



## 1. Project Data

**Project ID**

P115836

**Project Name**

SL-GEF Wetlands Conservation (FY11)

**Country**

Sierra Leone

**Practice Area(Lead)**

Environment &amp; Natural Resources

**L/C/TF Number(s)**

TF-98957

**Closing Date (Original)**

30-Jun-2015

**Total Project Cost (USD)**

1,800,000.00

**Bank Approval Date**

24-Mar-2011

**Closing Date (Actual)**

31-Mar-2016

**IBRD/IDA (USD)**
**Grants (USD)**

Original Commitment

1,800,000.00

1,800,000.00

Revised Commitment

1,800,000.00

1,799,712.01

Actual

1,799,712.01

1,799,712.01

**Prepared by**

Maria Shkaratan

**Reviewed by**
Christopher David  
Nelson
**ICR Review Coordinator**

Christopher David Nelson

**Group**

IEGSD (Unit 4)

## 2. Project Objectives and Components

### a. Objectives

The Project's Development Objective (PDO) and its Global Environmental Objective (GEO) are identical. The GEF Grant Agreement (page 4) states that the PDO is: "to improve strategic and operational conservation management of wetland areas in Sierra Leone."

Financial Agreement Development Objective:

Not applicable.



**b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?**

No

**c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?**

No

**d. Components**

**There were three components:**

**1: Strategic Planning for Wetland Conservation (both at appraisal and actual: US\$ 0.15 million):**

- 1.1. Reviewing and updating the existing policy and strategy for wetland conservation in Sierra Leone;
- 1.2. Updating the inventory and prioritizing conservation needs of key wetland ecosystems throughout Sierra Leone; and
- 1.3. Preparing a prioritized and phased strategic plan for wetland conservation nationwide.

**2: Wetland Conservation Site Planning and Management (both at appraisal and actual: US\$ 1.545 million):** The component will provide services to support: planning and management; goods (e.g. motorbikes, small boats, global positioning systems (GPS), radios, lap tops); minor infrastructure improvements; training, including workshops and study tours; and some operational costs in order to develop and implement effective conservation management at the selected priority wetland conservation sites. Best practice will be shared with managers and stakeholders at other wetland sites around the country in the context of implementing a national strategic plan for wetland conservation.

2.1. Pilot Site Management Planning and Implementation: (i) establishing conservation management teams (CSMTs) for each selected site and development of partnership among the government, NGOs, community organizations, traditional village leaders, and private sector; (ii) developing site specific conservation management plans (MPs) to be endorsed by traditional and local authorities; (iii) implementing conservation management plans such as minor infrastructure improvements, boundary demarcation, resource management improvements, implementation of monitoring systems, and development of sustainable financing options for selected sites; and (iv) building capacity of field staff and key stakeholders to undertake conservation planning, management, and enforcement through joint training programs.

2.2. Community Mobilization and Outreach and Conservation-linked Development, to support: (i) community outreach and awareness through strategic local and national communication programs such programs to include contributions to school curricula, preparation of information materials, extension services by field staff, and development of nature clubs; and (ii) conservation-linked community



development through the preparation and implementation of Community Action Plans (CAPs).

2.3. Mainstreaming Conservation in District Development Planning, thereby supporting the decentralization process by training conservation staff and local officials to work with District Councils and to ensure that conservation and sustainable natural resource management is incorporated in district and regional planning for development and service delivery.

**Component 3: Project Management (both at appraisal and actual: US\$ 0.105 million)** included the following activities: (i) ongoing operation of the National Steering Committee (NSC) and Project Management Team, (ii) developing and supervising annual and quarterly work plans and budgets, (iii) overseeing procurement and financial management and conducting annual audits, and (iv) establishing baselines, and developing planning, monitoring and evaluation systems for wetlands in the context of the national conservation program.

#### **e. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates**

##### **Project costs:**

The total project cost estimated at appraisal was US\$ 1.8 million. Actual cost was US\$1.8 million.

##### **Project financing:**

The project was financed by a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Grant for US\$1.8million that was fully disbursed.

##### **Dates:**

The project went through one restructuring, which included extension of the closing date. The closing date was moved from the original 06/30/2015 to the final 03/3/2016. This was mainly due to a 1.5 year of inactivity during Ebola outbreak over the period 2014 and 2015, and nine-month extension was to enable activities to be completed.

### **3. Relevance of Objectives & Design**

#### **a. Relevance of Objectives**

The Project objective was relevant to Government priorities and the country's environmental needs at the time of the project appraisal. The project objectives were aligned with the Agenda for Prosperity of the Government of Sierra Leone, the most recent top-level policy document. In particular, the second Agenda's Pillar - "Managing Natural Resources" - prioritizes protection of fisheries, marine resources, and water resources and underscores the importance of the wetland conservation. Wetlands provide valuable



ecosystem services and support livelihoods through fisheries production, flood control, shoreline stabilization, and maintenance of water quality. However, they were not legally protected at appraisal and were being used unsustainably, degraded, and destroyed. Project objectives identified and prioritized two actions that needed to be taken to establish effective management of wetland ecosystems.

The project was also consistent with the Joint Country Assistance Strategy (FY10-FY13), with relation to its objective to improve efficiency and transparency of agriculture and fisheries.

## **Rating**

High

### **b. Relevance of Design**

Design included a well-defined statement of objectives, with a clear focus. The project components were well structured, and could be expected to lead to the desired outcomes. The design also reflected two major items on the national conservation agenda: The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) states that aquatic biodiversity is a priority area of action and distinguishes between inland wetland freshwater and marine/coastal ecosystems. Consequently, project design included one inland wetland site (Mamunta Mayosso Wetland Sanctuary or MMWS) and one coastal ecosystem site (Sierra Leone River Estuary or SLRE).

The Project was designed on the basis of experience of other coastal management projects in West Africa and of several past and ongoing biodiversity projects in the country, in particular, the Bank-financed West Africa Regional Fisheries Program (WARFP) and the GEF-3 Sierra Leone Biodiversity Conservation Project (BCP). This resulted in a robust design and synergies, especially with the BCP, which can be viewed as the Project's sister operation (the two projects are similar but the focus of the BCP is on the terrestrial systems). The Project followed the same logic as the BCP: it included creation of a legal and institutional framework for conservation management and involved stakeholders in site management planning and capacity building of selected priority sites. Both projects reflected also a paradigm shift from the emphasis on legal basis and law enforcement to a participatory approach. Synergies were created because the Project replicated the BCP's methodologies and formats for community action planning, was managed by the same staff, used BCP's experience with procuring external consultancies for the legal review and with conducting biodiversity studies, and used the same National Steering Committee for combined discussions of both projects. The continuity of the two projects also helped to identify the impact of exogenous factors and unintended effects.

## **Rating**

Substantial



## 4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

### Objective 1

#### Objective

Objective 1. To improve strategic conservation management of wetland areas in Sierra Leone.

#### Rationale

Outputs:

The project achieved the objective of improved strategic conservation management of wetland areas in the country. In particular, a strategic plan for wetland conservation has been developed, and the wetland act has been produced and national consultations for its validation have been conducted. Strategic conservation management improved as a result of the clearly defined partnership agreements with users and authorities of the protected area resources, supported by the Conservation Site Management Committees (CSMCs) and signed MoUs to regulate cattle grazing at MMWS and adhere to other by-laws identified jointly with the communities and district authorities.

#### Rating

Substantial

### Objective 2

#### Objective

Objective 2. To improve operational conservation management of wetland areas in Sierra Leone

#### Rationale

Outputs:

Management Effectiveness at SLRE has improved. Original target was exceeded by 34 score points (the baseline was 20 score points, the target 24 points, and the actual result 58 points). This was achieved as a result of the introduction of regulations for PA management, boundary definition, finalization of the Management Plan, increased staffing and staff training, usage of GPS and camera traps, community participation, and biodiversity monitoring system in place.

Management Effectiveness at MMWS has improved. Original target was tripled. The factors of success are the same as in the SLRE, with addition to the following ones: demarcation of the boundary to make it known to the local population, agreements with local cattle herders and chief authorities regarding site protection, and an increase in the number of the PA staff.

The project created a structure for cooperation with local communities and authorities, which was critical for efficient wetland conservation management operations. This structure included fundamental management



instruments, communication lines, infrastructures and cooperation modalities, which were not present when the project started. As a result of the project activities, identification with the protected areas has increased significantly among residents at both sites, the sites have participatory management plans and have received modern equipment, and the level of trust between the government, local communities, and traditional local authorities has increased.

**Outcome:**

The project achieved the PDO: it has improved conservation management of wetlands in Sierra Leone. In particular:

1. Legal and regulatory framework for wetland conservation operations has been improved: the project supported the development of the Wetlands Act (the first legal instrument for the aquatic ecosystems) in the country) and the creation and enforcement of the by-laws at MMWS where cattle grazing and settlements were banned. A National Protected Area Authority was established.
2. Modern management technologies have been introduced and are being used. These include GPS-based data collection and software to work with satellite images.
3. Efficient management practices introduced were: new and harmonized patrolling formats, monthly reporting protocols, hiring of computer-literate administrators at the sites with field computers, and use of cameras for trapping wildlife.
4. Increased local ownership (as a result of the project activities) lead to reduced illegal activities and therefore costs for legal enforcement measures and measures needed to restore the habitats damaged by illegal activities.
5. Increased cooperation among traditional authorities, local government, and farmers has resulted in efficiency gains.
6. The availability of motorized transportation improved the efficiency of conservation efforts and facilitated management activity.
7. At the MMWS site, conservation activities have positive environmental impact on the downstream areas, in particular, on fish population.
8. The PDO level indicators 1a and 1b were exceeded: management effectiveness improvement significantly exceeded the target, by 34 score points in SLRE and by 40 score points in MMWS. However, while conservation management effectiveness has improved (see the scores above), it is too early to estimate improvements in biodiversity outcomes: biodiversity monitoring has not been in place long enough. The PRA sessions in 2014-15 registered the conservation status of both project sites and the collected data should be used as reference point. The vegetation maps can serve for future monitoring of vegetation changes.

**Rating**  
Substantial



## 5. Efficiency

### **Economic and Financial Efficiency:**

No economic and financial analysis was undertaken. The ICR mentions that “classical economic and financial analyses cannot be undertaken due to the nature of the Project.” Instead, the PAD has a section “Incremental Cost Analysis” which explains that this GEF grant will add value by bringing in international expertise in wetland management (TA), providing field investment for protection and management of the wetlands, and assisting with the development of rural enterprises and market mechanisms consistent with appropriate management of natural resources. The Incremental Cost Analysis section of the PAD then describes global environmental benefits the Project will provide (without quantifying them).

Understandably, quantifying the benefits of the biodiversity projects might be a complex task. However, an attempt could have been made by the project team to conduct a qualitative analysis of benefits. Instead, the “Incremental Cost Analysis” annex of the PAD (Annex 7) mainly describes the project objectives, components, and expected outcomes and does not reflect any analysis of the project benefits. This description adds no value to the information presented in the main body of the PAD. The “Incremental Costs” sub-section of Annex 7 only lists the total Project financing and co-financing from other sources and includes no comments of any kind. Annex 3 of the ICR – “Economic and financial Analysis” – only lists global project benefits from the PAD and briefly comments on their achievement. Again, no attempt to perform the analysis of the Project costs and benefits (the latter either quantified or not) is made. Consequently, a formal rating of the project's economic/financial efficiency is not possible.

### **Operational and Administrative Efficiency:**

The project was approved in June 2011, but the contract for the Project Management Team was signed only in May 2013, and implementation was therefore delayed by almost two years. In addition, due to the Ebola outbreak in 2014-15, project activities were suspended and the closing date extended for nine months, from July 2015 to March 2016. As a result, not all intended activities were completed. In particular, this relates to the development of by-laws for the six core zones of the SLRE and the physical boundary demarcation for SLRE. However, this did not impact the overall performance of the Project and the achievement of the objective.

### **Efficiency Rating**

Modest

- a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:



	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
ICR Estimate		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

\* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

## 6. Outcome

Relevance of the objective is rated as high and of design as substantial. Efficacy of the objective is rated as substantial. There is evidence that the Project achieved aspects of the PDO: it has improved conservation management of wetlands in Sierra Leone. The Project has resulted in important policy and institutional improvements: a policy framework for wetland management was designed and sent to the Parliament for approval; a National Protected Area Authority was established; increased budgetary support for wetland management meant increased staff and salaries; and awareness of the importance of the wetland conservation increased among the stakeholders including the government staff and the wetland areas residents – an achievement critical for the sustainability of the conservation efforts. However, the project had significant synergies with the earlier implemented Biodiversity Conservation Project, making the attribution of the outcomes more complicated. Many of the management resources were shared by the two projects, experience used, and costs reduced. While mentioning the attribution issue, it can be said with confidence that WLP substantially contributed to desired outcomes. Rating of the Project's efficiency is modest as insufficient relevant information is provided. The overall rating is therefore moderately satisfactory.

### a. Outcome Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

## 7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating

Three risks to the development outcomes were anticipated:

- 1 . That the implementing agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS), has limited technical expertise and low experience with project and financial management;
- 2 . That local communities will not support conservation practices;
- 3 . That the GoSL will not provide the needed resources for the wetland conservation.

However, it turned out that the risks were overstated in the PAD: (1) the Project benefited from the institutional arrangements under the Biodiversity Conservation Project; (2) the local stakeholders (communities) turned out to be interested in conservation activities. In addition, Project activities mitigated the third risk: the creation of the NPAA and new staff recruitment indicated that the Government was committed to the wetland conservation.



**a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating**

Modest

## **8. Assessment of Bank Performance**

**a. Quality-at-Entry**

The project was consistent with the Government and Bank strategic priorities, had significant strategic relevance, and its design was based on a thorough technical analysis and preparation and supported by stakeholder consultations. The safeguard issues were addressed. The Project was designed to complement the terrestrial focused GEF 3-supported similar BCP project. WCP was designed similar to BCP, which facilitated project implementation and Government support of the Project.

In addition, the project benefited from the synergies with the West Africa Regional Fisheries Program (WARFP-SL) (the Bank co-financed it). Cooperation with WARFP-SL helped the project to define cooperation lines between the Ministries to augment efforts to conserve marine resources, which are ecologically critical for the marine ecosystems and fisheries.

However, having gone through the experience of WARFP-SL, the design should have been more responsive to dealing with the issue of measuring and tracking the efficiency of the projects activities, particularly in setting up a realistic cost-benefit analysis. While difficult to accurately assess given the heavy TA aspect, there are various options that could have been used to ensure more thorough analysis of its cost effectiveness.

The project could have triggered the Involuntary Resettlement Policy, as project activities may have entailed limited land acquisition, relocation of a small number of settlements inside conservation sites, and restriction of access to the sites. However, later it became clear that there is no need for these actions and therefore no basis for the application of this Policy.

Procurement was a responsibility of a consultancy firm which was already working for a World Bank project: the Rural and Private Sector Development Project (RPSDP). Therefore, existing resources were used.

During appraisal and project preparation, the Bank worked closely with the implementing agency (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security, MAFFS-FD) to reflect its priorities. The selection of the sites and the project components were done jointly. This supported government ownership of the project and reduced risk to development outcomes.

The Project started effective implementation in June 2013, two years later than initially planned. However, the delay resulted in a positive side effect: the project could build on BCP experience and on the Client's and stakeholders' understanding of the project approach, which made project implementation efficient from start.



## **Quality-at-Entry Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

### **b. Quality of supervision**

Supervision missions were regular, the missions visited the main office of the Client, as well as the local level offices and the sites. Sub-regional visits to the Makeni office and to the sites were important, they informed the supervision team and motivated the beneficiaries and the local authorities. The WB Freetown office supported implementation by organizing regular meetings (video conferences) with the Project team involving relevant experts – financial management and procurement specialists. At the end of the project preparation, a comprehensive set of country and field missions was conducted (February 2016), which was important for motivating the stakeholders and increasing the sustainability of project implementation. The Government representatives were debriefed regarding the findings and recommendations from supervision missions.

The Bank worked with the Client very closely. All technical issues were addressed as they were encountered. Aide Memoires for missions were prepared timely. Country context was well known to the team, and the Client's strengths and weaknesses were taken into account. Contact with the Client was maintained during the Ebola crisis using (almost) monthly video conferences.

## **Quality of Supervision Rating**

Satisfactory

## **Overall Bank Performance Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

## **9. Assessment of Borrower Performance**

### **a. Government Performance**

The government had a strong interest in working with the Bank in the area of wetland conservation. The Government's commitment was reflected in the establishment of the NPAA, an increased budget support to the Protected Area network, the creation of a new policy emphasizing sustainable management of the wetland resources, the drafting of the Wetlands Act, and the NPAA's plan to create a Wetland Ecosystem Unit within its Authority. The Government showed genuine interest in wetland conservation, and was actively involved in the Project activities both at the national and sub-national levels.

However, the (almost) 2-year delay with project implementation start led to the situation when not all intended activities were completed: development of the by-laws for the six core zones of the SLRE and the physical boundary demarcation for SLRE are pending.

Establishment rules kept wardens' salaries low and a disincentive for proactive conservation. Conservation



staff (game guards and rangers) complained repeatedly about their low salaries of around US\$ 70 per month, leading to low motivation and performance. This was addressed during project implementation by including field food rations as an eligible project expenditure, and towards the end of the Project through the recruitment of new field staff under the NPAA with improved salary conditions.

A pragmatic and participatory approach to project implementation was pursued by Government staff including the Project Coordinator, the Forestry Division Director, the new NPAA Director and the MAFFS Minister. As a result, stimulated discussion were held including about criteria for the SLRE boundary definition, which led to its mapping for the Management Planning process. Government presence during monthly meetings with site managers, inter-ministerial Steering Committee meetings in Freetown, MAFFS monitoring and planning sessions and a site visit of the Minister to MMWS were critical for motivating local stakeholders

### **Government Performance Rating**

Satisfactory

### **b. Implementing Agency Performance**

At project initiation, the implementing agency was the Forestry Division of MAFFS (from 6/2013 to 11/2014). Once the NPAA was created, it became the implementing agency for the Project. The main actors from the Wildlife Branch of the Forestry Division moved to the NPAA, which strengthened Project implementation. The implementation agency was able to bridge between the central Ministry in Freetown, the Project local satellite office, and the Project sites, and build up and maintain contacts at interministerial level and with the World Bank. The Project Coordinator of FD/NPAA has been the institutional and Project memory from the concept preparation phase throughout the BCP implementation. This helped in guiding the new NPAA Director and in seamless continuation of Project implementation after NPAA installed its new office and functions. Also, communication was efficient and regular: meetings including the CS managers were held in Makeni and urgent matters were communicated by telephone. Most of the Project Management Team (PMT) personnel were experienced experts respected by the Client, which had a positive impact on coordination between Freetown and the local office.

### **Implementing Agency Performance Rating**

Satisfactory

### **Overall Borrower Performance Rating**

Satisfactory

## **10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization**

### **a. M&E Design**



The M&E design was the responsibility of the PMT in collaboration with Policy Evaluation, Monitoring and Statistics Division of MAFFS. The intermediate results were monitored using nine result indicators. The project outcome indicators were detailed and measurable, and fully reflected both the PDO and the project components. They included indicators of policy action and institution building. The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) was an effective method feeding into periodical adaptations of the Results Framework. Resource monitoring was done at the central (Freetown) level, as well as at the local and site levels and included budget, procurement, resource allocation, and maintenance of vehicles. The consolidated M&E reports were submitted to the Bank on time.

## **b. M&E Implementation**

The PMT produced quarterly M&E reports. M&E was performed at national, local, and site levels. At the national level, the National Steering Committee (NSC) was supposed to oversee and approve the work plan and budget. However, the NSC only met once because of the Ebola crisis. Peer review meetings were organized instead, and they served as regulatory and coordination tool. PMT was based locally (in Makeni), it monitored the sites and coordinated project management with the NPAA in Freetown. At the conservation sites, three monitoring activities were conducted: (i) weekly meetings with the Conservation Site Management Committee, (ii) monthly technical meetings in the local office with participation of Site Managers, District Forestry Officers, and District Council representatives, and (iii) the METT participatory annual monitoring meeting to measure Project progress.

## **c. M&E Utilization**

During the project preparation, monitoring data were used in annual project reports prepared for the NPAA, PMT, and the World Bank. In addition, quarterly and annual reports using the monitoring data were prepared for the Policy Evaluation, Monitoring, and Statistics Division (PEMSD) of MAFFS. The data were presented during the NCS or MAFFS peer-review meetings. GIS data and thematic maps were used for project activities, in particular, for the boundary definition at SLRE. Work and budget plans were supplied to MAFFS, and the Results Framework and Monitoring table were used by the World Bank.

The project monitoring data has enabled Conservation Site Managers to prepare their work plans and budgets, present standardized budget plans for specific tasks, and prepare reports to be presented and evaluated in monthly monitoring meetings in Makeni. The establishment of the NPAA with higher budgetary funding and increased number of staff at the sites should ensure that monitoring data will be produced, communicated and utilized after project end. The newly created GIS unit under NPAA used data collected at the sites including data on biodiversity and key ecological indicators. NPAA had also planned to streamline the database system with other PA managements, such as the WAPFoR and Gola Forest, which could mean a nationwide strategic up-grade of the Government monitoring system. It was not clear yet at the time of the ICR preparation whether NPAA had put in place the resources for effective monitoring and evaluation. However, the creation of a GIS unit was critical for effective M&E: the unit would make use of the satellite



images using the Arc-GIS software and license acquired during the Project period. This is an important tool to update information on the Protected Area system: determine more accurately the SLRE boundary and surface areas of the proposed hot spot areas (Core Zones) at SLRE, compare it with data from the inventory, and to up-date existing and define newly proposed conservation areas for a nation-wide mapping review.

## **M&E Quality Rating**

Substantial

## **11. Other Issues**

### **a. Safeguards**

The project was assigned environmental category 'B' under OP/BO 4.01 Environmental Assessment. It triggered also the following safeguard policies: Natural Habitats Policy (BP 4.04) and Involuntary Resettlement Policy (OP 4.12). An Environmental and Social Management Plan (EMP) was prepared. Project supervision confirmed that civil works (including protected areas headquarters, ranger outposts, and associated water supply systems) did not have negative impacts.

The project triggered the World Bank's Involuntary Resettlement Policy (OP 4.12). A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and a Process Framework were prepared. The RPF had been prepared because of the possibility of relocating settlements in the MMWS area. However, Government decided not to perform relocation, and therefore no Resettlement Action Plan was prepared. The Process Framework was prepared to address livelihood restoration issues related to the project-supported restriction of access to natural resources in both MMWS and SLRE conservation sites. Project implementation involved preparation and implementation of the Community Action Plans at both sites.

### **b. Fiduciary Compliance**

Procurement implementation was mostly rated as moderately satisfactory throughout the Project period and at project closure. Procurement was needed for several items classified as works, but mostly for items classified as Community Driven Development. The responsibility for financial management and procurement was assigned to two specialists who were already working for the ongoing World Bank-financed Rural and Private Sector Development Project (RPSDP) and were highly qualified. However, the work load created some difficulties in efficient approvals of terms of references and bidding and evaluation processes of tenders.

Financial management of the project was rated as moderately satisfactory throughout the project period and at the project closure. The difficulty with having good financial management was related to the need to transfer funds to the conservation sites in remote areas. While the Interim Financial Reports were satisfactory and met the Bank's requirements, they were often submitted late (as well as the audit reports), which explains the Project's overall Financial Management performance rating of moderately satisfactory.



Both financial management and procurement functions were performed by the PCU of the World Bank-financed Rural and Private Sector Development Project (RPSDP). The financial management reporting was not in line with the quarterly technical reporting of PMT, which made it difficult to receive cost-control information on time. In particular, concerns were raised by the World Bank team in a May-2014 mission on the slow disbursement of WCP funds. However, in October 2014 a Financial Report provided by the FM section revealed an improved disbursement rate due to high outstanding payment commitments that were not captured during May 2014 World Bank mission. Work overload and sick leave periods of the key FM staff were cited as reasons.

### c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

---

### d. Other

---

## 12. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Efficiency is rated Modest due to administrative shortcomings and insufficient evidence to establish a rating for efficiency.
Risk to Development Outcome	Negligible	Modest	---
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	There were shortcomings in the design, particularly in formulating a mechanism to accurately measure the cost effectiveness of the project.
Borrower Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	---
Quality of ICR		Substantial	---

### Note

When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006.

The "Reason for Disagreement/Comments" column could cross-reference other sections of the ICR Review, as appropriate.



### 13. Lessons

- 1 . The Project was designed on the basis of experience with the other biodiversity projects in West Africa, especially the GEF-3 Sierra Leone Biodiversity Conservation Project (BCP). This resulted in a robust design and synergies. Building on results achieved by other Bank projects can lead to improved project outcomes.
- 2 . The efficiency of Project implementation benefited from the synergy with a related Bank project - IDA's Rural and Private Sector Development Project (RPSDP). Using the RPSDP's PMT that had trained staff was very important for the efficient Project implementation. Also, the credibility of the RPSDP supported a positive reaction to the Project among the stakeholders. The lesson is that using existing institutional structures (in particular, created by other Bank projects) can be both a cost saving measure and a means to increased sustainability of project achievements.
- 3 . The project significantly benefited from the Government commitment to wetland conservation. This also increased sustainability of the project outcomes. This was achieved by regular and continued communication with the stakeholders from the start of the project preparation and involved the central government, local authorities, traditional authorities, and local communities. Such approach is time consuming but necessary in projects involving multiple stakeholders with varying interests and different degree of understanding of the project objectives and benefits.

### 14. Assessment Recommended?

No

### 15. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR provided sufficient information regarding the project activities with the exception of project efficiency, which was not estimated. Economic and financial analysis (or a qualitative analysis of the project benefits) is not provided in the PAD either, and the ICR should have made an effort to correct that omission. Also, the ICR could benefit from a better structure: at time it is long winded and, in some places, repetitious. Having said that, the report was candid and followed the guidelines, thus the overall quality of the ICR is substantial.

#### a. Quality of ICR Rating

Substantial