Unit (PMU) was housed within the DPWM which mainstreams project management and implementation experience into national institutions.

The project was implemented by a committed team within the DPWM who were able to implement project activities with minimum political interference. The Government also indicated its support for the project through the Minister of the Environment, Parks and Wildlife who visited the Kiang West to evaluate the project’s implementation in early 2013.

Combined with the above, there is strong indication that the local communities are actively participating in project activities: successfully implementing the alternative livelihood projects, and collaborating in monitoring the progress of new initiatives by providing feedback to the government staff, doing basic data collection and species monitoring, and performing basic surveillance activities for the protection of shared resources.

E. PERFORMANCE

1. Bank
Rate and justify rating on how well the Bank carried out its specific responsibilities assumed under the Trust Fund. If the TF financed Secretariat functions, describe how well the Secretariat carried out its roles and responsibilities, and its exit strategy, if any. If the Bank is executing Recipient work on behalf of Recipient, describe how well the rationale for Bank execution (as specified in the IBTF) was realized. (Rating Scale would
be consistent with the six point scale used in ISR/ICR: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU))

Bank Performance at design and implementation support stages are rated Satisfactory.

The Bank Task Team designed a project in close collaboration with the Recipient task team which resulted in a set of activities which were achievable in the project’s planned time frame. Results indicators and outcome and output indicators were realistic, measurable, and achievable. During the implementation support phase, the Task Team carried out regular field implementation support missions on a restricted trust fund budget and included the TTL, a Procurement and a Financial Management Specialist. The Task Team closely monitored project progress, maintaining a constant dialogue with the Government, its representatives, and other donors and development partners during the course of implementation through resourceful use of Skype and audio-conferencing between missions. Although the Bank’s Task Team could have benefited from the participation of a PA expert/environmental resources specialist, the technical aspects were implemented satisfactorily by the Recipient’s own technical specialists and there were no technical issues requiring the Bank’s intervention.

2. Recipient (for Recipient-executed TFs only)
Rate and justify rating on how well the different tasks that were expected from the Recipient under this Trust Fund were carried out. (Rating Scale would be consistent with the six point scale used in ISR/ICR: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU))

Recipient performance is rated Satisfactory.

The project was prepared and implemented with strong ownership on the part of the implementing agency and the government of The Gambia. Project activities were completed satisfactorily or ahead of schedule (works on park infrastructure and offices, technical skills training), targets were met or exceeded (METT scores), and achievements on occasion exceeded expectations such as: (a) the expansion of bi-monthly monitoring and data collection to other PAs and ecologically sensitive areas besides the project sites, and (b) developing partnerships with a private UK conservation agency, and the Gambian Tourism Board to pilot revenue-generating initiatives in each of the PAs.

Some initial delays in procurement and disbursements early in implementation occurred due to a lack of familiarity with Bank procedures, but these were resolved. At EOP, procurement and financial management ratings were “Satisfactory”. Audit reports were submitted on time and were unqualified.
**Safeguards compliance.** Throughout the implementation period, a multi-sectoral team\(^1\) of ESMP inspectors conducted periodic field missions at sites to evaluate ESMP recommendations and were satisfied with the level of compliance exercised by the contractors and agents hired under the Project.

**F. LESSONS LEARNED / RECOMMENDATIONS**

Describe the most significant positive and negative lessons learned from the success or failure of the grant activity and, as appropriate, make constructive recommendations for each stakeholder involved (Donor/Bank/Recipient/Development Community)—based on the assumption these stakeholders might decide to undertake a similar activity at a future time.

- Sustainable PA management requires the active involvement of affected local communities to be successful. PMPs provide a flexible and essential method for gaining the support of local communities for new conservation initiatives and the possibility of involving local communities in managing business ventures (e.g., ecotourism) for income-generation could save costs and increase chances of success. In return for consultation, local communities can effectively contribute to surveillance and monitoring activities, data collection, and providing information/feedback on tests and new initiatives for the management of natural resources.
- Strong commitment and political will combined with early consultations with the implementing agencies and stakeholders can produce realistic expectations and design for project activities, appropriate and measurable indicators, and improve prospects for obtaining positive results for the project.
- National environment trust funds, such as the National Biodiversity Trust Fund, if successful, could send a strong indicator to investors of government commitment, ownership and political stability and would also be an important complement to tourism development goals.

**G. ICM PROCESSING AND COMMENTS**

1. **Preparation**
   - TTL at Approval: Liba C. Strengerowski-Feldblyum
   - TTL at Closing: Liba C. Strengerowski-Feldblyum
   - Comment of TTL at Closing: The project accomplished great things with a small budget. I agree with the ratings.
   - Prepared by (if other than TTL): Lucie H.G. Tran
   - Date Submitted to Approving Manager: July 1, 2014

---

\(^1\) The team was led by the National Environment Agency (NEA) and included specialists from relevant sectors: water resources, fisheries, forestry, parks and wildlife departments, and community development departments.
2. Approval
Manager:
Date Approved by Manager:
Manager’s Comment:

3. TFO Evaluation of ICM Quality
TFO Reviewer:
TFO Rating on the Quality of ICM (Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory):
Comment and Justification for Rating Given by TFO: