



Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-GEF-USAID Project “Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa and Asia”

Evaluation Report

PIMS ID: 5620 / GEF ID: 9211

Project Duration: May 2018 – Dec 2023

Implementing Partner: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Donors: GEF (USD 2 million); USAID (USD 2 million)

GEF Focal Area: Ecosystems & Biodiversity

Regional Focus: Global / Eastern Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda)

Responsible Parties: APOPO, Grace Farms Foundation (GFF), Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers (ICS), Space for Giants (SfG), TRAFFIC, University of Washington, UNODC, WildAid

Evaluation period: January – September 2023

Evaluator: Edgar Kaeslin

30 September 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The UNDP Project Management Unit (PMU) provided timely and much appreciated support to the Evaluator in various stages of the evaluation. This refers in particular to administrative, financial and travel support by Petra Valastinova (Programme and Operations Associate) and technical support by Harun Guclusoy (Project Manager), Mikhail Paltsyn (Technical Project Advisor) and Tamara Tschentscher (Knowledge Management, M&E and Communications Officer).

Further support was kindly provided by the Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), Mandy Cadman, later Onesimus Muhwezi, as well as Vella Angima (Technical Coordination Analyst) and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub.

Very valuable and much appreciated were also the feedback and insights provided by the consulted key stakeholders, too many to be listed by names, shared through interviews (in person and virtual) and as replies to questionnaires. The kind additional support provided namely from Joint Port Control Units (JPCUs) also encompassed picking up the Evaluator and showing him around at the port sites in Mombasa (Khamis Mubarak), Dar es Salaam (Ponsiano Byabato) and Zanzibar (Hafidh Haji).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	7
2. Introduction	7
3. Project description	9
4. Findings	11
4.1 Project Design/Formulation	11
4.1.1 Analysis of Results Framework and TOC	11
4.1.2 Assumptions and Risks	13
4.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design	13
4.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation	13
4.1.5 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector	14
4.1.6 Gender responsiveness of project design	14
4.1.7 Social and Environmental Safeguards	15
4.2 Project Implementation	16
4.2.1 Adaptive Management	16
4.2.2 Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements	16
4.2.3 Project Finance and Co-finance	18
4.2.4 Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E	21
4.2.5 UNDP implementation/oversight	24
4.2.6 Project partner execution	25
4.2.7 Risk Management	26
4.3 Project Results and Impacts	27
4.3.1 Progress towards objective and expected outcomes	27
4.3.2 Relevance	31
4.3.3 Effectiveness	31
4.3.4 Efficiency	33
4.3.5 Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional, governance and environmental	33
4.3.6 Country ownership	36
4.3.7 Gender equality and women's empowerment	37
4.3.8 Cross-cutting Issues	37
4.3.9 GEF Additionality	38
4.3.10 Catalytic/Replication Effect	38
4.3.11 Progress to Impact	39
4.4 General questions	40
5. Main findings, conclusions and lessons	42
5.1 Project Design/Formulation	42
5.1.1 Main findings	42
5.1.2 Conclusions	43
5.1.3 Lessons	43

5.2	Project Implementation	43
5.2.1	Main findings	43
5.2.2	Conclusions	44
5.2.3	Lessons	45
5.3	Project Results and Impacts	45
5.3.1	Main findings	45
5.3.2	Conclusions	47
5.3.3	Lessons	47
6.	Recommendations	49
7.	Annexes	51
7.1	Annex 1: TE Terms of Reference (TOR)	51
7.2	Annex 2: List of documents consulted	52
7.3	Annex 3: Summary list of key stakeholders	53
7.4	Annex 4: List of stakeholders interviewed/consulted	54
7.5	Annex 5: TE Mission itinerary & schedule of consultative meetings/visits	54
7.6	Annex 6: Evaluation Criteria Matrix (ECM)	55
7.7	Annex 7: Questionnaires used	69
7.8	Annex 8: Summary of questionnaire results	75
7.9	Annex 9: TE Rating scales	76

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AEO	Authorized Economic Operator
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BPD	Buckingham Palace Declaration
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CO	Country Office
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCP	Container Control Programme
CPD	Country Programme Document
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTS	Cargo Targeting System
EAC	East African Community
ECM	Evaluation Criteria Matrix
EQ	Evaluation Question
FY	Fiscal Year
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GEB	Global Environmental Benefit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOVT	Government Ministries and Agencies
GFF	Grace Farms Foundation
GWP	Global Wildlife Programme
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer
HR	Human Resources
IC	International Cooperation
ICCWC	International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime
ICS	Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers
IGO	Intergovernmental Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IOP	International Organization Partner
IRH	Istanbul Regional Hub
IWT	Illegal Wildlife Trade
JPCU	Joint Port Control Unit
KMA	Kenya Maritime Authority
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
KYC	Know Your Customer
LATF	Lusaka Agreement Task Force
LE	Law Enforcement
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MO	Membership Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NP	National Project
OFP	Operational Focal Point
PB	Project Board
PCAT	Partner Capacity Assessment Tool
PIF	Project Information Form
PMU	Project Management Unit
PortMATE	Port Monitoring and Anti-Trafficking Evaluation Tool

PRF	Project Results Framework
ProDoc	Project Document
ProInR	Project Inception Report
PS	Private Sector
RP	Responsible Party
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
SDG(s)	Sustainable Development Goal(s)
SESP	Social and Environmental Screening Procedure
SfG	Space for Giants
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TF	Task Force
TL	Team Leader
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
UfW	United for Wildlife
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UoW	University of Washington
URA	Uganda Revenue Authority
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority
WB	World Bank

1. Executive Summary

Project Information Table

Project Details		Project Milestones	
Project Title:	Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa and Asia	PIF Approval Date:	4 June 2015
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #)	5620	CEO Endorsement Date (FSP) / Approval date (MSP):	27 July 2016
GEF Project ID:	9211	ProDoc Signature Date:	1 May 2018
UNDP Atlas Business Unit Award ID, Project ID:	SVK10, award: 99240, projects 00124782, 00108842	Date Project Manager hired:	15 November 2019
Country/Countries:	Global (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda)	Inception Workshop Date:	April 2019
Region:	East Africa	Mid-Term Review Completion Date:	NA
Focal Area:	Multi focal areas	Terminal Evaluation Completion date:	3 October 2023
Trust Fund:	[indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]		
Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Entity):	UNDP		
NGOs/CBOs involvement:	Responsible Parties: WildAid TRAFFIC Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers Space for Giants University of Washington APOPO Grace Farms Foundation		
Private sector involvement:			
Geospatial coordinates of project sites:	Mombasa Port: 4°04'04.40" S - 39°39'00.91" E Dar es Salaam Port: 6°49'23.99" S - 39°17'32.52" E Zanzibar Port: 6°09'19.41" S - 39°11'28.75" Kampala Dry Port: 0°17'15.44" N - 32°39'14.87" E		
Financial Information			
PDF/PPG	at approval (US\$M)	at PDF/PPG completion (US\$M)	
GEF PDF/PPG grants for project preparation	\$52,425		
Co-financing for project preparation			
Project	at CEO Endorsement (US\$M)	at TE (US\$M)	
[1] UNDP contribution:	\$150,000	\$150,000	
[2] Government:	\$0	\$0	
[3] Other multi-/bi-laterals:	\$2,600,000 (UNODC co-financing)	TBC + \$2,000,000 (USAID) + \$100,000 (UNEP)	
[4] Private Sector:	\$0	\$0	
[5] NGOs:	\$500,000 (Royal Foundation)	TBC+ \$131,640 (GFF) + \$50,000 (TRAFFIC)	

[6] Total co-financing [1+2+3+4+5]:	\$3,250,000	\$2,331,640 +
[7] Total GEF funding:	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
[8] Total Project Funding [6 + 7]	\$5,250,000	\$4,331,640 +

Project description

1. Highly-valued African wildlife resources (e.g., ivory, rhino horn, pangolin scales) that have been poached continue to be illegally trafficked from Sub-Saharan Africa to Asia by freight ships departing from East, Central and West African ports. They are hidden in containers amongst legal goods where they are difficult to detect by law enforcement agencies. The screening and scanning of export containers results in few seizures. Consequently, there is an urgent need to strengthen law enforcement in the shipping routes between Africa and Asia. The UNDP GEF Project “Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa and Asia“ has been aiming to achieve this through addressing the main barriers that impede the effective detection of illegal wildlife goods: insufficient awareness and capacity at African and Asian ports, and the lack of adequate coordination and cooperation amongst the various local, national and international agencies and organizations that play significant roles along the trade routes.
2. The project aimed at providing socioeconomic benefits at both national and local levels. At the local level, shipping-related businesses benefit from reduced corruption, fewer interceptions of their legal goods due to inspections, and faster processing of trade which reduces their costs and enhances their revenue. The disruption of the wildlife trafficking chain, with associated criminals removed from the supply chain, helps to restore security at both national and local levels.
3. The immediate objective of the project has been to reduce the illegal maritime trafficking of highly-valued wildlife resources between Africa and Asia through strengthened wildlife law enforcement capacity at ports and improved South-South cooperation. The project aimed to achieve its objective through implementing the following components:
 1. Best practice in combating wildlife trafficking at ports;
 2. South-South and institutional cooperation in combating maritime trafficking;
 3. Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation.
4. Project implementation started in May 2018. All project activities will be concluded by the end of 2023. This includes two project extensions over altogether 32 months. Financed through a USAID grant, the project had been extended in 2021 by adding to it an equivalent set of consistent measures in the Kampala dry port, another related wildlife trafficking hotspot, and by further strengthening capacity building and multi-sector coordination and cooperation in the ports of Mombasa, Dar es Salaam and Zanzibar.
5. The expected result of the intervention is that interception rates of trafficked wildlife at the project’s key ports (Mombasa, Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar, Kampala/Entebbe) increase (at least initially) and are followed up by appropriate and well-coordinated law enforcement responses leading to increased rates of arrest and prosecution of wildlife traffickers, both within the country of seizure and internationally, and, ultimately, to markedly reduced maritime trafficking of wildlife from Africa to Asia.

Summary of findings – Project Design

6. An analysis revealed that the project objectives and outcomes are in line with national and regional priorities and strategies of the concerned countries and consistent with UN strategic planning frameworks, priorities, and goals with regard to the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources and wildlife.

7. The project reasoning and logic were well defined from the beginning (in the ProDoc) while the activities and the methods and criteria for assessing and monitoring the project achievements have been further clarified in the project inception phase and thereafter.
8. A wide variety of potential stakeholders, beneficiaries and partners of the project had been identified and consulted during project preparation and at project inception. But none of these partnerships were fully clarified and negotiated in the project preparation phase.

Summary of findings – Project Implementation

9. No significant shortcomings with regard to gender are perceived in the project design and implementation. The project has been targeting equal participation of men and women to the extent possible. Women involvement in project activities was in the range of 30-36%. Given the male dominance in the port sector, this is quite remarkable.
10. The partners involved in project implementation come from all relevant sectors. Their numbers and diversity is high. The Responsible Parties (RPs), in particular, have actively been engaged in project implementation by managing their contributions themselves.
11. Local and national government stakeholders, in general, were supportive of the objectives of the project. Through increasing awareness, knowledge, capacities and professional networks of the various port stakeholders, the project promoted ownership and sustainability of the project's results.
12. The number of direct project beneficiaries, i.e., those stakeholders who participated in workshops and trainings, was almost nine times higher than initially planned (of which approximately 32% were women). This significant increase was partly due to the shift to virtual trainings as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic.
13. In this project there were considerable variances between planned and actual budget expenditures. The COVID-19 pandemic and other factors led to a situation in which project activities regularly were delayed and then had to be realized under a tight schedule. As a result, implementation of project activities was not spread out evenly over the project lifetime. Main bulks of project activities were conducted in 2022 and in 2023 after the pandemic.
14. The project mobilized significant additional co-financing since inception, comprising in particular a US\$ 2 million grant from USAID to strengthen project activities in the target ports and extend them to the dry ports of Uganda.
15. The quality of M&E reporting increased during project implementation while it was not totally sufficient from the beginning. Mainly the improved and more comprehensive M&E plan required by USAID from January 2021 was adequate to monitor the project results and track progress towards achieving the project objective.
16. The project risk log, including Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and other risks, was properly maintained, updated and adjusted annually by the Project Management Unit (PMU). In this way, it was effective in mitigating the identified risks. There is no indication that any risks had been overlooked.
17. The project faced a number of significant implementation challenges. The unexpected COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, affected project implementation very severely causing changes to most project activities and substantial delays in their delivery. Nevertheless, the UNDP team was able to respond adequately, adapt its management of the project accordingly, and implement the project surprisingly well and deliver results.

Summary of findings – Project Results and Impacts

18. The project's objective and outcomes have been achieved to 70-100%, the project objective in average to 77%, and the project outcomes in average to 86%. The eleven project outputs (GEF and USAID) have been fulfilled in the range between 60% and 100%, in average to 87%. These figures may still increase slightly until project closure. Thus, the project outputs, outcomes and objective have largely been delivered.
19. The eight RPs, in general, managed and administered their project day-to-day activities quite well under UNDP supervision. Two of them, however, failed to deliver significant parts of the agreed work and at least half of them had difficulties to manage their planned contributions according to schedules. UNDP support to implementing partners was perceived to be adequate, of good quality and timely.
20. Judged by activities, the Know Your Customer (KYC) regulations framework achieved minimal results. Only about 30-40% of what was planned has been implemented by Space for Giants (SfG). As a consequence, collaboration with SfG was stopped in 2022. In 2023, the KYC framework regained momentum after a consultant was hired who meanwhile made progress on the draft regulations. It is now likely that they will be completed by the end of the year. Another activity that may not be implemented as planned is the introduction of the automatic risk profiling system of sea containers (RiskProfiler) to Dar es Salaam and Zanzibar Ports and Uganda Revenue Authority (URA) in Kampala. It was initially planned for 2020 but not fully delivered by UNODC. It has been achieved to about 60% and will now probably not be completed at all.
21. Financial and human resources, including for project management, were used efficiently and economically in accordance with the project's Annual Work Plans (AWPs).
22. The project had two approved extensions over altogether 32 months justified by delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the harmonization of activities under the GEF and USAID funding. They were absolutely necessary.
23. The project put in place a number of frameworks, policies, guidelines and mechanisms that create accountability, transparency and technical knowledge transfer after project closure, such as the Zanzibar Joint Port Control Unit (JPCU), International Maritime Organization (IMO) Guidelines, and KYC legal framework.
24. The project managed to involve a couple of famous national football players as project "champions" in the Illicit Wildlife Trade (IWT) awareness campaign in all three East African project countries who supported the project goals through various media channels directed in particular at port-workers. Publications, blog posts, web stories and videos were produced and used by the project to highlight and share some particular experiences and stories.
25. South-South cooperation between African countries, in particular Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, was quite significant. The project also initiated and promoted cooperation between African and Asian countries to some extent but the focus was on African ports.
26. The project was designed to mend key capacity gaps at the target ports that allow traffickers to operate. The incremental inputs and added value of the project are considerable, given the small size and rather short duration of the project.
27. The key impact of the project is that the target ports over time are getting more resilient to wildlife and other trafficking. Mechanisms to ensure sustainability of the project have been put in place and will likely work to further strengthen the desired impacts.

28. The risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact of the project are all related to impeding the continued implementation of the project's successful models (e.g., lack of secured follow-up investments to continue successful models, corruption).

Conclusions

29. Project logic and reasoning were well defined from the beginning while the project activities, the methods and criteria for assessing and monitoring progress, and the identification and involvement of adequate project stakeholders and partners needed to be further clarified in the project inception phase and thereafter based on consultations with project stakeholders. This led to delays in the implementation of actual project activities.
30. The project outcomes and outputs have in average been achieved to 86-87%, thus largely been delivered (this figure may still increase slightly until project closure). Given the multiple challenges the project has faced, and the considerable expansion of the activities through incorporating the USAID grant in the midst of implementation, this is judged as a good result.
31. A fundamental role in project implementation has been played by the eight RPs. In general, they managed and administered their project day-to-day activities quite well under UNDP supervision. Two of them, however, failed to deliver significant parts of the agreed work (thus requiring additional attention and follow-up by UNDP) and at least half of them had difficulties to implement their contributions in a timely manner. This labour division with RPs has the potential to be very efficient, but with increasing RP numbers it entails the risk that not all of them deliver as planned.
32. The project faced a number of significant implementation challenges. The slow start of actual project implementation together with the unexpected COVID-19 pandemic led to a situation in which planned activities regularly were delayed and had to be realized under a tight schedule. As a result, the implementation of project activities was not spread out evenly over the project lifetime. Main bulks of project activities were conducted in 2022 and in 2023 after the pandemic.
33. The key impact of the project is that the target ports over time are getting more resilient to wildlife and other trafficking. Through increasing awareness, knowledge, capacities and professional networks of the various port stakeholders, mechanisms have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project. In doing so, the project also promoted local ownership. This makes it more likely that the target ports maintain the elevated standards in combating wildlife trafficking achieved through the project and will continue working towards further improvements and best practices. The risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact are all related to impeding the continued implementation of the project's successful models.

Synthesis of key lessons learned

34. In the analysis of the project design and formulation phase, one major lesson emerged: Many preparatory project activities, such as identifying and contacting the most suitable partners and stakeholders, consulting with them on the project and clarifying/negotiating with them their potential involvement and roles could not duly be completed in that phase because this is a very time consuming exercise. As a result, all these activities had to be moved to the inception phase of the project. This delayed the project's implementation of actual activities. The lesson would be to anticipate and avoid such developments through making available more time and resources during project preparation for extensive consultations with potential project partners and beneficiaries to clarify and prepare decisions on their involvement, roles and responsibilities well in advance. This particular challenge of this project seems to have been underestimated.
35. The Evaluator can only base his findings on facts and clear evidence. In a modern world, a lot of information is exchanged through e-mails and increasingly through social media, in particular

WhatsApp. A tendency has been detected in this project that such information exchange has not been fully worked up and compiled into proper records like Word or pdf documents. It is available somewhere but scattered out in various bits and pieces. This is true, for example, for the project’s lessons learned and monitoring results. However, to be effective in guiding project implementation, they should be stored in readily available, regularly updated monitoring sheets and compilations.

36. A unique risk and unexpected challenge was the COVID-19 pandemic that had to be managed on top of the more “regular” risks. It may be useful to work up how it affected delivery of the project and to what extent the measures taken to mitigate its impact were adequate and effective. This would inform future projects in similar circumstances.
37. The project established Zanzibar Joint Port Control Unit (JPCU), and built capacity of existing JPCUs, other law enforcement agencies, and the private sector to prevent, detect and intercept wildlife trafficking in the supply chain. The extent of that capacity in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda has been estimated by the PMU to be only around 5-10% of the required. These models should thus be continued until a much higher percentage of the required capacity in these countries has been built.
38. When comparing the contributions and information flowing from the project into the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) and vice versa, the impression remains that this is a unidirectional support of the GWP, although the project could have received multiple benefits from the GWP as well. This is a missed opportunity.
39. Evaluation Ratings Table (The Terminal Evaluation (TE) Rating Scales used here are shown in Annex 9)

1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating
M&E design at entry	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
M&E Plan Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
Overall Quality of M&E	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
2. Implementation/Oversight & Implementing Partner Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	Satisfactory (S)
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
Overall quality of Implementation/Oversight and Execution	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Effectiveness	Satisfactory (S)
Efficiency	Satisfactory (S)
Overall Project Outcome	Satisfactory (S)
4. Assessment of Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	Moderately Likely (ML)
Socio-political	Moderately Likely (ML)
Institutional framework and governance	Moderately Likely (ML)
Environmental	Moderately Likely (ML)
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	Moderately Likely (ML)

40. Recommendations Summary Table

A more comprehensive list of recommendations including additional information on the sources of the recommendations is given in chapter 6.

Rec #	TE Recommendation	Unit	Time
A	Continue pursuing options for building awareness and capacities of port stakeholders	Govt.	n/a
A.2	Focus on improving capacities and tools of JPCUs who cover all aspects of combating IWT	Govt.	n/a
A.3	Improve capacities and tools of private sector organizations, including clearing agents	Govt.	n/a
A.8	Build in on-the-ground practical exercises to follow up on DNA analysis of trafficked wildlife	Govt.	n/a
A.9	Involve senior officials of agencies (LE, customs, police, prosecutors) in all project countries	Govt.	n/a
A.10	Sustain cooperation (joint trainings) and communication channels between Africa and Asia	Govt.	n/a
B	Identify future potential improvements in sequences and procedures of project preparation	PMU	12/2023
B1	Provide more time/resources during project preparation for consultations with potential project stakeholders to prepare decisions on their involvement, roles, and responsibilities in advance	UNDP	n/a
B2	Enhance coordination with relevant UNDP COs and their activities/partners in future projects	UNDP	n/a
B3	Identify alternative management options for cooperating/collaborating with UN organizations	PMU	12/2023
B6	Identify corruption control measures at all levels to strengthen project achievements	Govt.	n/a
C	Identify future potential improvements in sequences and procedures of project implementation	PMU	12/2023
C1	Use distinct monitoring sheets (e.g., Excel) for quarterly monitoring project progress and comprehensively documenting any changes and developments that occur based on PRF indicators	UNDP	n/a
C2	Use distinct knowledge management sheets for regularly and comprehensively documenting and compiling any experiences, lessons and good practices encountered	UNDP	n/a
D.1	Work up how the pandemic affected delivery of the project and to what extent the measures taken to mitigate its impact were adequate and effective	PMU	12/2023

2. Introduction

Background and context

41. The illegal poaching and trade of African wildlife remains a major threat to the survival of unique ecologically and economically important species and to the achievement of the highest priority goals of the international environmental agenda: reversing biodiversity loss, land degradation and climate change, and attaining sustainable development. It also threatens major development goals such as eradicating poverty and increasing welfare, health and security.
42. With the shipping sector the project targets a highly relevant and neglected section of wildlife trafficking from Africa to Asia by organized criminal syndicates that is complementary to other initiatives that aim to combat the illicit trade at source or reduce the demand for wildlife products in destination countries.
43. This terminal evaluation (TE) is the first and final assessment of the project's results and achievements and covers all its components, i.e., the UNDP GEF and USAID contributions. Since the activities under the USAID grant will continue after finalization of the TE for another 3-4 months, primarily completed activities under the USAID grant have been evaluated.

Purpose and scope

44. The purpose of this TE was to assess the actual achievements of the project against what was expected to be achieved based on the objectives, targets, baselines, indicators and assumptions as set out in the project's logical/results framework and Theory of Change (TOC). Comparing expected outcomes to actual achieved outcomes allowed to identify, analyse and rate the project's achievements (successes and shortcomings). The assessment also aimed to evaluate the efficiency of project management, such as the delivery of activities and outputs in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The findings have also been the basis for drawing conclusions, learning lessons and making recommendations that will inform the sustainability of the project's achievements as well as further UNDP and GEF programming.
45. The geographic scope of the TE covered in particular the main seaports of Kenya (Mombasa) and Tanzania (Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar), and dry ports of Uganda (Entebbe, Kampala). The thematic scope of the TE is detailed in the section on Findings (chapter 4) and covers the three main sections and 25 thematic aspects of the Evaluation Criteria Matrix (ECM) which is included in Annex 6.

Methodology

46. The TE covers all project activities and has taken into account the available evidence and encountered circumstances. It followed UNDP and GEF guidance as detailed in the Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects¹. In doing so, it looked at various aspects of the project design/formulation, project implementation and project results/impacts compiling relevant and credible information to answer the comprehensive set of evaluation questions listed in the Evaluation Criteria Matrix (ECM) given in Annex 6. This was done through desktop analysis of all relevant project documents (see Annex 2) and consultations (in person and virtual/online) with the key stakeholders of the project (see Annex 3). A varying selection of technical evaluation questions was directed in questionnaires and/or individual interviews to different groups of project stakeholders and beneficiaries (see Annex 7).
47. Most stakeholders, however, were not able to provide answers directly to many of the highly technical evaluation questions, mainly because they were not familiar enough with the UNDP GEF

¹ [Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#)

project language or because their actual involvement in the project did not enable them to cover all of them or to go into such details. For this reason, a smaller number of more general questions was used to guide the majority of interviews with project stakeholders and partners, in person and virtual. They can be divided into two groups, i.e., those stakeholders that have made active contributions to the project, and those who have mainly increased their knowledge and skills through participating in trainings and workshops (beneficiaries). This format also allowed respondents to address other open questions and to express their particular opinions on project performance. Interviews were (semi)structured allowing some degree of flexibility as appropriate. For practical reasons the number of interview questions did not exceed 20 for in person and virtual consultations.

48. The results of the consultations with key project stakeholders have also been analysed quantitatively and taken into account in a simple way as follows: To the extent possible, the replies to individual ECM questions have been categorized as “yes”, “+/-”, or “no”. A “+/-” was counted as half a “yes”. In this way, the percentage of “yes”-votes was calculated from all replies. For this calculation, a minimal number of five stakeholder replies was required.

Data Collection

49. An availability check showed that the stakeholders based in the capitals and main port locations (i.e., Nairobi, Mombasa, Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar, Kampala, Entebbe) of the project countries which were available and could be visited and interviewed in the frame of the evaluation mission give a good representation of key stakeholders. There was thus no need to conduct a stakeholder analysis for selecting the most appropriate set of interviewees. The limited number of days available for the evaluation mission and its tight schedule, however, did not allow to include additional destinations such as Dodoma, Arusha, and Morogoro (all in Tanzania). The mission itinerary with the final schedule of actual stakeholder consultative meetings and site visits is included in Annex 5.
50. In the course of the evaluation mission 17 in person interviews, each with one or several participants, had been conducted with the project’s key stakeholders. They included diverse representatives from national government Ministries/agencies, private sector shipping and logistics companies, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), International Organization Partners (IOPs), UN and international cooperation/development agencies. These have been complemented by 12 online consultations (virtual interviews and/or responses received to questionnaires) with stakeholders who could not be contacted during the visit to project countries and who were based elsewhere. Altogether, 29 consultations with all relevant project stakeholder groups, including the PMU, PB and all RPs, had been undertaken (see Annex 4).
51. Field visits during the evaluation mission were restricted to site visits in the port areas. They allowed the Evaluator to gain a first-hand experience and better understanding of the various activities going on at the ports.

Data Analysis

52. A main focus of the TE has been on evaluating the project outputs, outcomes and impacts based in particular on the aspects of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact and the respective evaluation criteria listed in the Inception Report. Other aspects that have been assessed were the progress towards objective and expected outcomes, country ownership, gender equality/women’s empowerment, cross-cutting issues, GEF additionality and catalytic/replication effect. The project design/formulation and implementation phases have also been assessed based on other aspects and corresponding evaluation criteria (see Inception Report). To the extent possible, the project achievements have been assessed at the *outcome* level but output and activity levels have been considered as well as these may not correlate as clearly and directly as anticipated

with the outcomes they are meant to support (this is true in general and not a criticism of how the project formulated its outputs and activities).

53. The evaluation questions have been analysed using quantitative (e.g., counting yes/no-replies, calculating percentages of certain replies), or qualitative (descriptive) means. They were analysed for the three main sections and 25 aspects of the ECM (Annex 6). Some key aspects, in addition to receiving a descriptive assessment, have been rated on a 4-point (sustainability) or 6-point scale (other key aspects; see Annex 9). The scores for evaluated topics are based on the available evidence as explained in the Findings section. Overall ratings where required were based on average scores. Tables have been included to illustrate significant results and project performance.

Ethics

54. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations’.

Limitations

55. The evaluation has been subject to the following limitations:
- limited time availability (32 days) for a significant number of evaluation areas (25): thus only a limited amount of data on performance of each evaluation area could be collected;
 - limited time availability (2 weeks max.) for the evaluation mission in contrast to the various locations of project stakeholders in several countries; thus not all of them could be visited at their locations; the mission needed to focus on the capitals and main ports;
 - some of the key stakeholders were not available for interviews at any given time: as a consequence not all of them could be consulted in person during the evaluation mission or through online consultations;
 - some key stakeholders may have had a conflict of interest and thus may not in all cases have expressed their opinions about the project’s achievements frankly; this could have been the case, for instance, if they expected future similar project activities to which they also would like to contribute; however, the Evaluator did not have any indication for this behaviour and does not believe that it would have led to any significant bias in answers.
 -
 -

3. Project description

Problems to be addressed and project approach

56. Highly-valued African wildlife resources (e.g., ivory, rhino horn, pangolin scales) that have been poached continue to be illegally trafficked from Sub-Saharan Africa to Asia by freight ships departing from East, Central and West African ports. They are hidden in containers amongst legal goods where they are difficult to detect by law enforcement agencies. The screening and scanning of export containers results in few seizures. Consequently, there is an urgent need to strengthen law enforcement in the shipping routes between Africa and Asia. The UNDP GEF Project “Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa and Asia“ has been aiming to achieve this through addressing the main barriers that impede the effective detection of illegal wildlife goods: insufficient awareness and capacity at African and Asian ports, and the lack of adequate coordination and cooperation amongst the various local, national and international agencies and organizations that play significant roles along the trade routes.

Development context: socio-economic and environmental benefits

57. The project will provide socioeconomic benefits at both national and local levels. In terms of income generation, at the local level, shipping-related businesses will benefit from reduced corruption, fewer interceptions of their legal goods due to untargeted inspections, and altogether faster processing of trade which will reduce their costs and enhance their revenue. At the national level, the increased interception of illegal goods, reduction of corruption and increased efficiency in container processing could result in greater revenue generation from international trade, leading to long-term national economic development.
58. The disruption of the wildlife trafficking chain, with the associated criminals removed from the supply chain, will help to restore security at both national and local levels. National security will benefit from improved governance and transparent trade procedures, as well as from the prevention of wildlife products such as ivory funding activities of serious criminal groups. Local port stakeholders will be less exposed to criminals and illegal activity. Combating wildlife crime will also reduce insecurity and criminal activity in rural areas, where wildlife is abundant, which will particularly benefit women and other vulnerable groups. And the prevention of corruption will benefit local people.
59. Ultimately, preventing the illegal wildlife trade will reduce poaching of globally significant species such as African elephants and rhinoceros. Recovering wildlife populations will support sustainable rural community development, e.g., through wildlife tourism, and by helping to restore and maintain healthy ecosystems. This will serve as incentive for sustaining good management of natural resources and result in global environmental benefits of biodiversity conservation and ecosystems becoming more resilient against climate change.

Project objectives

60. The immediate objective of the project has been to reduce the illegal maritime trafficking of highly-valued wildlife resources between Africa and Asia through strengthened wildlife law enforcement capacity at ports and improved South-South cooperation. The project aimed to achieve its objective through implementing the following components:
 1. Best practice in combating wildlife trafficking at ports;
 2. South-South and institutional cooperation in combating maritime trafficking;
 3. Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation.
61. The project has also contributed to national and international development objectives and commitments, namely SDG 15.7 ('Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products'), and commitment #10 of the Buckingham Palace Declaration to establish a best practice system for combating wildlife trafficking at ports, which has informed component 1 of the project.
62. The evaluation also assessed if relevant and compulsory cross-cutting issues had been considered, and to what extent. This refers in particular to the use of gender-responsive methodologies and tools that should ensure that aspects of gender equality and women's empowerment are adequately incorporated into the project. Other relevant cross-cutting issues which required cross-checking refer to agreed priorities in country programming (UNDP CPD, UNDAF, etc.), aspects of south-south or triangular cooperation, and the general promotion of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Project start, duration and extensions

63. Project implementation started in May 2018. All project activities will be concluded by the end of 2023. This includes two project extensions over altogether 32 months. Total project duration thus amounts to over 5.5 years. Financed through a USAID grant, the project had been extended in 2021 by adding to it an equivalent set of consistent measures in the Kampala dry port, another related wildlife trafficking hotspot, and by further strengthening capacity building and multi-sector coordination and cooperation in the ports of Mombasa, Dar es Salaam and Zanzibar.

Theory of Change

64. The project included a Theory of Change (TOC) from the beginning. It encompasses all required elements, i.e., a definition of the problem/threat that is being addressed, its root and underlying causes, and an analysis of the barriers to and actions required for overcoming the barriers and achieving the desired result of the intervention which is to substantially reduce the maritime trafficking of wildlife from Africa to Asia.

Expected results

65. The expected result of the intervention is that interception rates of trafficked wildlife at the project's key ports increase (at least initially) and are followed up by appropriate and well-coordinated law enforcement responses leading to increased rates of arrest and prosecution of wildlife traffickers, both within the country of seizure and internationally, and, ultimately, to markedly reduced maritime trafficking of wildlife from Africa to Asia.

Key stakeholders

66. The main stakeholders of the project include the PMU, PB, Implementing Partners/Responsible Parties, government counterparts (e.g., government agencies, port authorities, Joint Port Control Units), additional donors (USAID), private sector partners (e.g., container terminal operators, freight forwarders, shipping and logistics companies), as well as NGOs (e.g., TRAFFIC, WildAid, APOPO, SfG). A summary list of the key stakeholders involved in project implementation and their roles is given in Annex 3.

4. Findings

67. The findings of the evaluation report are structured into the three main sections (project design/formulation, project implementation and project results/impacts) and 25 thematic aspects of the ECM and are presented in this order (see Annex 6). Each paragraph refers to a specific evaluation question (EQ) that can also be found in Annex 7 based on the numbers given in square brackets at the beginning.

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

4.1.1 *Analysis of Results Framework and TOC*

68. [EQ01] **Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?** The project's objective and components as presented in the ProDoc have been further clarified at the multiple face-to-face and virtual meetings and discussions of the project with key stakeholders during the inception phase (October 2018 to March 2019). They were widely perceived to be clear, practicable and feasible in the given time frame (May 2018 to May 2021). This is supported by the Evaluator's consultations with stakeholders. The analysis shows that to 89% the objective and components were perceived as clear, practicable and feasible (n=9). The Evaluator, however, regards the initial time frame of three years as very ambitious for achieving the changes aimed at by the two distinct components 1 and 2, even in a context without pandemic.

69. [EQ02] **Was the project designed to address country priorities and be country-driven?** A desktop analysis revealed that the project objectives are in line with national and regional priorities and strategies of the concerned countries about the conservation and sustainable management of their natural resources. The Kenya National Wildlife Strategy 2030 and the Tanzanian National Strategy 2014 to Combat Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade, for example, both aim at reducing poaching and IWT through enhancing public awareness, strengthening collaboration (also regional and international) and collaborative law enforcement operations. This is also expressed through their signing of international agreements and commitments. All countries, for instance, have committed themselves to the UN goals of the the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and SDGs. This finding is supported by the Evaluator's consultations with stakeholders. 100% of received replies say that the project was designed to address country priorities (n=7).
70. [EQ03] **Were outcomes and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change (TOC)? Was there a clearly defined and robust TOC? Did the Theory of Change include: a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, and consideration of how to overcome barriers?** Analysis of the ProDoc showed that there is a well-defined TOC which the project outcomes and outputs are consistent with. It includes a clear definition of the issue/threat, its root causes, the desired outcomes, as well as an analysis of barriers to and actions required for overcoming the barriers and achieving the desired result of the intervention. The Evaluator's consultations with stakeholders support this finding to 90% (n=5). The TOC is also clearly in line with the TOC for the GWP global coordination project under which this project has been launched, namely its middle section on reducing trafficking through inter-institutional collaboration for law enforcement, private sector engagement, and capacity building on forensics and other detection means.
71. During the inception phase a different presentation of the TOC has been worked out that aligns more directly to the terms of the logical framework/project logic, i.e., outputs, outcomes, impacts (mid-term and long-term), and GEBs, and takes into account the special project set-up under the GEF-6 GWP coordination project showing thematic links to the GWP NPs on knowledge management and learning.
72. [EQ04] **Was the Results Framework well defined? Was it sound/robust from the beginning or was it revised later (e.g., during the Inception Workshop)?** The project's objective, components, outcomes and outputs had not been changed, or only marginally been re-worded in the Project Result Framework (PRF) following the discussions with key stakeholders during the inception phase (any such changes would require GEF approval in a possibly lengthy procedure). Modifications, adjustments and additions, however, have been made to the project's activities, indicators, baselines, end of project targets and assumptions and risks. Another important clarification during the inception phase was the resulting geographical focus for concrete project interventions on the ports of Mombasa, Dar es Salaam and Zanzibar. Further adjustments to these parameters have been made during project implementation. With other words, the strategic set-up and project logic were well defined from the beginning in the ProDoc while the activities and the methods and criteria for measuring and monitoring progress and assessing project achievements have been further clarified and adjusted in the inception phase and thereafter. The project key stakeholders expressed to 90% that the PRF has been sound and robust from the beginning (n=5).
73. [EQ05] **Did the project aim to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socioeconomic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant?** Socioeconomic benefits of the project have already been highlighted in chapter 3. The project has been contributing to broader development impacts, namely with regard

to the sustainable management of natural resources, to improving governance, income and safety, reducing corruption, and gender equality and women's empowerment. With exception of the latter, however, it was not clearly worked out how these additional development benefits are being captured. From the consultations with key stakeholders, the received replies indicate to 90% that the project aimed to capture broader development impacts (n=5).

74. [EQ06] **Were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant, Time-bound/Timely/Track-able/Targeted)?** The indicators in the ProDoc's Results Framework were not yet SMART enough (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant, Time-bound) but they became more relevant, practicable and SMART as a result of the multiple consultations with the project key stakeholders during the inception phase as documented in the Project Inception Report. Indicators in the Results Framework of the USAID proposal were SMART when this addition to the project came into force.

4.1.2 *Assumptions and Risks*

75. [EQ07] **Were the assumptions and risks in the PIF and ProDoc articulated well? Did they adequately take into account the experiences of project stakeholders/partners?** The assumptions (and respective risks) in the ProDoc have been formulated in a too general sense and were not specific and targeted enough to be directly applicable. As happened with other elements of the PRF (see EQ4), this inadequacy has been corrected in the project inception phase (based on multiple consultations with the key project stakeholders) by formulating more realistic assumptions that are more aligned to the indicators and have a clear focus on the target ports. A problematic assumption is the increase in the numbers of illicit wildlife product seizures and related arrests of criminals as a result of project achievements because this factor is subject to various influences that are mostly independent of the project and cannot realistically be predicted (as pointed out in a footnote of the Project Inception Report). Other adjustments and additions to the assumptions and risks have been made in the course of annual reviews (e.g., referring to the COVID-19 pandemic).
76. [EQ08] **Were the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust, and did they help determine activities and planned outputs?** The assumptions and risks formulated in the ProDoc are logical but not specific, focussed and aligned enough to be robust and easily applicable. They did not help determine the planned outputs (and activities) because outputs were updated and finalized first and only then risks and assumptions for their delivery were formulated.

4.1.3 *Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design*

77. [EQ09] **Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?** The ProDoc incorporated some lessons from other GEF and non-GEF projects, however, this project is widely unique, so there were not many adequate lessons readily available to be incorporated. Relevant GEF projects are in particular the GWP NPs in the focal port countries of Kenya, Tanzania, Thailand and Indonesia (see Table 3 of the ProDoc for coordination with other GEF initiatives).

4.1.4 *Planned stakeholder participation*

78. [EQ10] **Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?** The replies received from consultations with key stakeholders (n=11) confirmed to 91% that the perspectives of those key

stakeholders and beneficiaries who would be affected by project decisions, who could affect the outcomes, and who could contribute information or other resources to the process, had been taken into account during project design processes.

79. [EQ11] **Had the planned stakeholder interactions, as set out in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, been adequately built into the project design?** In the project preparation phase multiple consultations had been conducted with the identified project partners and key stakeholders to discuss their potential involvement and roles. Key stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project had been identified in national governments, port authorities and port-based law enforcement officers, private sector companies operating within the shipping industry and at ports, and local communities located along common transit routes and near ports, of the four focal port countries (see Table 3 of the ProDoc). With exception of the local communities whose role at the end was less tangible in the overall project concept, these stakeholders had been adequately built into in the project design. A Stakeholder Engagement Plan, aligned to the PRF and including project partners and beneficiaries, can be found in Annex 8 of the ProDoc. Most of these key stakeholders have been involved in project implementation as planned.
80. [EQ12] **Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?** Many obvious partners and partnerships for combating wildlife trafficking had been identified and contacted as potential partners during project preparation (e.g., IMO, UNODC, TRAFFIC, The International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC), United for Wildlife Task Forces (UfW TF)). Only some of them later had major roles and responsibilities during project implementation. In the ProDoc, for instance, UNODC was already defined as a RP for certain activities. Other RPs have been engaged later during project implementation. But none of these partnership arrangements were fully clarified and properly negotiated in the project preparation phase. Ideally, in that phase of the project, i.e. before GEF approval/endorsement of the ProDoc, one would identify and clarify the roles of implementing partners. Here, this process continued in the inception phase and beyond in a dynamic way. It would be better to know exactly who does what before project implementation starts.

4.1.5 *Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector*

81. [EQ13] **Was there planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and/or other initiatives and complementary interventions?** There was planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects. The project was planned to be coordinated with and feed knowledge, experiences, lessons learned, etc. into GEF GWP Projects in Africa and Asia, in particular in the four focal port countries of Kenya, Tanzania, Thailand and Indonesia.

4.1.6 *Gender responsiveness of project design*

82. [EQ14] **Were gender issues integrated in the project's strategy, rationale and TOC? Are there any gaps?** Both UNDP and the GEF require a gender responsive approach, which is an approach that seeks to ensure that women and men are given equal opportunities to participate in and benefit from an intervention, and promotes targeted measures to address inequalities and support the empowerment of women. To fulfil these requirements and mainstream gender in the project activities the project has developed a simple Gender (Mainstreaming) Strategy. Into the project logic of the TOC no specific gender aspects have been introduced. Overall, no significant deficiencies (gaps) with regard to gender are perceived in the project design.
83. [EQ15] **Were gender considerations integrated in the project's design, including through a gender analysis with the specific context of the project for advancing gender equality and women's empowerment and a gender action plan with a specific implementation plan for the**

delivery of gender activities, with indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party? Following UNDP and GEF requirements, gender mainstreaming principles have been incorporated into the project but there was not a strong emphasis on it. A simple gender analysis and mainstreaming strategy has been prepared during project design and annexed to the ProDoc. It has been further elaborated in the project inception phase and a Gender Action Plan (GAP) has been added to it with specific implementation information on the delivery of the planned gender activities: indicators, targets, timeframe, and responsibility. It includes specific GAP indicators aligned to the project outputs. Some sex-disaggregated/gender-sensitive indicators and targets have been used in the PRF. The project has been targeting equal participation of men and women to the extent possible although the ports and shipping sector is clearly male-dominated. To mitigate the risk of potential discriminations against women, the project has been committed to ensure that women are explicitly provided with opportunities to benefit from the project. The minimum requirement on project implementation has been that women are ensured at least equal opportunities as men to participate in the trainings provided and to apply for any positions opened up by the project, and that relevant gender aspects are included as part of the curriculum of any training provided.

84. A stronger emphasis on gender mainstreaming has been put on the GWP NPs which have wider thematic and geographical scopes. For them, a comprehensive gender mainstreaming strategy has been developed, gender roles in the management of natural resources have been documented, awareness and communication campaigns with specific focus on gender have been conducted, and project interventions have been periodically reviewed for best practices in gender mainstreaming. To monitor the project outcomes and impacts of these projects, sex-disaggregated data have been collected and gender-sensitive indicators have been used.
85. [EQ16] **Was the project aligned with national policies and strategies on gender equality?** All focal port countries support gender equality and women's empowerment. In 2010, for example, Kenya adopted a new progressive Constitution that promotes gender equality and women's empowerment. National policies and strategies on gender equality, however, have not been designed for the particular environment of ports. Nevertheless, the project mainly had to consider the specific gender situation at the target ports, not nationally.
86. [EQ17] **Was the gender expertise used in the design and development of the project adequate?** The gender expertise used in the design and development of the project was adequate. Specific professional expertise was available in the PMU with support from competent agencies and organisations that came on board in the course of the project inception phase. This has been confirmed by many project partners and stakeholders.
87. [EQ18] **Was the UNDP Gender Marker rating assigned to the project document realistic and backed by the findings of the gender analysis?** The project (document) has been assigned a Gender Marker rating of "1", meaning that the project contributes to gender equality in a limited way but not significantly. This rating seems realistic and is backed by the findings of the gender analysis.

4.1.7 *Social and Environmental Safeguards*

88. [EQ19] **Are the environmental and social risks identified through the SESP relevant?** Through conducting the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) during project preparation four environmental and social risks were identified which are relevant to the project. All of them had been assessed to be of low significance. The overall risk rating thus was low as no risk of high or moderate risk level had been identified. Later, during project implementation, two of these risks were updated to moderate levels (related to port staff capacity and gender), and

two additional health risks with regard to the COVID-19 pandemic were added, resulting in an increased overall risk level of “moderate”.

89. [EQ20] **Were the management measures outlined in the Project Document SESP and any management plans effective?** The management measures outlined in the ProDoc SESP are understood to be relatively effective in mitigating the identified risks based on their periodic updates and adjustments. A unique risk and unexpected challenge was the COVID-19 pandemic that had to be managed on top of the more “regular” risks.

4.2 Project Implementation

4.2.1 *Adaptive Management*

90. [EQ21] **Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of annual reviews and planning?** In the annual review and planning meetings, the PB had some recurrent statutory tasks, such as approving previous meeting minutes and project progress reports with annexed official documentation, updated/adjusted PRFs, quality assurance reports and new yearly work plans and budgets. It further held consultations among its members on issues that needed discussion. In these meetings, the PB also authorized a number of significant changes (see EQ23).
91. [EQ22] **If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes? And how?** The changes mentioned above were made at output and activity levels in accordance with the project TOC. As such they did not change the expected project outcomes.
92. [EQ23] **Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the PB? Explain the process and implications.** Based on the results of the annual review and planning consultations, the PB authorized in writing a number of significant changes, namely it approved an 18-month project extension (new operational closure date of 3 November 2022) and later a second 14-month project extension (new operational closure date of 3 January 2024), a USAID grant proposal and invitation and acceptance of USAID to be an additional member of the PB (after USAID’s signature of co-financing on 23 December 2020). These changes mainly served to compensate the time lost due to the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and to strengthen awareness, security and capacity building measures with regard to port law enforcement and maritime trafficking of wildlife together with an extension of project activities to the dry ports in Uganda based on the unique opportunity of substantial additional co-financing from USAID. As such they were significant and had a relevant and positive impact on the project.

4.2.2 *Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements*

93. [EQ24] **Did the project develop and leverage the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?** Partners can be understood as those stakeholders that are more actively engaged in the project either by shaping it through their advice and feedback and by establishing essential connections and contacts (e.g., within government agencies), or by actively implementing certain project activities. During the project inception phase and throughout project life, the PMU identified, contacted and consulted as needed a rather exhaustive list of potential project partners from all relevant sectors, i.e., industry (private sector), government, research and services (international organizations, NGOs, foundations, etc.), as documented in the Project Inception Report and project annual reports. These manifold contacts informed and helped shape the project in an adaptive process and a lot of them turned into actual project partnerships. The numbers and diversity of the partnerships involved in project implementation thus is high, and in particular the RPs have actively been engaged in project implementation.

94. [EQ25] **Did local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Did they have an active role in project decision-making that supported efficient and effective project implementation?** Local and national government stakeholders, in general, were supportive of the objectives of the project. The TE consultations with key stakeholders (n=13) reflected high rates of government support to the project (85%). In several cases port stakeholder workshops and trainings were opened and/or attended by high government officials who could use these occasions to influence project directions and decisions such as giving support to the development of IMO guidelines, AEO trainings, and the introduction of a KYC legal framework at the Kenyan ports. In the inception phase they helped clarify the key capacity gaps at the target ports and suggested and discussed some activities the project could implement. However, they did not have a more active role in project decision-making on a more regular basis and through more concrete contributions. During the project inception phase, and again in 2020 to develop the USAID proposal for additional co-financing, a lot of consultations with port stakeholders were conducted and, as a consequence, the project was adjusted to reflect their needs at the ports. This was crucial to gain the support of local and national governments.
95. [EQ26] **Did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? And how? Were there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities?** Stakeholder involvement and public awareness are two different topics. It is not advisable to include both of them in the same question. Moreover, what public awareness campaigns have been contributing to project achievements cannot be answered with any certainty. If successful, they lead to changed attitudes in the targeted audience. But even if such change occurs, one cannot be totally sure what the cause of that change was.
96. As already pointed out, a wide array of partners and stakeholders has been involved in this project, and the design and implementation of all project activities was guided by the outcomes of stakeholder consultations. Eight RPs have even directly been entrusted with the management of their contributions (i.e., UNODC, TRAFFIC International, Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers, WildAid, Space for Giants, University of Washington, APOPO and Grace Farms Foundation). This was the basis for any of the project's achievements. The practical capacity building exercises undoubtedly were an important contribution towards achieving the project objectives. Several beneficiaries, mainly from government agencies, however, criticized that not all of them had access to an in-person training, or that having access to a single training is not good enough and that very few could benefit from the whole set of trainings provided. This was perceived as a major limitation to stakeholder participation in project activities. They pointed out that they would need ongoing capacity building and that best would be a mentoring programme with an expert working with them on a daily basis over a period of time (such as in the established collaboration with UNODC Container Control Programme (CCP); informal communication channels for continued support have been made available by GFF and UoW).
97. [EQ27] **Was there invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability?** The project activities were designed and implemented to support stakeholder ownership and continuation after project closure. Especially important in this regard are the increased awareness, knowledge, capacities and professional networks of the various port stakeholders facilitated through the project. Project key stakeholders indicated to 100% that there was invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability (n=6).
98. [EQ28] **Did actual stakeholder interaction compare to what was planned in the project document and Stakeholder Engagement Plan?** Basically, there are two categories of project stakeholders: those who made active contributions to the project (project partners), and those who mainly increased their knowledge and capacities through participating in trainings and workshops (project beneficiaries).

99. The ProDoc already lists various potential project stakeholders and stakeholder types, e.g., in the Stakeholder Involvement Plan. Many of them became actual project partners in minor or major roles. Other partners, such as the majority of RPs, have been engaged later during the inception phase or during project implementation. Finally, the number of stakeholders who received trainings, i.e. the direct project beneficiaries, was much higher than initially planned. While the target was set at 200 (of which 40% were women) in the ProDoc, it reached 1721 by the end of June 2023, a figure almost nine times higher (of which approx. 32% were women). This significant increase in the number of trainees was partly due to the shift to virtual trainings as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. One participant from a port-related NGO suggested to put more emphasis on online trainings in general as these can have more participants and be better shared and are thus better value. In person trainings, on the other hand, are often more effective and cannot effectively be conducted remotely, especially for very specialised trainings.
100. [EQ29] **Was the gender action plan appropriate and adaptive in facilitating gender mainstreaming objectives?** To mainstream gender in the project activities the project developed a Gender (Mainstreaming) Strategy and Gender Action Plan (GAP) in the project inception phase. The GAP was aligned to the project outcomes and outputs, included specific GAP indicators and activities that allowed to address gender inequalities and empower women and was followed to deliver the project results. However, this was compromised a bit by the lack of a moderate budget allocated to a few specific gender-related activities. The GAP was port-specific and updated and adapted annually (last update in the second quarter of 2021).
101. [EQ30] **Were stakeholder engagement exercises gender responsive (e.g., measures to ensure women’s meaningful participation, women-only sessions)?** In the PRF, the end of project target for the total number of direct female project beneficiaries has been set at 40%. Given the male dominance in the port sector, this goal has been quite ambitious. Overall, women involvement in the project activities was in the range of 30-36% according to the latest 2022 annual progress report. This has only been achieved by following the Gender Strategy and GAP. Stakeholder engagement exercises thus were gender responsive but, as pointed out above, may have suffered from lacking a specific budget, e.g., for hiring specialised NGO facilitators to lead women-only sessions at the three port stakeholder workshops which could have resulted in some practical gender action points for the port environment.
102. [EQ31] **Were systematic and appropriate efforts made to include diverse groups of stakeholders (e.g., women’s groups) during implementation?** Again based on the Gender Strategy and GAP, efforts have been made by the PMU during project implementation to include diverse groups of stakeholders, such as women’s groups or groups with equal men and women participation. During the large port stakeholder workshops in Mombasa and Dar es Salaam, for instance, an attempt was made to discuss perceptions of gender dimensions in maritime wildlife trafficking with key stakeholders in separate discussion groups, but this has not been perceived as a success.

4.2.3 Project Finance and Co-finance

103. [EQ32] **Were there variances between planned and actual expenditures and, if yes, what are the reasons for those variances?** In this project there were considerable variances between planned and actual expenditures as shown in Table 1. One reason for this, at least in 2020-2021, was the COVID-19 pandemic. Other reasons were the complexity of the project, the tight time-frames, the late start of implementing actual project activities, the initial absence of a project manager and other support staff, etc. This led to a situation in which project activities had to be implemented in a rush based on (too) optimistic planning and of continued delays. At project inception most stakeholders and partners, in particular the RPs with their essential roles, had not yet been clearly identified, so this had to be a first priority in that phase. Under these circumstances,

the short project duration of only three years was not realistic to get everything done properly and further substantial delays were unexpectedly caused by the pandemic and the additional USAID co-financing. Not surprisingly, the project had to be extended in two steps over 32 months. As a consequence, planned and actual budget expenditures differ considerably.

Table 1: Planned and actual GEF and USAID project expenditures from 2018 to 2023

Planned figures are in black colour, actual figures in green. ProInR = Project Inception Report. All values are in US\$.

Year	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
Expenditures ProDoc		\$657,950	\$584,070	\$757,980			\$2,000,000
Expenditures ProInR		\$934,682	\$808,805	\$171,073			\$1,914,560
Expenditures GEF	\$85,440	\$241,975	\$449,500	\$346,238	\$876,846		\$1,999,999
Expenditures USAID				\$202,972	\$1,628,414	\$134,132	\$1,965,518

104. [EQ33] **Were additional sources of co-financing leveraged by the project compared to what was foreseen in the ProDoc? If yes, what volumes?** To the US\$ 2 million GEF grant for this project US\$ 3.25 million of parallel co-financing have been added by project partners in the preparation phase as documented in the ProDoc (UNDP: US\$ 150,000; UNODC: US\$ 2,600,000; Royal Foundation: US\$ 500,000). These initially planned co-financing commitments did not change during project implementation (see Table 2). The project, however, mobilized significant additional co-financing since inception, totalling US\$ 2,383,490, comprising a US\$ 100,000 contribution from UNEP (received from the government of Norway) to co-finance two wildlife law symposiums in West Africa which were held in partnership between the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Illicit Trade in Wildlife and Forest Products and the GWP, a US\$ 2 million grant from USAID to strengthen project activities in the target ports and extend them to the dry ports of Uganda, as well as two further co-financing amounts from GFF and TRAFFIC International. Altogether, the project has leveraged US\$ 5,633,490 of co-financing (of which slightly more than US\$ 2,000,000 from the USAID grant could be spent directly by the project). They have undoubtedly strengthened the project's achievements (see Tables 2 and 3). Table 3 also presents information on the type and source of the co-financing contributions and whether they are considered to be 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure'.

Table 2: Co-Financing Table

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP		UNODC		Royal Foundation		Total	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
In-kind support	150,000	150,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	500,000	500,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
Other								
Totals	150,000	150,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	500,000	500,000	3,250,000	3,250,000

Table 3: Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing at TE Stage

Sources of Co-Financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilize	Amount (US\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	grant/in-kind	recurrent expenditure	150,000
GEF Agency	UNODC	grant/in-kind	recurrent expenditure	2,600,000
Foundation	Royal Foundation	in-kind	recurrent expenditure	500,000
GEF Agency	UNEP (Norway)	cash	investment mobilized	100,000
Donor Agency	USAID	cash	investment mobilized	2,101,850
Foundation	GFF	cash	recurrent expenditure	131,640
NGO	TRAFFIC Intl.	in-kind	recurrent expenditure	50,000
Total Co-financing				5,633,490

105. [EQ34] **Were strong financial controls established to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables?** UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH) has a strong financial control system. All the project expenses were controlled quarterly and annually. Thus, the financial controls were good and allowed the PMU to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time. The interviews and consultations with RPs, who actively implemented certain elements of the project, did not indicate that the disbursement of funds was not timely, e.g., for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
106. [EQ35] **Did the project demonstrate due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits?** The project budget was analysed quarterly and revised annually by the PMU. Activity 3.2.8 of the PRF, in addition to this, asks for an annual audit of the project. The PMU clarified that this has been covered through audits and annual spot checks of RPs. Full financial audits have been conducted for the two RPs who received for their contributions the highest shares of the project budget (TRAFFIC: US\$ 388,186; and GFF: US\$ 350,000). Full audits are required for recipients of grants exceeding USD 150,000. In addition to these two full audits, four spot checks (serving as quick audits) have been carried out in 2022 and 2023 for the four RPs that were funded with over USD 50,000 per calendar year (WildAid, APOPO, TRAFFIC, and University of Washington). UN agencies such as UNODC are not considered for spot checks. For ICS and SfG no audit or spot check was required because of the comparatively minimal funding they received (less than US\$ 50,000). GFF and TRAFFIC will be spot checked again in 2023 since they are exceeding again the USD 50,000 threshold. The major findings of the available audits and spot checks are reported below under EQ36.
107. [EQ36] **Are there any significant observations from financial audits? If yes, what are the major findings?** Proper financial audits were conducted only for two RPs (see EQ35), TRAFFIC and GFF. For TRAFFIC, the expenses of four activities under the USAID grant were audited (totalling US\$ 333,046) covering the period from 24 June 2021 until 31 December 2022. Seven audit areas had been looked at. Of these, six received an overall rating of “satisfactory”, while the area on record keeping systems and internal controls was given an overall rating of “partially satisfactory” meaning that a low and a medium risk had been identified that should be addressed. For GFF, the expenses of one activity under the USAID grant were audited in the period from 1 January to 31 December 2022 covering only US\$ 124,910 (from their total of US\$ 350,000). For the same audit areas, GFF received three “satisfactory” and four “partially satisfactory” overall ratings. The latter pointed to a few single low and medium risks in the areas of HR selection/administration, financial management, procurement of goods/services, and record keeping systems/internal controls that should be addressed. No significant irregularities had been found in both audits. Concerning the spot checks: For TRAFFIC a financial overcharge of US\$ 1,878 due to a manual input mistake was detected that needs to be corrected. For the other RPs, in particular some tax issues were raised, i.e., if VAT exemption has to be requested by them and how realistic

and practical such attempts would be. Otherwise, no significant findings were reported in the spot checks.

108. [EQ37] **Were changes made to fund allocations? Were these the result of budget revisions? And were the changes/revisions appropriate and relevant?** Between the planned costs in AWP and actual budget expenditures reported in annual reports there were big discrepancies as shown in Table 1 for total annual budgets (and the same is true at outcome, output and activity levels). A main reason for this were significant initial delays in implementing the project activities (see also EQ32) and thus repeated shifts of delayed activities to the next reporting period. Unspent balances were shifted from one year to the next and remaining funds, such as from unrealized RP activities, were re-allocated to the UNDP budget for project implementation. Moreover, additional PMU support staff positions were agreed by the PB and introduced in 2021 with further implications on the spendings. And some budget positions reserved for activities considered less important (e.g., additional gap assessments in the ports) were redistributed to higher priority activities (e.g., IWT campaigns at target ports). As a consequence, main bulks of project activities were conducted in 2022 and in 2023 after the pandemic. And the project budget and fund allocations had to be revised, adjusted and approved by the PB at least annually in response to changes in the project environment.
109. The COVID-19 pandemic also led to changes in activities and changes made to fund allocations. The online delivery of an increased number of trainings resulted in significant budget savings. Another restructuring of budget matters was a result of the substantial USAID co-financing in 2021 and its alignment with GEF project activities which doubled the amount of funds available to the project and required the addition of further project locations, activities, and RP contributions. As far as can be judged these changes and revisions were appropriate and relevant. They have been approved by the PB but were not subject to GEF approval.

4.2.4 Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E

110. [EQ38] **Was the M&E plan well-conceived, practical and sufficient at the point of CEO endorsement? Was it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?** GEF CEO endorsement for this project weirdly was done in conjunction with the GEF-6 GWP coordination project at a very early stage (in June 2016) when there was no ProDoc and M&E plan. So it cannot be said if the M&E plan was sufficient at the point of CEO endorsement, there was none. A preliminary Monitoring Plan for monitoring the project objective and outcomes based on indicators, data sources, means of verification, etc., had been included in the ProDoc (together with very marginal evaluation plan information). Activity 3.2.1 of the PRF asked for reviewing and updating this plan, including setting PRF baselines, during the project inception phase, i.e., between October 2018 and March 2019. As a result, most indicators were adjusted, improved or replaced altogether. Outcome Indicator 1.2 “Change in knowledge and attitudes of port stakeholders regarding IWT”, for example, was removed because measuring change in knowledge and attitudes of port stakeholders is difficult. And Outcome Indicator 1.3 “Changes in ongoing anti-trafficking practices and capacity at ports (measured by PortMATE scores)” was substituted with more realistic and easy-to-measure indicators counting the number of port law enforcement officers who have successfully completed CCP advanced trainings and the number of containers risk-profiled daily at Mombasa and Dar es Salaam Ports, respectively. In January 2021 an additional, more elaborate Activity Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan required for the USAID co-financing was produced, with specific indicators for all GEF and USAID activities, outputs, outcomes and objective, which integrated and aligned all GEF and USAID project elements and incorporated the above mentioned improvements. While the initial M&E Plan of the ProDoc was not sufficient, improvements took place in the project inception phase but mainly the further improved and more comprehensive M&E plan required by USAID

was well-conceived, practical and suitable to monitor the project results and track progress towards achieving the project objective.

111. [EQ39] **Did the M&E plan include a baseline, SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results?** The M&E plan of the ProDoc did not include baselines, data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times. Baselines were first added to objective and outcome indicators during the project inception phase and were specified as well for all output indicators only in January 2021 in the more elaborate M&E plan required by USAID. The SMARTness of indicators improved during the inception phase and thereafter with an emphasis on being measurable and practical. The project M&E system has been kept simple – indicators almost exclusively refer to numbers/counts. After it developed and matured in the first half of project implementation, it conformed to GEF and USAID M&E requirements.
112. [EQ40] **Were baseline conditions, methodology, logistics, time frames, and roles and responsibilities well-articulated?** In the comprehensive M&E plan for USAID, baseline conditions, methodologies, data sources and assessment frequencies, were well-articulated. Roles and responsibilities had already been identified in the ProDoc for monitoring project objective and outcomes.
113. [EQ41] **Have inclusive, innovative and participatory monitoring systems been used?** Inclusive and participatory monitoring systems had been used since project preparation requesting, for instance, to count numbers of people disaggregated by gender. On the other hand, it cannot be said that the M&E plan was innovative. Indicators in the end referred only to numbers/counts, although ideally one would want to measure change directly, for example in attitudes and acquired knowledge.
114. [EQ42] **Did the M&E plan specify how the project keeps the GEF OFP informed and, where feasible, involved?** As stated in the ProDoc, the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) is meant to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements, notably the GEF Tracking Tools, across all GEF-financed projects in the country. Surprisingly, in all three Eastern African project countries the GEF OFP, generally a senior government official, was invisible and did not reply to any messages, neither from the Evaluator nor from the UNDP CO. Thus, unfortunately, the GEF OFPs could not be consulted in the course of this TE, nor did they seem to have any role or involvement in this project.
115. [EQ43] **Have standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements been fulfilled? Have the results framework indicators been monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR? Have the risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g., gender strategy) been monitored on a regular basis?** Until May 2019, the PRF indicators had been updated in the ProDoc. The 2019 annual report included detailed descriptions of how the project activities accomplished results and progress but did not use indicators to monitor progress systematically. It was finalized on 11 February 2020 and presumably shared with all PB members. An updated PRF with a separate column on 2019 achievements had also been produced. In that document progress was monitored against objective and outcomes based on agreed indicators but not against outputs. On 18 February 2020, during the third PB meeting, the project's progress in 2019 was presented to PB members and approved through consensus since there was no objection. The annual report for 2020 monitored progress against project objective and outcomes based on indicators, baselines and targets. The same is true for 2021 and 2022 annual reports which, based on a different presentation of M&E findings that followed USAID standards, monitored progress also against project outputs and included more details. Thus, the quality of M&E reporting increased during project implementation while it was not totally sufficient from the beginning. To some extent annual monitoring of PRF indicators,

risks and other plans developed to support project implementation (e.g., gender strategy) has informed evidence-based reporting. It would be useful though to compile all relevant information in one place (not leaving it scattered in bits and pieces over dozens of documents) allowing a complete overview at any given time that can be easily updated. This could be in the form of distinct monitoring sheets (e.g., Excel) for quarterly monitoring project progress and comprehensively documenting and describing any changes and developments that occur.

116. [EQ44] **Was the M&E budget in the project document sufficient? And was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?** The total budget reserved for Component 3 was small (including Output 3.1.: Documentation of best practices and lessons learned by the project and shared across the GWP and with other initiatives; and Output 3.2.: Project activities and results regularly monitored and evaluated). Given the simplicity of the project M&E system, the budget it required was minimal but adequate comprising mainly the salary component of the Knowledge Management and M&E Officer.
117. [EQ45] **Was data on specified indicators, relevant GEF Tracking Tools/Core Indicators gathered in a systematic manner?** The PMU monitored project activities and outputs quarterly (based on reporting from RPs, etc.) and the outcomes annually based on respective indicators. PRF and GEF Tracking Tools/GEF Core Indicators were updated annually and submitted to UNDP and GEF for review. The findings were used to inform project annual progress reports. Doing this in a more systematic manner by using distinct monitoring sheets and more regularly updating them to document, monitor and describe any project developments and progress would have been advisable and is missing in this form.
118. [EQ46] **Were progress and financial reports compliant with reporting requirements, including quality and timeliness of reports?** The PMU has in general been compliant with progress and financial reporting requirements, although there were slight delays in delivering some reports. The quality of the M&E sections of quarterly and annual technical reports would have benefitted from stronger narratives explaining in words clearly the main developments and conclusions instead of hiding all information in extensive tables with few words of comments added.
119. [EQ47] **Was the information provided by the M&E system (i.e. M&E results) used to improve and adapt project performance?** M&E results were used in a simple way to keep the project on track and ensure implementation and delivery of the project outputs. A comprehensive compilation and documentation of M&E results with more regular updates in distinct monitoring sheets, however, is lacking.
120. [EQ48] **Were the M&E results shared and discussed with project stakeholders and project staff (PMU)?** M&E results were regularly discussed at PMU meetings and shared with the PB. Any adjustments to project activities and other required major decisions were discussed with and approved annually by the PB.
121. [EQ49] **Was there adequate monitoring of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP and in line with any safeguards management plan's M&E section?** During project preparation four environmental and social risks for the project had been identified through the SESP (duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project; rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights; the project could potentially reproduce discriminations against women; the outcomes of the project are sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change; see ProDoc). All of them were assessed to be of low significance. During project implementation two of these risks were upgraded to moderate levels (related to port staff capacity and gender) and two additional health risks with regard to the COVID-19 pandemic were added resulting in an increased overall risk level of "moderate". The project risk log,

including SESP and other project risks, was updated and adjusted annually by the PMU and shared with the PB for their comments and approval. In this way, it was effective in mitigating the identified risks.

122. [EQ50] **Did the M&E system include proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?** The M&E system is designed for the project’s lifetime and does not need to be continued after project closure. The project did not include M&E training for parties to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used in the same way after the project has come to an end. But this may have been an added value for the project, in particular for the ports’ law enforcement agencies and the RPs given their potential future roles in keeping the project alive and sustaining the project’s achievements. Other potential partners in M&E, such as the GEF OFPs and national/regional institutes, were not (much) involved in the project.
123. [EQ51] **Was the project’s TOC reviewed and refined during implementation?** The TOC was reviewed twice during project implementation: in the project inception phase based on various consultations with stakeholders and during development of the USAID proposal. After adding the USAID co-financing and further aligning the UNDP GEF and USAID project elements, another slightly simplified version of the port project’s TOC has been worked out which is reproduced below in Figure 1.
124. [EQ52] **Did the PB fulfil its given role in M&E activities? To what extent?** The PB reviewed and approved the project annual reports, including PRF and risk log, annually. The PB members all have technical experience in areas relevant to the project. Not all of them, however, were able to answer a selection of the specific technical evaluation questions the GEF is interested in. They may not be familiar enough with GEF project language and tools. It would be an added benefit though if several PB members had this specific expertise as it would allow them to make more informed comments on the M&E and risk assessment results that are shared with them. On the other hand, there are other criteria for selecting PB members and it may not always be possible to find several suitable PB members that in addition to their qualifications and roles have this specific project logic expertise.
125. M&E Ratings

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating
M&E design at entry	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
M&E Plan Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
Overall Quality of M&E	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

4.2.5 UNDP implementation/oversight

126. [EQ53] **Did UNDP effectively deliver on activities related to project implementation (e.g., project start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation)?** This project faced a number of significant challenges. In the beginning, it was a challenge to identify and engage the right stakeholders, then additional project management support had to be found, and finally the COVID-19 pandemic complicated matters further. All this led to delays and put additional stress on the PMU. However, although circumstances were difficult, the UNDP team was able to implement the project surprisingly well and deliver results. This was confirmed by replies received from consultations with project stakeholders (N=5), all of them RPs, which to 100% confirmed that the degree of leadership shown by UNDP was very good and that it coordinated the inputs of implementing partners well.

127. [EQ54] **Was UNDP support to the project partners/team adequate, of high quality and timely?** UNDP support to implementing partners was perceived to be adequate, of good quality and timely. The replies received from consultations with project stakeholders (N=6) confirmed to 100% that this was the case. In some cases, however, in particular where significant delays began to show that were not (only) due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the PMU could have followed up more quickly and closely with the RPs.
128. [EQ55] **Was UNDP annual reporting candid and realistic?** UNDP annual reporting has been comprehensive, candid and realistic. This was fully confirmed by the replies received from consultations with project stakeholders (all RPs).
129. [EQ56] **Was UNDP's responsiveness to significant implementation problems/challenges adequate?** Although the project faced a number of significant implementation problems and challenges, UNDP was able to respond to them adequately and adapt its management of the project accordingly as confirmed also by the replies received from consultations with project stakeholders (all RPs).
130. [EQ57] **Was UNDP oversight of the management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP adequate?** The project risk log, including SESP and other project risks, was updated annually by the PMU and shared with the PB for their comments and approval (see EQ49). In this way, UNDP oversight of the management of environmental and social risks as identified through the SESP has been adequate.

4.2.6 Project partner execution

131. [EQ58] **Did project partners effectively manage and administer the project day-to-day activities under UNDP overall responsibility/supervision?** The eight RPs, in general, managed and administered their project day-to-day activities quite well under UNDP supervision but there were exceptions and shortcomings as follows: (1) SfG prepared an initial draft of the KYC legal regulatory framework for import/export actors in Kenya but failed to organize drafting workshops to further develop and finalize it. They justify this failure with the COVID-19 pandemic that made in-person meetings impossible throughout most of 2020 and 2021 (accordingly, the RP agreement was extended to 30 June 2022), and the elections in Kenya in 2022 that absorbed required participants from government. The NGO estimates it delivered about 40% of agreed activities. But because of continued lack of progress, the RP agreement with SfG finally was cancelled and the unspent balance returned to UNDP at the end of August 2022. SfG still aimed to follow up with the KMA on finalizing and promoting the KYC framework after the elections and to have it approved by public and private sectors by November 2023. However, this was very uncertain. The PMU therefore directly hired a consultant for this task who meanwhile made progress on the draft regulations. It is now likely that they will be completed by the end of 2023. Their approval, however, can now only be gained after project closure in 2024. (2) UNODC struggled to deliver the agreed activities under the GEF funds, partly because of COVID-related restrictions, and completed these activities only in the third quarter of FY2022. As a consequence, a follow-up agreement with UNODC based on USAID co-financing was only signed on 23 September 2022. It included four activities, one on a controlled delivery practical exercise for JPCUs and other LE officers that was later removed from the agreement and will now be undertaken by GFF, the others covering advanced trainings and tools for LE agencies to detect, intercept, and prosecute wildlife trafficking at the target ports. Two of these latter activities were scheduled to be implemented in the third quarter of FY2023 but both did not take place because the trainer again cancelled and UNODC was not able to find an alternative expert to replace him. Given these limited efforts by UNODC further delays are to be expected in the delivery of these activities which may no longer take place before project closure. (3) TRAFFIC had difficulties to deliver a vulnerability assessment for selected transport nodes in wildlife trade. The consultant hired for this assessment

was several months late in delivering the inception report on the approach. To manage this risk, the agreement with TRAFFIC was extended to include second quarter of FY2023. A first draft of the assessment report was finalized, reviewed and validated by March 2023. By June 2023 layout and design have also been completed and a visual guide illustrating the most vulnerable nodes for wildlife trafficking in the supply chain has been prepared and reviewed (design work only started). (4) APOPO was found to be lacking a clear plan for testing their rats approach and conducting subsequent trainings in the real port environment of Dar es Salaam. By the second quarter of 2023, however, their testing was largely successful although not all aspects of their research could be realized according to plans, mainly because some wildlife target samples were not provided by a partner. The question, for instance, whether rats would detect large amounts of wildlife targets hidden among larger packaging such as wooden crates or cardboard boxes, remained unanswered.

132. [EQ59] **Was there an appropriate focus on results and timeliness?** As detailed in the above paragraph, some RPs struggled to deliver the expected results and some had difficulties to stay within the agreed timelines, even the extended ones due to the COVID-19 pandemic (all RPs were facing some delays due to COVID-19). While at least half of the involved RPs, namely the ones mentioned in the paragraph above, had difficulties to deliver their contributions in a timely manner, two of them, SfG and UNODC, did not deliver significant parts of the expected work.
133. [EQ60] **Were the use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services appropriate?** The use of funds was generally in accordance with RP financial agreements. The few audits that have been conducted found some small irregularities, e.g., VAT additions, and in one case with TRAFFIC led to subsequent corrections in financial accounting.
134. [EQ61] **Was risk well managed?** Project risks were managed quite satisfactory with the support of the PMU, including serious COVID risks (see also EQ64).
135. [EQ62] **Was the quality of project partners’ annual (work) plans sufficient?** The quality of project partners’ annual work plans was good. Each RP agreement included a detailed quarterly plan for each activity. This was done jointly with the PMU.
136. [EQ63] **Was annual reporting of project partners candid and realistic?** The RPs reported quarterly on the state of implementation of their activities and planned and actual expenditures until they completed their contributions. The quality of RP reporting was in all cases sufficient. Annual donor reports were compiled by the PMU based on the RP’s quarterly reports and monthly or, where needed, bi-weekly monitoring and coordination calls with the RPs.
137. [EQ64] **Was management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP and implementation of associated safeguards requirements adequate?** The management of environmental and social risks as identified through the SESP and the implementation of associated safeguards was adequate. It was mainly monitored by the PMU and not the RPs.
138. UNDP Implementation/Oversight & Implementing Partner Execution Ratings

UNDP Implementation/Oversight & Implementing Partner Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	Satisfactory (S)
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
Overall quality of Implementation/Oversight and Execution	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

4.2.7 *Risk Management*

139. [EQ65] **Were new risks (including SESP risks) or changes to existing risks reported on in the annual progress reports/PIRs?** New risks (including SESP risks) and perceived changes in levels of existing risks were compiled annually in updated risk logs and reported on in the annual progress reports that were shared and discussed with PB members.
140. [EQ66] **Were risk ratings (low, moderate, substantial, high) changed during project implementation? How? Were these revisions appropriate and timely? Were management measures adjusted accordingly? And how?** At least one change in risk ratings during project implementation has been noticed in the annual risk logs. It refers to the potential discrimination against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in activities and access to benefits. It has been changed from low to moderate risk level based on re-assessed increased impact and slightly increased probability. Moreover, two environmental risks have been added on the COVID-19 pandemic, one referring to continued potential delays to project implementation rated as high risk, and the other referring to potential increase of health risks rated as moderate risk. The annual risk logs have been shared and discussed, as needed, with the PB members. The SESP template has also been used to quarterly monitor SESP risks and produce and implement a set of corrective actions (see EQ68). This shows that risks have been re-assessed quarterly and annually and that the management has been adjusted accordingly.
141. [EQ67] **Did those risks (including SESP risks) affect project implementation?** The unexpected COVID-19 pandemic affected project implementation very severely causing changes to most project activities and substantial delays in their delivery.
142. [EQ68] **Were systems, plans, tools and actions used to identify, prioritize, monitor and manage those risks (including SESP risks)?** The project's Risk Log and SESP templates have been available to quarterly and annually monitor the social, environmental and other risks and produce and implement a set of corrective actions, as required. They collect data on risk impact and probability, counter-measures/management response, status and responsibility. Specific information for SESP monitoring was meant to be collected quarterly from RPs, port stakeholders and news but it is not clear if this has actually been done (see also EQ70).
143. [EQ69] **Were any risks (including SESP risks) overlooked and what were the consequences of that?** There is no indication that any risks (including SESP risks) had been overlooked. It seems that all relevant risks for the project were captured correctly.
144. [EQ70] **Was the project's risk register properly maintained during implementation (including SESP risks)?** The risk logs were properly maintained during project implementation and updated annually as required by GEF and UNDP. For the required quarterly updates of the SESP templates no records were available to the Evaluator that showed that these were done properly.
145. [EQ71] **Did the project staff (PMU) keep the PB informed of new risks, changes to existing risks and the escalation of risks (including SESP risks)?** The PMU kept the PB informed of new risks, changes to existing risks, their perceived levels, and the proposed management responses/measures.

4.3 Project Results and Impacts

4.3.1 *Progress towards objective and expected outcomes*

146. [EQ72] **Did the project accomplish the objective and achieve the expected outcomes based on the respective indicators? What were the final achievements?** Based on the three PRF indicators, the targets of the project's objective have largely been fulfilled, i.e., to 77%, if the three

indicators are given the same weight (an overview of the end of project achievements of objective and outcomes based on PRF indicators is given in Table 4). Not as high as anticipated were the numbers of seizures and arrests at the ports which reduced the achievement rate quite a bit. However, these figures are neither a clear indication of the project's success nor failure and have to be taken with caution. Three new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management of natural resources, a mandatory UNDP indicator, have been added to the baseline which is slightly higher than targeted (reported by the PMU are four, but the addition of the JPCU in Zanzibar refers to one agreement and has been double counted; rate of achievement: 100%, however, the stakeholders and authorities at one or more Asian ports may not yet be involved actively enough in efforts to combat maritime wildlife trafficking). By the end of June 2023 the total number of direct project beneficiaries was almost nine times higher than the target value (30-36% were women compared to the 40% targeted; rate of achievement: 100%; the gender target has widely been achieved). With regard to the third indicator on annual wildlife crime law enforcement statistics: The number of seizures and arrests at the target ports as said were below expectations (rate of achievement: 30%). And the number of seizures and arrests/month across GWP NPs have yet to be compared to the baseline values (the data has not yet been provided but the targets are just a minimal increase).

147. Based on the three PRF indicators (two of them with two sub-indicators each), project outcome 1 has been achieved to 87% (see Table 4). 42 law enforcement officers of Dar es Salaam and Mombasa JPCUs (30% women as targeted) successfully completed CCP advanced trainings on CITES, wildlife crime intelligence and automatic risk profiling (as compared to the minimum target of 30). The baseline for the total number of containers risk-profiled daily in Mombasa and Dar es Salaam ports, a sub-indicator of indicator three (1.3 b), however, did not change significantly yet, because Dar es Salaam JPCU is still learning to use the Risk Profiler and CTS is not yet functional at Mombasa Port.
148. Based on the four PRF indicators, project outcome 2 has been achieved to 72% (see Table 4). Two of the four indicators have only partially been achieved. This refers to the small number of law enforcement officers from African and Asian ports that participated in the exchange visit and collaboration programme (only in 2019 four officers were on the exchange programme; rate of achievement: 27%) and the smaller than anticipated number of collaborative UN initiatives (GWP coordination project indicator) that were part of the project: West Africa Wildlife Crime Symposium (2018); joint IMO and UNDP initiative on developing the IMO Guidelines for the Prevention and Suppression of the Smuggling of Wildlife on Ships engaged in International Maritime Traffic (2021); and inclusion of an Africa-Asia Collaboration Award category in the Asia Environmental Law Enforcement Awards managed by UNEP (rate of achievement: 60%).
149. Based on the two PRF indicators, project outcome 3 on the documentation and sharing of the lessons learned and best practices from this project and across the GWP has been fully (100%) achieved (see Table 4). Lessons were shared in different formats (e.g., knowledge exchange webinar, GWP Annual Report, exposure stories, GEF Voices, PANORAMA Solution, a study tour to Kenya in 2022 and a video). Additional lessons are in the pipeline (i.e., a publication on the campaign, a best practice guide and four other videos). Altogether, on the basis that all of them are given the same weight, the project outcomes have been achieved to 86%.

Table 4: End of project achievements of objective and outcomes based on PRF indicators

Target refers to minimum end of project target; for sub-indicators (a, b) the mean value is taken for calculation of overall achievements (in %).

Objective/Outcome	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Achieved
Objective	1. Number of new partnership mechanisms (required UNDP Indicator)	2	4	6 (100%)
Objective	2. Total number of direct project beneficiaries (GEF Core Indicator)	0	200	1773 (100%)
Objective	3. Annual wildlife crime LE statistics (a1) number of seizures at the target ports	0	5	2 (40%)
Objective	3. Annual wildlife crime LE statistics (a2) number of arrests at the target ports	0	10	2 (20%)
Objective	3. Annual wildlife crime LE statistics at ports (b1) number of seizures across GWP National Projects	5620	> 5620	to be determined
Objective	3. Annual wildlife crime LE statistics at ports (b2) number of arrests/month across GWP National Projects	124		to be determined
Objective	all			77%
Outcome 1	1.1 (a) Total number of maritime and port sector signatories of the BPD	22	28	27 (96%)
Outcome 1	1.1 (b) Number of signatories of the BPD at target ports	4	6	6 (100%)
Outcome 1	1.2 Number of port stakeholders implementing wildlife crime and illicit trafficking awareness/security/training programmes at target ports	0	2	3 (100%)
Outcome 1	1.3 (a) Total number of LE officers at Mombasa and Dar es Salaam ports successfully completed CCP advanced trainings	0	30	42 (100%)
Outcome 1	1.3 (b) Total number of containers risk-profiled daily at Mombasa and Dar es Salaam Ports	227	1000	227 (23%)
Outcome 1	all			87%
Outcome 2	2.1 Number of JPCUs at target ports established and cooperating with other African and Asian ports	2	3	3 (100%)
Outcome 2	2.2 Number of LE officers at Zanzibar port using ContainerComm for regular communication with other African and Asian ports	0	6	6 (100%)
Outcome 2	2.3 Number of LE officers from African and Asian ports participating in exchange visit and collaboration programme	0	15	4 (27%)
Outcome 2	2.4 Number of collaborative UN initiatives	1	5	3 (60%)
Outcome 2	all			72%
Outcome 3	3.1 Number of lessons learned/best practices from this project documented and shared with stakeholders	0	6	16 (100%)
Outcome 3	3.2 Number of lessons learned, and best practices captured across the GWP and shared with stakeholders	0	6	23 (100%)
Outcome 3	all			100%

150. [EQ73] **Were the key expected outputs actually delivered? What factors affected delivery of these outputs?** The eleven GEF and USAID project outputs have been achieved in the range between 60% and 100% (an overview of the end of project achievements of these outputs based on PRF indicators is given in Table 5). Based on the output indicators and targets, outputs were achieved in average to 87% by the end of June 2023. This figure will likely increase slightly until project closure. Thus, the project outputs have largely been delivered. The main factors that negatively affected output delivery were the COVID-19 pandemic, RPs that did not implement their contributions as agreed and delayed support from government officials for issuing permits, etc.

Table 5: End of project achievements of outputs based on PRF indicators

Target refers to minimum end of project target; for sub-indicators (a, b) the mean value is taken for calculation of overall achievements (in %). Disaggregated by gender means that achievement rates are calculated separately for men and women.

Outputs	Indicators	Target	Achieved (Indicator)	Achieved (Output)
Output 1.1	1.1.1 Total number of awareness events organized	15	15 (100%)	
Output 1.1	1.1.2 Total number of stakeholders involved in the events disaggregated by gender and sector		(99%)	99.5 %
Output 1.2	1.2.1 Total number of LE officers at the target ports trained to detect and intercept wildlife trafficking, including automated risk profiling, disaggregated by gender		(100%)	
Output 1.2	1.2.2 Total number of ports with automated risk profiling system in place	2	2 (100%)	
Output 1.2	1.2.3 Total number of port assessment and forensics reports provided to ports' stakeholders for follow up	7	8 (100%)	100 %
Output 1.3	1.3.1 Total number proposals, frameworks, and incentives schemes developed by project for ports and maritime stakeholders	7	5 (71%)	71 %
Output 1.4	1.4.1 Total number of awareness and trainings events	11	11 (100%)	
Output 1.4	1.4.2 Total number of awareness and trainings events' participants disaggregated by gender and sector		(91.5%)	
Output 1.4	1.4.3 Number of media campaigns and other outreach activities focused on wildlife conservation and/or demand reduction developed ...	1	1 (100%)	
Output 1.4	1.4.4 Number of individuals reached by wildlife crime campaigns, as a result of USG assistance or engagement	1000	2000 (100%)	98 %
Output 1.5	1.5.1 Number of LE officers trained and mentored		(56.5%)	
Output 1.5	1.5.2 Total number of ports with automatic risk profiling system (ARPS) in place	2	1 (50%)	
Output 1.5	1.5.3 Number of new tools and/or technologies developed, and/or shared to combat wildlife crime	5	4 (80%)	62 %
Output 2.1	2.1.1 Official presence/absence of Zanzibar JPCU	1	1 (100%)	
Output 2.1	2.1.2 Total number of trained officers at Zanzibar JPCU (disaggregated by gender)		(100%)	
Output 2.1	2.1.3 Total number of officers supported for exchange visit trips (disaggregated by gender)		(42%)	81 %
Output 2.2	2.2.1 Total number of inter-agency task force initiatives supported by the project	5	3 (60%)	60 %
Output 2.3	2.3.1 Total number of officers trained and mentored in wildlife crime investigation techniques disaggregated by gender		(88%)	88 %
Output 3.1	3.1.1 Total number lessons learned and shared by the project	11	13 (100%)	100 %
Output 3.2	3.2.1 Total number of quarterly and annual reports produced by the project	20	20 (100%)	100 %
Output 3.3	3.3.1 Total number of lessons learned and shared by the project (USAID grant)	5	9 (100%)	100 %

151. [EQ74] **Was outcome achievement dependent on delivery of project outputs and other factors such as project design, linkages with other activities, extent of co-financing, stakeholder involvement, etc.?** Outcome achievement is by design dependent on delivery of the project outputs. To what extent is difficult to say. The better they are chosen, the higher this dependency is. The indicators on how to measure the project outcomes have been formulated in the PRF and its updates. They are all about counting numbers, e.g., the number of officers trained and mentored in certain techniques, disaggregated by gender. Project output indicators, on the other hand, had only been formulated in 2021 when additional M&E standards for the USAID co-financing were required. A comparison of them with the outcome indicators reveals that they are very similar. They too are all about counting numbers such as trainees. This shows that project outcomes and outputs are not separated to the degree one would wish. Clear is that the achievement of outputs should lead to accomplishing the respective project outcomes. An indication that the outputs have

been chosen carefully in the project is that they had been adjusted markedly during the project inception phase to ensure they address the gaps at ports that key stakeholders pointed out. Outcome achievement was also dependent on the substantial co-financing by USAID in the midst of implementation and the (late) integration of additional locations, outputs and activities into the project. While it undoubtedly was a great opportunity that brought a lot of additional benefits, it also distracted attention from the GEF funded parts and in this way may have diminished the achievements there to a small degree.

152. [EQ75] **Did the project contribute to GWP outcomes? How?** The project was set up under the GEF-6 GWP global coordination project and includes a separate component on knowledge management and M&E. As such there are strong links by design to the GWP. Accordingly, the project contributed significantly to the GWP outcomes through documenting and sharing knowledge, lessons learnt and best practices.

4.3.2 *Relevance*

153. [EQ76] **Were the project's objective and outcomes in line with national development priorities?** The project objective and outcomes are all in line with the national priorities of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda as outlined in wildlife conservation legal frameworks and species management action plans. Moreover, the project outputs were adjusted in the inception phase to meet national demands at the ports (see also EQ2).

154. [EQ77] **Was the project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, UNDAF, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), SDGs, GEF and GWP strategic programming?** The project's objectives are fully consistent with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, UNDAF, UNSDCF, SDGs, GEF and GWP priorities which all address the unsustainable use of natural resources, as well as gender equality and the role of women and rural poor, in their use (see also EQ80). Some of them explicitly cover the danger posed by commercial poaching and IWT (e.g., UNDAF 2018-2022 for Kenya).

155. [EQ76, 77] When considering also how stakeholders and (co-financing) partners were engaged and the extent to which the intervention was informed by the needs and interests of various and diverse stakeholders through in-depth consultations in the inception phase, as well as the relevance to and obvious complementarity to other initiatives that aim to combat IWT at source, mainly in large protected areas, the overall rating for the criteria of relevance is seen as "highly satisfactory".

4.3.3 *Effectiveness*

156. [EQ78] **Did the project achieve, or does it expect to achieve, the planned results (objectives, outputs, outcomes, impacts)? To what extent?** The project achieved the expected results to 85-90% (please see EQs 72-73 for more details). Given the challenges the project had faced due to a slow start, the coronavirus pandemic, and a few unreliable partners, as well as the considerable expansion of the activities through involving USAID in the midst of implementation, this is judged as a good result.

157. [EQ79] **Did the project outputs effectively contribute to delivery of the project outcomes?** This question has already been answered above (please see EQ74).

158. [EQ80] **Did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF and GWP strategic priorities, and national development priorities? What are the contributing factors?** The project did in fact contribute to the CPDs, national development priorities, SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan, as well as GEF and GWP strategic priorities (see EQ77), in particular in the areas of wildlife and natural resources

conservation, sustainable economic development, security and safety, tourism, and gender equality.

159. [EQ81] **In which areas did the project have greatest and least achievements?** Judged by activities, the KYC regulations framework achieved minimal results. Only about 30-40% of what was expected has been implemented by SfG. Consequently, the collaboration with SfG had been stopped in 2022. The NGO, however, continued to work with Kenyan government agencies (e.g., KMA, KWS) on preparing the draft regulations. UNDP (PMU) took over the coordination of the work and hired a consultant for this task who meanwhile made progress on the KYC draft framework. A workshop was held with the public sector from 10-12 May 2023 in Mombasa and the regulations were later in the month presented to the private sector at the Trade Facilitation workshop, also in Mombasa. It is now likely that they will be completed by the end of 2023 (see also EQ58). Another activity that may not be implemented as planned is the introduction of the automatic risk profiling system of sea containers (RiskProfiler) to Dar es Salaam Port, Zanzibar Port and Uganda Revenue Authority (URA) in Kampala. It was initially planned for 2020 but not fully delivered by UNODC. It shall now be realized under Output 1.5 in the framework of the UNODC-UNDP agreement for the USAID grant. By 30 June 2023 about 60% of this output have been achieved. Its introduction to Zanzibar Port and URA was planned for March 2023 but had to be cancelled because the trainer from Vietnam was no longer made available. This activity will now probably not be completed at all. Another activity that has only been implemented to about 60% refers to Activity 2.2.1 (Support of UN Inter-Agency Task Force Initiatives). All other outputs and activities of the project have largely been achieved. By the end of June 2023 they were completed in the range between 70% and 100% (see Table 5).
160. [EQ82] **What are the key factors that influenced (achievement or failure to achieve) the results?** The key factors that influenced the achievement of results (or failure to achieve them) have been mentioned repeatedly throughout the report. A slow start of actual implementation followed by the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020-2021 led to delays in most activities. Other negative factors were the complexity of the project, the tight timeframes, and the initial absence of a project manager and other support staff. Among positive factors were the project implementation by mostly professional and engaged RPs which allowed to implement multiple project activities in parallel, and the great opportunity to expand and strengthen the project's achievements through the significant USAID co-financing.
161. [EQ83] **Would any alternative strategies have been more effective in achieving the project's outcomes?** This question is rather speculative. Illegal trafficking of wildlife can be opposed at source, in transit or by reducing demand in the Asian destination countries. The project was designed to address the key gaps at the target ports, i.e., in transit. The chosen approach makes sense. It is unlikely that a very different strategy would have been more effective.
162. [EQ84] **What other programmes/projects/actions contributed to the achievement of the project outcomes?** Some project partners such as UNODC, WCO, IMO and TRAFFIC have other projects and established activities running in parallel that aim at reducing the maritime trafficking of illegal goods such as the CCP, CTS and EAC AEO Programme. These already supported the achievement of the project's results albeit at a lower frequency but have been strengthened and built into the project as important training components. Thus their contributions to the project outcomes in a scenario without the project cannot be assessed in isolation.
163. [EQ85] **Did the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human rights-based approach?** The project's contribution to gender equality and the empowerment of women was relatively moderate as the ports are a men-dominated environment. However, about 30-36% of the total number of direct project beneficiaries were women and the ambitious gender target of the project has widely been achieved. Some workshop instructors and

RP contributors were also women. Potential discrimination against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in activities and access to benefits, has been monitored as a project risk and changed from low to moderate risk level (see EQ66).

4.3.4 *Efficiency*

164. [EQ86] **Were financial and human resources used efficiently and economically?** All financial and human resources, including for project management, were used efficiently and economically in accordance with the project's AWP.
165. [EQ87] **Were project funds (e.g., annual project budget) delivered in a timely manner?** Generally, the project funds (e.g., annual project budget) were delivered in a timely manner. Some delays happened in relation to COVID-19 restrictions, to UNDP approvals of RP agreements, the change of UNDP's enterprise resources planning (ERP) system from ATLAS to Quantum, and due to delays of some RPs in delivering the agreed activities (e.g., UNODC and SfG).
166. [EQ88] **Were there any project extensions? If yes, could such extension(s) have been avoided?** The project had two approved extensions over altogether 32 months. They were justified by the delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and through the harmonization of activities under GEF and USAID funding. These extensions were absolutely necessary for completion of the project activities and delivery of the project results.
167. [EQ89] **Was the project management structure (as outlined in the project document) efficient in generating the expected results? To what extent?** The project management structure was efficient in generating the expected results. The PMU was fully operational in 2019. Additional PMU staff positions were agreed by the PB and introduced in 2021. A very significant role in project delivery has been played by the RPs. They implemented a majority of project activities and managed their contributions themselves (under UNDP PMU coordination/oversight). This labour division and involvement of multiple RPs made the management structure more efficient.
168. [EQ90] **Did M&E systems ensure effective and efficient project management?** Based on M&E results the project activities were adjusted annually. They were used to keep the project on track and ensure effective and efficient project management (see EQ47).
169. Assessment of Outcomes

Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Effectiveness	Satisfactory (S)
Efficiency	Satisfactory (S)
Overall Project Outcome	Satisfactory (S)

4.3.5 *Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional, governance and environmental*

170. [EQ91] **Will financial resources be available once the GEF assistance ends for sustaining project outcomes/achievements?** Some project outputs do not require financial support or only little support after they are delivered such as the KYC legal framework, IMO Guidelines, virtual e-learning courses (e.g., ICS Ports/Supply Chain course, GWP Conservation Storytelling training, PortMATE webinar), automatic risk profiling systems, ContainerComm communication, etc. Others would need to be repeated on a regular basis and require quite significant financial resources such as mentoring to law enforcement officers, all trainings with on-site participation at ports (e.g., on financial investigation and asset recovery, controlled deliveries, AEO). The PMU

estimates the probability of financial resources availability for sustaining project achievements after the GEF assistance ends at 60-75%. It has also been working on a roadmap for the continuous financial support of key project elements from USAID, federal/national governments, and other donors.

171. [EQ92] **Do other opportunities for financial sustainability exist and how well were they used by the project?** Potential donors for financial sustainability are the USAID East Africa Environment Programme, WWF, TRAFFIC, UNODC-WCO CCP, as well as the governments of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda since all of them are stakeholders and partners of the project. IMO and UNDP also have the idea to develop a GEF project concept on supporting implementation of the IMO Guidelines which incorporates a lot of models of the project.
172. [EQ93] **Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? How effective were the project mechanisms to ensure socio-political sustainability of the project outcomes?** Given the project's narrow focus on the ports and that it does not involve any activities with local communities, its potential to create socio-political unrest is very small. Project key stakeholders indicated to 67% (n=6) that there are no social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of the project outcomes. Nevertheless, the project addressed socio-political risks through policy activities such as the KYC Export/Import Framework and the IMO Guidelines. Some private sector actors may aim at more self-regulation and are thus not fully supportive of the project. This risk has been mitigated by involving high levels of government. And it is mitigated by the fact that a lot of trade agencies have ended up in court because of the ivory trade.
173. [EQ94] **Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?** An independent impact evaluation of the wildlife crime awareness campaigns conducted by WildAid from July to November 2022 at Mombasa, Dar es Salaam and Kampala ports found that awareness and sense of responsibility of the port, cargo and shipping sector workers increased but it was not able to detect behavioural changes over the short period. The main aim of these campaigns was to raise awareness of the IWT. This included calls-to-action to inspire reporting of suspected wildlife crime activities and setting up reporting hotlines. Over this period, the number of wildlife crime incidences reported to the newly established hotlines increased in Tanzania and Uganda (no data was received from Kenya). This result is confirmed by the Evaluator's consultations with project key stakeholders who replied to 82% that there is sufficient public and stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project (n=14). The campaigns, however, targeted the port-based workers as the primary audience with specific materials directed at the ports in line with donor priority to focus on ports. The general public was targeted through social media, TV, radio, and billboards (see also EQ26).
174. [EQ95] **Have lessons learned been documented by the project team on a continual basis?** The project lessons have been extracted on a quarterly basis and documented briefly in the quarterly reports. The notes made there not always are lessons, some say that a training was very useful and well received but this is not a lesson. What is missing is a structured compilation of all the lessons learned of the project with clear priorities (e.g., lessons of major and minor importance). A consultant has been hired by the project who currently develops a best practice guide for port stakeholders to control illegal wildlife trafficking based on the best available experience in the world (Activity 3.1.9). If this Best Practice Guide also comprehensively covers the lessons learned by the project has yet to be seen.
175. [EQ96] **Are the project's successful aspects being transferred to relevant parties, potential beneficiaries, etc., for learning, potential replication and/or scaling in the future?** A global workshop on the best practices to prevent, detect, and intercept wildlife trafficking through seaports and implement the Buckingham Palace Declaration commitments took place from 21-23

June 2023 in Dar es Salaam (Activity 1.1.6.). It served as a wrap up of the project and to inform key stakeholders of the project's achievements and shortcomings for learning, potential replication and/or scaling in the future. Major components of the project have been implemented by the RPs, some of whom may want to continue their project activities after project completion or replicate them elsewhere. Moreover, some project outputs (e.g., PortMATE tool) are now being applied in different countries and other projects. The project has also supported lesson-learning at the GWP NP level.

176. [EQ97] **Do the national legal/institutional frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits?** The risk that national legal and institutional frameworks, policies, and governance structures pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits is very low as the project has been built in compliance with current policy and legislation frameworks.
177. [EQ98] **Has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that create mechanisms for accountability, transparency and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure?** The project has put in place a number of frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that create mechanisms for accountability, transparency and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure, such as the Zanzibar JPCU, the IMO Guidelines, and e-learning courses. Others are in progress like the KYC legislative framework and Best Practice Guide. Moreover, for all the RPs as implementing partners PCAT/HACT assessments were conducted throughout the life of the project to (re-)assess their technical, managerial, administrative and financial capacities, pushing for continued improvement of their structures and processes.
178. [EQ99] **Has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? To what extent?** The project established Zanzibar JPCU, and built capacity of existing JPCUs, other law enforcement agencies, and the private sector to prevent, detect and intercept wildlife trafficking in the supply chain. The extent of that capacity in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda has been estimated by the PMU to be only around 5-10% of the required (which is still considerable for a small project). These models should thus be continued to achieve a much higher percentage of the required capacity in the countries. Consultations with key stakeholders indicated to 70% that the project has developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure (n=10).
179. [EQ100] **Has the project identified and involved champions (i.e., individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes?** The project managed to involve a couple of famous national football players (three playing in East Africa, and one in the Premier League) as project "champions" in the IWT awareness campaign in all three East African project countries. They conveyed messages through various media channels to large audiences, in particular port-workers, about the seriousness of IWT/maritime trafficking of wildlife and that protecting wildlife is everyone's responsibility. In addition, some high government representatives attended project inception and other meetings and are seen by many as champions as well. Another category of champions are key players who have strong and long-term interest to work with the project countries, and the ports specifically, on combating wildlife crime such as the RPs. The consulted key stakeholders confirmed to 92% that the project involved champions who promote sustainability of project outcomes (n=6).
180. [EQ101] **Has the project achieved stakeholders' (incl. government and private sector) consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date?** The courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date have been deliberated at the global workshop on best practices to prevent, detect, and intercept wildlife trafficking through

seaports which took place from 21-23 June 2023 in Dar es Salaam (Activity 1.1.6.) and is the subject of a roadmap the project will produce in the second half of 2023 (see EQ96). The PMU is working with donors (USAID, WWF) and RPs who are willing and interested to continue the project activities after it has come to an end.

181. [EQ102] **Are there environmental factors that could undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?** Climate change and pandemics can potentially influence the structure and handling of supply chains in the world which would impact in some way the project results, but this cannot be predicted reliably and is rather unlikely over the next years.

182. [EQ103] **Will certain activities in the project area pose a threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?** All consulted key stakeholders who answered this question say that they are not aware of any activities planned in the project area that pose a threat to the sustainability of project outcomes (n=5).

183. Assessment of Sustainability

Assessment of Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	Moderately Likely (ML)
Socio-political	Moderately Likely (ML)
Institutional framework and governance	Moderately Likely (ML)
Environmental	Moderately Likely (ML)
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	Moderately Likely (ML)

4.3.6 *Country ownership*

184. [EQ104] **Did the project concept have its origin within the national sectoral and development plans?** The project objective and outcomes are consistent with the national priorities of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. The project outputs were further adjusted in the inception phase to well meet national demands at the ports (see EQs 76, 80). The consulted key stakeholders who were able to reply to this question confirmed to 94% that the project concept was in line with the national sectoral and development plans (n=9).

185. [EQ105] **Have outcomes (or outputs) from the project been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans?** Outcomes and outputs from the project have probably not yet been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans, but some have good prospects to be incorporated into the local and potentially national development plans, like the KYC legal framework, IMO guidelines, AEO training programme, capacity building for LE officers, etc.

186. [EQ106] **Were relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation?** Many relevant country representatives from government and civil society have actively been involved in project planning at the inception phase and in the course of implementing the project activities. The latter refer mainly to the RPs who made substantial contributions.

187. [EQ107] **Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the PB?** Country representatives from government agencies were involved in project implementation mainly as workshop participants and trainees, in other functions only marginally, and no national government representatives were included in the PB. The reason for this is that it is a regional project. As from 2022, UNDP CO representatives were partly present as observers at the PB meetings. Country representatives from civil society were engaged in the project mainly as RPs (i.e., TRAFFIC, WildAid, APOPO, SfG), trainers, or lecturers.

4.3.7 Gender equality and women's empowerment

188. [EQ108] **Did the project have an adequate, regularly updated and reviewed Gender Mainstreaming Strategy (GMS)/Gender Action Plan (GAP)?** To mainstream gender in the project activities the project developed a Gender (Mainstreaming) Strategy and Gender Action Plan (GAP) in the project inception phase. The GAP was aligned to the project outcomes and outputs, included specific GAP indicators and activities that allowed to address gender inequalities and empower women and was followed to deliver the project results. The GAP was port-specific and updated and adapted annually (last update in the second quarter of 2021; see EQs 15, 29).
189. [EQ109] **Was the project effectively contributing to gender equality and women's empowerment?** The project's contribution to gender equality and the empowerment of women was relatively moderate as this is a men-dominated environment. However, 30-36% of the total number of direct project beneficiaries were women and the ambitious gender target of the project has widely been achieved (see EQ85). The consulted key stakeholders who replied to this question confirmed to 100% that the project was effectively contributing to gender equality and women's empowerment (n=6).
190. [EQ110] **Were the project's gender results achieved?** The project's gender results were achieved to about 90% given the project target of women involvement of 40% (actual female involvement was 30-36%; see EQs 85, 109). As a whole, the project's gender results account for "Gender Targeted" based on UNDP's Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES).
191. [EQ111] **Is there any potential negative impact from the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?** The project is not aware of any potential negative impacts from the project on gender equality and women's empowerment. This is confirmed by the consultations with key stakeholders. 100% of those who replied did not see any negative impacts on gender and women (n=5).

4.3.8 Cross-cutting Issues

192. [EQ112] **Does the project objective conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and other country programme documents (UNDAF, UNSDCF, etc.)?** The project's objective conforms to agreed priorities in the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, UNDAF, and UNSDCF, which all address the unsustainable use of natural resources, as well as gender equality and the role of women and rural poor in their use (see EQ77).
193. [EQ113] **Did the project contribute to South-South and Triangular Cooperation? To what extent?** South-South cooperation between African countries, in particular Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, was quite significant. The project also initiated and promoted cooperation between African and Asian countries, although to a lesser extent as the project's focus was on African ports, for instance through the exchange visit programme (implemented only in 2019), ContainerComm communication, GWP lessons learning pilot (webinar), and the GFF-led controlled delivery trainings in 2023. The consulted key stakeholders confirmed to 100% that the project contributed to South-South Cooperation (n=5).
194. [EQ114] **Did the project contribute to SDGs? To what extent?** The project did contribute to SDGs, certainly to SDG 15 (Life on Land) and namely to SDG 15.7 ('Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products'; see Project description). It also supported the achievement of SDG 12, 'ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns', in this case of wildlife resources.

4.3.9 *GEF Additionality*

195. [EQ115] **Did the project provide incremental input to address relevant development challenges? To what extent?** The project's incremental reasoning builds on existing and functional state authorities and institutions whose mandates touch on enforcement of wildlife laws. The project activities served to complement and accelerate the achievement of anti-wildlife trafficking goals. The project is designed and implemented to mend key capacity gaps at the target ports that allow traffickers to operate. Thus, the project nature is completely incremental. The incremental inputs and added value of the project are considerable, given the small size and quite short duration of the project. From the six areas of GEF Additionality, the project refers to "Specific Environmental Additionality", i.e. it provides a wide range of value-added interventions/services to achieve the GEB, in this case a reduction of wildlife trafficking.
196. [EQ116] **Can the outcomes be attributed to the GEF contribution as originally anticipated? Do M&E documents provide evidence of the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF-supported project?** The project's GEF and USAID activities have probably contributed substantially to improvements in the target ports with regard to outcomes 1 (port stakeholders work towards and maintain best practice) and 2 (better coordination and enhanced South-South cooperation). Nevertheless, these improvements cannot clearly be attributed to the GEF and USAID support. M&E has been held very simple, comprehensive monitoring sheets updated quarterly are lacking, and does not provide evidence of the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF- and USAID-supported intervention. Other partner activities, like the UNODC-WCO CCP and inputs from TRAFFIC and government, for example, have likely contributed to project outcomes as well.

4.3.10 *Catalytic/Replication Effect*

197. [EQ117] **Is there anything that might have been done better or differently? What are the project lessons learned, failures and missed opportunities to date?** The consulted key stakeholders to 59% felt that certain things could have been done better or differently in the project (n=11). To the extent possible, their advice has been incorporated into the recommendations chapter. It includes enhancing coordination with other relevant UNDP CO interventions, increasing the number of participants per training, increasing the ratio of virtual (on-line) trainings for better efficiency, continuing awareness trainings in Zanzibar until 70% of the population are sensitized (currently only 30% seem to be), or incorporating corruption control measures into the project. One key stakeholder perceived the lack of time flexibility due to COVID-19 as a missed opportunity. To be able to fully assess the project lessons learned, failures and missed opportunities to date, a structured, comprehensive compilation of all the lessons learned of the project would be helpful. This is missing so far (see EQ95). Relevant, for instance, are difficult constellations between project partners/organizations. Collaboration with UNODC, for example, may have better been organized in a different manner.
198. [EQ118] **Did the project generate and disseminate its lessons well? What are the project knowledge products that were used to share lessons and experiences?** The project's lessons were to some degree captured in the quarterly and annual reports. However, they are spread out over many documents and not easily accessible. A structured, comprehensive compilation of all the lessons learned of the project is missing so far. The project, upon request, also contributed to GWP NPs and annual reports, e.g., to help extract the results and lessons learned from GWP NPs, but this was lately not much requested. The project further assisted a few other UNDP-led GWP GEF projects to extract their lessons. However, compiling the lessons learned should first be done properly in the own project. Publications, blog posts, web stories and videos were produced and used by the project to highlight and share some particular experiences and stories. To disseminate the project's lessons among the stakeholders, the PMU in collaboration with TRAFFIC in June

2023 conducted a global workshop on the best practices to prevent, detect and intercept wildlife trafficking through seaports. Upon this basis, a consultant is currently preparing a Best Practice Guide for ports to control illegal wildlife trafficking documenting the best available experiences in the world. More needed, however, would be to comprehensively compile the lessons learned from the maritime wildlife trafficking project in the first place and to disseminate these lessons among the key stakeholders (see EQ95, 117). The consulted key stakeholders to 82% felt that project generated and disseminated its lessons well (n=11).

199. [EQ119] **Did the project have an effective exit strategy?** The project does not have an exit strategy. But the project will generate a roadmap for continued strengthening of anti-wildlife trafficking activities at the target ports after the global workshop on best practices. All project activities were designed to ensure ownership by competent partners (or RPs) with long-term presence in the EAC. This strategy will ensure sustainability of the project results and continuation of the key activities after the project is completed.
200. [EQ120] **Have approaches, models, knowledge and lessons developed by the project been replicated, scaled up, or otherwise transferred, or have a potential to do so? How can the scalability and replicability of project outcomes be further improved?** The following project models and tools have already been replicated by other projects: Port Stakeholder Workshops, PortMATE assessment tool, ICS supply chain awareness and security trainings, e-learning courses on prevention and interception of wildlife trafficking through ports, and wildlife crime financial investigations and asset recovery trainings for law enforcement agencies. These project models can be used by similar port projects and be replicated in other ports in Africa and Asia.
201. [EQ121] **Did the project have a catalytic effect towards developing pertinent national and international policies, legislation, projects or programmes that target wildlife crime?** Certain products, models and outcomes of the project may have a catalytic effect towards developing pertinent national and international policies, legislation, projects or programmes that target IWT and wildlife crime. Examples could be the IMO Guidelines for the Prevention and Suppression of the Smuggling of Wildlife on Ships, the development of an IMO-UNDP GEF project concept to implement these guidelines, or the KYC framework for export/import agents in Kenya (see EQ105). The consulted key stakeholders confirmed to 92% that the project did have a catalytic effect towards developing such policies, legislation and projects/programmes (n=6). An assessment of the catalytic effect of the project based on the four GEF categories accounts for “replication”, i.e., activities, models and tools are repeated within and outside the project, nationally or internationally.

4.3.11 Progress to Impact

202. [EQ122] **Have significant impacts been achieved or will likely be achieved through achieving the project outcomes?** The key impact is that the target ports are getting more capable to prevent, detect, intercept, and follow-up on wildlife trafficking both thorough decisive law enforcement by government agencies and dedicated involvement of CSOs and the private sector. In other words: the target ports over time are getting more resilient to wildlife and other trafficking. Another important impact which is in the process of being achieved is the changed awareness and behaviour of the port, cargo and shipping sector workers. An independent impact evaluation on WildAid’s awareness raising campaign revealed that awareness and sense of responsibility have increased among the port worker community but behavioural changes could not (yet) be detected (see EQ94). Mechanisms to ensure sustainability of the project have been put in place and it is regarded as likely that they work to further strengthen the desired impacts.
203. [EQ123] **Are there any barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact?** There are a number of risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term

impact of the project. They are all related to impeding the continued implementation of the project's successful models to prevent, detect and intercept illicit wildlife trafficking at the ports. One such risk is a lack of secured follow-up investments to continue successful models initiated or supported by the project in the target ports. Lack of investments in other African and Asian ports can also decrease the project impact as traffickers switch to other ports for operations. Government support at the ports is a key requirement as well. Another risk that should be considered is the loss of private sector interest in supply chain security programmes due to economic reasons. And corruption at all levels is a very significant risk too, especially if Mombasa, Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar, and Kampala ports remain attractive of as key transit points for wildlife traffickers.

204. [EQ124] **Did the project produce unintended impacts, both positive and negative? If so, what are their implications?** At the impact level, neither positive nor negative unintended developments are known from the project. However, on a lower level some positive unexpected reactions have been noted such as receiving requests from the governments of Kenya and Tanzania to accept more officers for controlled delivery trainings than could be accommodated and requests by the Government of Uganda to expand the awareness campaign to other (dry) ports and critical border crossings in the country.
205. [EQ125] **Have contributions been made to policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, incl. observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.)?** Examples for contributions made to policy, legal and regulatory frameworks are the IMO Guidelines, the development of an IMO-UNDP GEF project concept to implement these guidelines, or the KYC framework for export/import agents in Kenya (see EQ121). Increased capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, systems, etc.) have been documented in the wildlife crime awareness campaign evaluation and in the survey of the training impacts on law enforcement officers and private sector participants of the EAC regional AEO programme and of the financial investigations on wildlife crime training.
206. [EQ126] **Have contributions been made by the project to the expected impacts of the Global Wildlife Program (GWP)?** The project contributed to the GWP through additional USAID co-financing into the project, the lessons learning and communication trainings for GWP NPs, and through the use of common indicators such as the number of seizures and arrests. The number of seizures and arrests/month across GWP NPs have yet to be compared to the project's baseline values (the data has still not been provided by the GWP; see EQ72). When comparing the contributions and information flowing from the project into the GWP and vice versa, the impression remains that this is a unidirectional support of the GWP, although the project could have received multiple benefits from the GWP as well. This is a missed opportunity.

4.4 General questions

207. Most stakeholders were not able to provide answers to many of the highly technical UNDP/GEF evaluation questions, mainly because they were not familiar enough with the UNDP GEF project language or because their actual involvement in the project did not enable them to cover all of them or to go into these details. For this reason, a number of more general and straightforward questions were used to guide the majority of interviews with project stakeholders and partners, in person and virtual. They were divided into two groups, i.e., those stakeholders that have made active contributions to the project, such as conducting trainings and/or being responsible for agreed project outputs, and those who have mainly increased their awareness, knowledge, skills, and professional networks through participating in trainings and workshops. This format also allowed respondents to address other open questions and to express any particular opinions on the project. The responses they made were analysed quantitatively in a simple way as done with the main

evaluation questions: To the extent possible, the replies to individual questions have been categorized as “yes”, “+/-”, or “no”. A “+/-” was counted as half a “yes” (see beginning of chapter 4). In this way, the percentage of “yes”-votes was calculated from all replies (the number of replies received is given in brackets as “n”).

208. Interviewed project stakeholders who participated in one or more trainings and/or workshops indicated to 88% that their work has benefitted from these exercises through them having been able to increase their pertinent awareness, knowledge, capacities and personal networks among the large community of port workers (n=12). To a major part (75%) they confirmed that these inputs have actually been what they needed and wished for. Nobody expressed a very different opinion. However, to only 50% they felt that significant changes had been introduced into their daily work (n=12). And to only 45% they were confident that their daily work has become more effective in detecting illegal goods and contraband (n=11).
209. The other group of interviewees, i.e., those who have made active contributions to the project in one way or the other, was asked if they understood their contribution to the project and how it fits into the project logic. To 89% the answer was affirmative (n=9; eight of these replies came from the RPs). To 75% they expressed that they encountered obstacles in delivering their contributions (n=8) and to 67% that they were able to fully deliver it (n=9), the responses coming again mainly from the RPs (two RPs in particular had difficulties with delivering their agreed contributions, even under the revised time schedule). By many, the COVID-19 pandemic with the significant changes it brought to the project life cycle was seen as primary obstacle. Other obstacles the project stakeholders referred to were manifold and dependent on the particular tasks they had, e.g., reaching out to and engaging celebrities, implementing calls for action to report wildlife crimes, governments which kept changing their commitments, etc.
210. One question all interviewees were asked, i.e., both groups of stakeholders, was if they understood how the project aimed at reducing maritime trafficking. Overall, to only 50% the answer was affirmative (n=13). This is a rather low percentage given that some have clearly answered with “yes” and it is a hint that the project concept may need to be better explained to some stakeholder groups, such as the various trainees from government agencies and the private sector. Another question all consulted stakeholders were asked (but not all could answer) was if the project, or the components they were contributing to, performed well (which overall was confirmed to 88%; n=13), or if the project was managed/administered well (confirmed to 89%; n=19).

5. Main findings, conclusions and lessons

5.1 Project Design/Formulation

5.1.1 *Main findings*

211. The UNDP GEF USAID maritime wildlife trafficking project has been launched as a child project under the GEF-6 GWP global coordination project. In this way, a PIF was never prepared for it and it was weirdly endorsed by the GEF CEO long before a ProDoc had been prepared together with the GWP global coordination project in June 2016. This complicated set-up under the GWP coordination project with somehow confusing links on knowledge management and learning to the substantially different GWP NPs which only rarely concern ports is quite unusual.
212. The project's objective and components presented in the ProDoc were perceived by the project stakeholders to be clear, practicable and feasible in the given initial time frame of three years. Nevertheless, this time frame was rather ambitious for achieving the multiple changes aimed at, even in a context without pandemic. An analysis revealed that the project objectives are in line with national and regional priorities and strategies of concerned countries with regard to the conservation and sustainable management of their natural resources.
213. The ProDoc included a well-defined TOC with all essential elements from the beginning. During the inception phase a different presentation of the TOC has been worked out that aligns more directly to the terms of the logical framework and takes into account the special project set-up under the GWP coordination project. The project was coordinated with and fed knowledge, experiences, lessons learned, etc., into GEF GWP NPs in Africa and Asia. In 2021, the TOC was again updated slightly to accommodate the USAID additional co-financing.
214. The project strategy and logic were well defined from the beginning while the activities and the methods and criteria for assessing and monitoring the project achievements have been further clarified in the project inception phase and thereafter. An important decision in the project inception phase was to geographically focus the project interventions on the ports of Mombasa, Dar es Salaam, and Zanzibar (and later, with the USAID co-financing, Kampala dry port).
215. The project assumptions and risks formulated initially in the ProDoc were not specific and targeted enough to be of practical use. More realistic assumptions were formulated in the project inception phase. Other adjustments and additions to the assumptions and risks have been made in the course of annual reviews (e.g., referring to COVID-19 pandemic).
216. The project is quite unique, so there were not many adequate lessons readily available to be incorporated into it. However, a wide variety of potential stakeholders, beneficiaries and partners of the project had been identified and consulted during project preparation and at project inception. Some of them later had major roles and responsibilities. But none of these partnerships were fully clarified and negotiated in the project preparation phase.
217. No significant shortcomings with regard to gender are perceived in the project design. The project (document) has been assigned a Gender Marker rating of "1", meaning that the project contributes to gender equality in a limited way but not significantly. This rating seems realistic (the ports and shipping sector is clearly male-dominated) and is backed by the findings of the project's gender analysis. The project has been targeting equal participation of men and women to the extent possible.

218. Four social and environmental risks were identified through applying the SESP during project preparation. All of them were perceived to be of low significance. The SESP has periodically been updated and adjusted. In this way, it was effective in mitigating the identified risks.

5.1.2 *Conclusions*

219. The project's set-up as a child project under the GWP global coordination project carries with it expectations and commitments with regard to coordination and knowledge management of GWP NPs and does not seem to consider that it is a full and complex subject in itself with a clear focus on ports that would deserve and require a full and independent GEF project set-up (with a proper PIF and project endorsement based on the ProDoc).

220. Project logic and reasoning were well defined from the beginning while the project activities, the methods and criteria for assessing and monitoring progress, and the identification and involvement of suitable project stakeholders and partners needed to be further clarified in the project inception phase and thereafter. Some elements of the project management tools presented in the ProDoc (M&E indicators, targets and baselines; assumptions and risks; etc.) were not yet present, complete or fully fledged and required amendment in the project inception phase based on consultations with project stakeholders. This all led to delays in the implementation of actual project activities.

221. The delays mentioned above in actual project implementation made it difficult to fully achieve the ambitious project goals within only three years of project implementation as initially planned (the later project extensions were based on other justifications).

5.1.3 *Lessons*

222. In the analysis of the project design and formulation phase, one major lesson emerged: Many preparatory project activities, such as identifying and contacting the most suitable partners and stakeholders, consulting with them on the project and clarifying/negotiating with them their potential involvement and roles could not duly be completed in that phase because this is a very time consuming exercise and requires decisions to be made by the project's official management bodies (e.g., the PB) that first need to be put in place and made operational. As a consequence, all these activities had to be moved to the inception phase of the project. This delayed the project's implementation of the actual activities. In this context the COVID-19 pandemic unexpectedly struck which led to additional challenges and delays. The lesson would be to anticipate and avoid such developments, mainly through making available more time and resources during project preparation for extensive consultations with potential project partners and beneficiaries to clarify and prepare decisions on their involvement, roles and responsibilities well in advance. This particular challenge of this project seems to have been underestimated.

5.2 Project Implementation

5.2.1 *Main findings*

223. Partners involved in project implementation come from all relevant sectors, i.e., industry (private sector), government, research and services. Their numbers and diversity is high. The RPs, in particular, have actively been engaged in project implementation through managing their contributions themselves.

224. Local and national government stakeholders, in general, were supportive of the objectives of the project. Through increasing awareness, knowledge, capacities and professional networks of the various port stakeholders, the project promoted ownership and sustainability of the project's results.

225. The number of direct project beneficiaries, i.e., those stakeholders who participated in workshops and trainings, was almost nine times higher than initially planned (of which approximately 32% were women). This significant increase was partly due to the shift to virtual trainings as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic.
226. Overall, women involvement in project activities was in the range of 30-36%. Given the male dominance in the port sector, this is quite remarkable. Stakeholder engagement exercises thus were gender responsive but may have suffered from lacking a moderate budget for a few specific gender-related activities.
227. In this project there were considerable variances between planned and actual budget expenditures. The COVID-19 pandemic and other factors led to a situation in which project activities regularly were delayed and then had to be realized under a tight schedule. As a result, implementation of project activities was not spread out evenly over the project lifetime. Main bulks of project activities were conducted in 2022 and in 2023 after the pandemic.
228. The project mobilized significant additional co-financing since inception, comprising in particular a US\$ 2 million grant from USAID to strengthen project activities in the target ports and extend them to the dry ports of Uganda.
229. The requirement of an annual audit of the project has been covered through full audits and annual spot checks of RPs. Full financial audits have been conducted for two RPs, TRAFFIC and GFF, who received for their contributions the highest shares of the project budget. In addition, spot checks serving as quick audits have been carried out in 2022 and 2023 for all RPs that were funded with over USD 50,000 per calendar year.
230. The quality of M&E reporting increased during project implementation while it was not totally satisfactory from the beginning. Mainly the improved and more comprehensive M&E plan required by USAID from January 2021 was sufficient to monitor the project results and track progress towards achieving the project objective. What has also been missing, even if not an explicit UNDP or GEF requirement, is the use of distinct monitoring sheets and more regularly and comprehensively updating them to better document, monitor and describe any project developments and progress.
231. The project risk log, including SESP and other project risks, was properly maintained during project implementation and updated and adjusted annually by the PMU. In this way, it was effective in mitigating the identified risks. There is no indication that any risks had been overlooked.
232. The unexpected COVID-19 pandemic affected project implementation very significantly causing changes to most project activities and substantial delays in their delivery. Nevertheless, the UNDP team was able to respond adequately, adapt its management of the project accordingly, and implement the project surprisingly well and deliver results.
233. The eight RPs, in general, managed and administered their project day-to-day activities quite well under UNDP supervision. Two of them, however, failed to deliver big chunks of the agreed work and at least half of them had difficulties to deliver their contributions in a timely manner.
234. UNDP support to implementing partners was perceived to be adequate, of good quality and timely. This was fully confirmed by consultations with project stakeholders.

5.2.2 Conclusions

235. The project faced a number of significant implementation challenges. The late start of actual project implementation together with the unexpected COVID-19 pandemic led to a situation in which planned activities regularly were delayed and had to be realized under a tight schedule. As a result, the implementation of project activities was not spread out evenly over the project lifetime. Main bulks of project activities were conducted in 2022 and in 2023 after the pandemic.
236. A fundamental role in project implementation has been played by the eight RPs. In general, they managed and administered their project day-to-day activities quite well under UNDP supervision. Two of them, however, failed to deliver big chunks of the agreed work (thus requiring additional attention and follow-up by UNDP) and at least half of them had difficulties to implement their contributions in a timely manner. This labour division with RPs who manage their contributions themselves has the potential to be very efficient. From the perspective of oversight, however, it entails the risk that the more RPs are involved in the project the higher the likelihood becomes that not all of them deliver as planned and expected.
237. Through increasing awareness, knowledge, capacities and professional networks of the various port stakeholders from all relevant sectors, the project promoted local ownership and sustainability of the project's results. This makes it more likely that the target ports will maintain the elevated standards in combating wildlife trafficking achieved through the project and will continue working towards further improvements and best practices.

5.2.3 *Lessons*

238. The Evaluator can only base his findings on facts and clear evidence. In a modern world, a lot of information is exchanged through e-mails and increasingly through social media, in particular WhatsApp. A tendency has been detected in this project that such information exchange has not been fully worked up and compiled into proper records like Word or pdf documents. It is available somewhere but scattered out in various bits and pieces. This is true, for example, for the project's lessons learned and monitoring results. To be more effective in guiding project implementation, they would better be stored in readily available, updated monitoring sheets and compilations.
239. What has been missing in project management, is the use of distinct monitoring sheets (e.g., Excel). By regularly (quarterly) and comprehensively updating them it would be easier to document, describe and monitor any project developments, and keep track of progress and failures more reliably. The quality of the M&E sections of quarterly and annual technical reports would have benefitted from stronger narratives explaining in words clearly the main developments and conclusions.
240. The project did not include M&E training for parties to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used in the same way after the project has come to an end. But this may have been an added value for the project in particular for the ports' law enforcement agencies and the RPs, given their potential future roles in keeping the project alive and sustaining the project's achievements.
241. A unique risk and unexpected challenge was the COVID-19 pandemic that had to be managed on top of the more "regular" risks. It would be useful to work up how it affected delivery of the project and to what extent the measures taken to mitigate its impact were adequate and effective. This would inform future projects in similar circumstances.

5.3 Project Results and Impacts

5.3.1 *Main findings*

242. The project objective and outcomes have been achieved to 70-100%. The targets of the project's objective have in average been fulfilled to 77% and of the project outcomes in average to 86%.
243. The project objective and outcomes are in line with the national priorities of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda and consistent with UN strategic planning frameworks, priorities, and goals.
244. The eleven GEF and USAID project outputs have been achieved in the range between 60% and 100%. Based on the output indicators and targets, outputs were achieved in average to 87%. This figure may still increase slightly until project closure. Thus, the project outputs have largely been delivered.
245. Judged by activities, the KYC regulations framework achieved minimal results. Only about 30-40% of what was planned has been implemented by SfG. As a consequence, collaboration with SfG was stopped in 2022. In 2023, the KYC framework regained momentum after a consultant was hired who meanwhile made progress on the draft regulations. It is now likely that they will be completed by the end of 2023. Another activity that may not be implemented as planned is the introduction of the automatic risk profiling system of sea containers (RiskProfiler) to Dar es Salaam and Zanzibar Ports and Uganda Revenue Authority (URA) in Kampala. It was initially planned for 2020 but not fully delivered by UNODC. It has been achieved to about 60% and will now probably not be completed at all.
246. The project's contribution to gender equality and the empowerment of women was relatively moderate as the ports are a men-dominated environment. However, 30-36% of the total number of direct project beneficiaries were women and the project's ambitious gender target has widely been achieved. The project is not aware of any potential negative impacts of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment.
247. The project had two approved extensions over altogether 32 months justified by delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the harmonization of activities under the GEF and USAID funding. They were absolutely necessary.
248. The project management structure was efficient in generating the expected results. Financial and human resources, including for project management, were used efficiently and economically in accordance with the project's AWP. A very significant role has been played by the RPs who implemented and managed a majority of the project activities themselves.
249. The PMU estimates the probability that financial resources will be available for sustaining the project's achievements after the GEF assistance ends at 60-75%. A roadmap for the continuous support of key project elements is in preparation.
250. The project's lessons have been extracted quarterly and documented very briefly in the quarterly reports. What is missing is a structured, comprehensive compilation of all the lessons learned of the project with clear priorities.
251. The project put in place a number of frameworks, policies, guidelines and mechanisms that create accountability, transparency and technical knowledge transfer after project closure, such as the Zanzibar JPCU, IMO Guidelines, and KYC legal framework.
252. The project managed to involve a couple of famous national football players as project "champions" in the IWT awareness campaign in all three East African project countries who supported the project goals through various media channels directed in particular at port-workers.
253. No national government representatives were included in the PB because the maritime trafficking project is a regional project.

254. South-South cooperation between African countries, in particular Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, was quite significant. The project also initiated and promoted cooperation between African and Asian countries to some extent but the focus was on African ports.
255. The project is designed to mend key capacity gaps at the target ports that allow traffickers to operate. The incremental inputs and added value of the project are considerable, given the small size and rather short duration of the project.
256. The project's GEF and USAID activities have probably contributed substantially to improvements in the target ports with regard to the outcomes 1 and 2. Nevertheless, these improvements cannot clearly be attributed to the GEF and USAID support. M&E has been held very simple and does not provide evidence of the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF- and USAID-supported intervention.
257. Publications, blog posts, web stories and videos were produced and used by the project to highlight and share some particular experiences and stories. A structured, comprehensive compilation of all the lessons learned of the project is missing so far.
258. A number of the project's models and tools have been replicated by other projects (e.g., PortMATE, ICS supply chain training). These models can readily be used by similar port projects and be replicated in other ports in Africa and Asia.

5.3.2 Conclusions

259. The project's outcomes and outputs have in average been achieved to 86-87%, thus largely been delivered. Given the multiple challenges the project has faced, and the considerable expansion of the activities through incorporating the USAID grant in the midst of implementation, this is judged as a good result.
260. Key factors that negatively affected achievement of project results are a slow start of actual implementation, the COVID-19 pandemic, the complexity of the project, its tight timeframes, and the initial absence of a project manager and other support staff. Among positive factors were the project implementation by committed RPs which allowed to implement multiple project activities in parallel, as well as the significant USAID co-financing that allowed to expand and strengthen the project's achievements.
261. The key impact of the project is that the target ports over time are getting more resilient to wildlife and other trafficking. Mechanisms to ensure sustainability of the project have been put in place and will likely work to further strengthen the desired impacts. The risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact of the project are all related to impeding the continued implementation of the project's successful models (e.g., lack of secured follow-up investments to continue successful models, corruption).
262. Certain products, models and outcomes of the project may have a catalytic effect towards developing pertinent national and international policies, legislation or projects that target illicit trade and wildlife and forest crime in the ports environment (e.g., JPCU, KYC legal framework, IMO Guidelines).

5.3.3 Lessons

263. Outcome achievement is by design dependent on delivery of the project outputs. To what extent is difficult to say. The better they are chosen, the higher this dependency is. The indicators on how to measure the project outcomes have been formulated in the PRF and its updates. They are all about counting numbers, e.g., the number of officers trained and mentored in certain techniques,

disaggregated by gender. Project output indicators, on the other hand, had only been formulated in 2021 when additional M&E standards for the USAID co-financing were required. A comparison of them with the outcome indicators reveals that they are very similar. They too are all about counting numbers such as trainees. This shows that project outcomes and outputs are not separated to the degree one would wish. This is an area for improvement in future UNDP and GEF projects.

264. The project established Zanzibar JPCU, and built capacity of existing JPCUs, other law enforcement agencies, and the private sector to prevent, detect and intercept wildlife trafficking in the supply chain. The extent of that capacity in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda has been estimated by the PMU to be only around 5-10% of the required. These models should thus be continued until a much higher percentage of the required capacity in these countries has been built. This could be further elaborated by the roadmap UNDP PMU is currently preparing for the continuous financial and other support of key project elements.
265. The project's lessons were to some degree captured in the quarterly and annual reports. However, they are spread out over many documents and not easily accessible. A well-structured, comprehensive compilation of all the specific lessons of the project and dissemination of it among the key stakeholders is missing. But this would be much needed to have the full picture and be able to capitalize on the lessons derived from the project.
266. When comparing the contributions and information flowing from the project into the GWP and vice versa, the impression remains that this is a unidirectional support of the GWP, although the project could have received multiple benefits from the GWP as well. This is a missed opportunity and could be done better in future projects.

6. Recommendations

267. A brief, structured overview of the recommendations identified and collected during this evaluation is presented in Table 6. The source of many of them are the project key stakeholders. This is not a concluding compilation of all the most important recommendations from the project and they are not necessarily meant to be prescriptive. But they should be well considered for any follow-up activities the maritime trafficking project may have. In most cases time limits cannot be given as they refer to future similar interventions and as such are not known. The few suggested time limits for completion presented in the Time column refer to the project closure date (end of December 2023) and entail brief analyses by the PMU which will contribute to the project's lessons learned.

Table 6: Recommendations

Abbreviations: UNDP = UNDP Country Office; Govt. = Government; Unit = responsible unit; Time = time limit for completion; KS = key stakeholder; RP = responsible party; PMU = Project Management Unit; com = comment; in **bold** are the key recommendations listed in the Recommendations Summary Table of the Executive Summary.

Rec #	Para #	TE Recommendation	Unit	Time
A	33,98,238	Continue pursuing options for building awareness and capacities of port stakeholders	Govt.	n/a
A.1	33,198	Continue awareness raising exercises in Zanzibar as majority of population is not yet sensitized	Govt.	n/a
A.2	38,99,266	Focus on improving capacities and tools of JPCUs who cover all aspects of combating IWT	Govt.	n/a
A.3	38,99,266	Improve capacities and tools of private sector organizations, including clearing agents	Govt.	n/a
A.4	198	Identify ways of training more stakeholders/increasing the number of participants per training	UNDP	n/a
A.5	198	Increase ratio of online trainings where adequate to reach more participants and for better value	UNDP	n/a
A.6	RP com	Continue concept of multiple courses as it takes participants a while to get the full picture	UNDP	n/a
A.7	KS com	Continue advanced follow-up trainings with the same participants for better effectiveness	UNDP	n/a
A.8	RP com	Build in on-the-ground practical exercises to follow up on DNA analysis of trafficked wildlife	Govt.	n/a
A.9	RP com	Involve senior officials of agencies (LE, customs, police, prosecutors) in all project countries	Govt.	n/a
A.10	UNDP com	Sustain cooperation (joint trainings) and communication channels between Africa and Asia	Govt.	n/a
A.11	211	Better explain project concept to trainees from government agencies and the private sector	UNDP	n/a
A.12	101,227	Include a moderate budget for hiring specialised facilitators to lead women-only sessions, e.g., at port stakeholder workshops, to generate practical gender action points for the port environment	UNDP	n/a
A.13	PMU com	Distinguish in-person and virtual trainings for the indicator of direct project beneficiaries	UNDP	n/a
B		Identify future potential improvements in sequences and procedures of project preparation	PMU	12/2023
B1	34,223	Provide more time/resources during project preparation for consultations with potential project stakeholders to prepare decisions on their involvement, roles & responsibilities in advance	UNDP	n/a
B2	198	Enhance coordination with relevant UNDP COs and their activities/partners in future projects	UNDP	n/a
B3	198	Identify alternative management options for cooperating/collaborating with UN organizations	PMU	12/2023
B4	KS com	Assign a government focal point in each country to coordinate and follow up on the project	Govt.	n/a
B5	KS com	Assign a focal point in involved government agencies, as feasible, to coordinate with the project	Govt.	n/a
B6	198	Identify corruption control measures at all levels to strengthen project achievements	Govt.	n/a
B7	KS com	Consider involving new stakeholders and partners in the project (e.g., Maritime Technology Cooperation Centre Africa, Zanzibar Maritime Authority, Zanzibar Food and Drugs Authority)	UNDP	n/a
C		Identify future potential improvements in sequences and procedures of project implementation	PMU	12/2023
C1	35,231,240	Use distinct monitoring sheets (e.g., Excel) for quarterly monitoring project progress and comprehensively documenting any changes and developments that occur based on PRF indicators	UNDP	n/a
C2	35,199	Use distinct knowledge management sheets for regularly and comprehensively documenting and describing any experiences, lessons and good practices encountered	UNDP	n/a
D	36,233,242	Work up the effects the COVID-19 pandemic had on the project	PMU	12/2023
D.1	36,233,242	Work up how the pandemic affected delivery of the project and to what extent the measures taken to mitigate its impact were adequate and effective	PMU	12/2023
E	Evaluator	Attribute more time and resources for conducting the project's TE	PMU	12/2023
E.1	Evaluator	Doubling the funds and extending the activities and locations need adjustment of TE budget	PMU	12/2023

268. Half of these recommendations refer to maintaining and further strengthening the increased awareness, capacities and skills of the project stakeholders in the African port countries, for preventing, detecting and intercepting wildlife trafficking, as well as coordinating with their African and Asian counterparts the required seizures and arrests.
269. The responsibilities for keeping the project's achievements alive have in Table 6 newly been assigned to the governments and the UNDP COs as leads. In all three African project countries it has been noted that the latter have not been much engaged in the project. In Uganda, for instance, they were not even present for the interview appointment with the Evaluator. In addition, the PMU will not be operational any more in the near future.

7. Annexes

7.1 Annex 1: TE Terms of Reference (TOR)

[to be attached as separate document]

7.2 Annex 2: List of documents consulted

#	Documents consulted
1	Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects
2	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
3	CEO Endorsement Request of GWP global coordination project
4	UNDP Social & Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5	Inception Workshop Report
6	Project Annual Work Plans
7	Project Quarterly Reports with quarterly updated SESP and project risks
8	Project Annual Progress Reports
9	Project Quality Assurance Reports
10	Responsible Parties Reports
11	Minutes of PB Meetings
12	GEF Core Indicators
13	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs
14	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditure
15	Audit and spot check reports
16	Project communications materials
17	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of
18	List of contracts over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc.)
19	Global Wildlife Programme documents
20	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including PB members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
21	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

7.3 Annex 3: Summary list of key stakeholders

Abbreviations: Tz = Tanzania; Ass. = Association; Auth. = Authority; Found. = Foundation; Univ. = University; Mgmt. = Management

Location	Project Stakeholder	Roles	Sector	Key Contacts
Nairobi	GEF OFP Kenya	Cabinet Secretary, MECCF	GOVT	S. Tuya
Nairobi	Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)	Head of KWS Lab & Forensics	GOVT	M. Yongo Otiende
Nairobi	Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF)	Director LATF	IOP	E. Phiri
Nairobi	USAID Kenya & East Africa Env. Office	Regional TL/Senior Wildlife Advisor	IC	M. Lauridsen, B. Wamalwa
Nairobi	UNDP Kenya CO	Team Leader Env.; Program Specialist	UN	E. Koech; W. Ayiamba
Nairobi	Space for Giants (SfG)	Director Wildlife Justice-Rule of Law	NGO	K. Wambua
Mombasa	Kenya Maritime Authority (KMA)	Legal Specialist	GOVT	K. Kithikii
Mombasa	Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA)	JPCU Mombasa	GOVT	Kh. Mbarak, D. Oburi et. al.
Mombasa	Kenya Ports Authority (KPA)		GOVT	Chelangat, Onsarigo, M.Leli
Mombasa	Port Management East & South Africa	Economist	IGO	R. Muigai
Mombasa	Kenya Ships Agents Association	CEO	PS	J. Tellah
Mombasa	Kenya Intl. Freight & Warehousing Assoc.	Executive Officer; IT Admin.	PS	D. Ochieng; N. Musembii
Mombasa	Container Freight Stations Ass. of Kenya	CEO	PS	D. Nzeki
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Revenue Authority (TRA)	JPCU Dar es Salaam	GOVT	P. Byabato; L. Rwegasira
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Revenue Authority (TRA)	Commissioner General	GOVT	E. Mhede
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Ports Authority (TPA)	Acting Port Director	GOVT	E. Lema
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Freight Forwarders Association	Manager	PS	J. Urrio
Dar es Salaam	Inland Container Depots Dry Ports Ass. Tz	Container Freight Stations	PS	M. Shange
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Shipping Agents Association	Manager	PS	A. E. Uronu
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Truck Owners Association	Manager	PS	M. J. Zongo
Dar es Salaam	UNODC Container Control Program (CCP)	Coordinator E&S Africa; Consultant	UN/IOP	G. Skjoldmose; E. Landy Tei
Dar es Salaam	UNDP Tanzania CO	TL Env. & CC; Program Specialist	UN	G. Lyatuu; A. Kitogo
Zanzibar	Tanzania Revenue Authority (TRA)	Commissioner General	GOVT	B. Zuberi Nassoro
Zanzibar	Tanzania Revenue Authority (TRA)	JPCU Zanzibar	GOVT	H. Haji
Zanzibar	Zanzibar Drug Control&Enforcement Auth.	JPCU Zanzibar	GOVT	F. Ali Said
Zanzibar	Zanzibar Freight Forwarders Bureau (ZFB)	Manager	PS	J. Hamad Said
Arusha (Tz)	TRAFFIC	Director East Africa; Program Officer	MO	J. Thomson; A. Mashalla
Arusha (Tz)	East African Community (EAC) Secretariat	Env. & Nat. Res. Mgmt. Specialist	IGO	D. Mwikila
Dodoma (Tz)	GEF OFP Tanzania	Permanent Secretary, Office of VP	GOVT	M. Maganga
Dodoma (Tz)	Ministry of Nat. Res. & Tourism (MNRT)	Chair National Anti-Poaching TF	GOVT	R. Mande
Dodoma (Tz)	MNRT Wildlife Division	Tanzania Wildlife Mgmt. Authority	GOVT	?
Morogoro (Tz)	APOPO	CEO; Training Specialist; Researcher	NGO	Ch. Cox, C. Fast; I. Szott
Kampala	GEF OFP Uganda	Deputy Secretary to MFPED Treasury	GOVT	P. Ocailap
Kampala	Uganda Revenue Authority (URA)	Customs Enforcement Operations	GOVT	G. Mwesigye, G. Okaka et al.
Kampala	Uganda Revenue Authority (URA)	JPCU Kampala	GOVT	S. Egadu, C. Mutesi et. al.
Kampala	Uganda Revenue Authority (URA)	CCP - JPCU Kampala/Entebbe	GOVT	R. Khomagum; P. Najjuma
Kampala	Uganda Revenue Authority (URA)	EAC AEO Prog., Uganda Customs	GOVT	M.Ojok, P.Karungi, D.Dongo
Kampala	Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)	Prosecutor	GOVT	K. Ndeke
Kampala	USAID Uganda	Deputy Director	IC	M. McMorrow
Kampala	UNDP Uganda CO	TL Energy & Environment	UN	T. Sengalama, N. Burunde
Kampala	WildAid	East Africa / H-W Coexistence Rep.	NGO	M. Robertson
Kampala	Uganda Clearing Industry&Forwarding Ass.	Manager	PS	B. Bwire
Kampala	Uganda Freight Forwarders Association	Manager	PS	N. Kafeero
Kampala	Express Shipping and Logistics Uganda Ltd.	Head of Sales & Marketing	PS	M. Musasiizi
Kampala	UNDP	Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)	UN	O. Muhwezi, M. Cadman
London	Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers (ICS)	Head of Business & Partnerships	MO	M. Gilbert
London	International Maritime Organization (IMO)	Technical Officer Maritime Safety	IOP	M. Fontanet Solé
London	The Royal Foundation; UfW Transport TF	Manager; UfW Transport TF Manager	Found.	R. Campbell; I. Cruickshank
Washington	World Bank Global Wildlife Program (GWP)	Program Manager; IWT Specialist	IOP	L. Farroway; M. Zavagli
New Canaan	Grace Farms Foundation	Director; Chief Accountability Officer	Found.	R. Khattabi
Seattle	University of Washington (UoW)	Research Professor	Univ.	S. Wasser
Istanbul	UNDP	Istanbul Regional Hub Manager	UN	G. Trogemann

7.4 Annex 4: List of stakeholders interviewed/consulted

Stakeholders/Partners	Key contact	Sector	Date / Means
Kenya Revenue Authority, JPCU Mombasa	Khamis Mbarak	government	02-05-2023
Port Management East & Southern Africa (PMAESA)	Ruth Muigai	IGO/priv. sect.	02-05-2023
Tanzania Truck Owners Association (TATO)	Medrine Joseph	private sector	03-05-2023
JPCU Dar, UNODC Container Control Programme	Ponsiano Byabato	government/UN	03-05-2023
UNDP Tanzania Country Office	Gertrude Lyatuu	UN	04-05-2023
Tanzania Revenue Authority, JPCU Zanzibar	Hafidh Haji	government	05-05-2023
UNDP Project Manager	Harun Guclusoy	UN	05-05-2023
Zanzibar Freight Forwarders Bureau (ZFB)	J. Hamad Said	private sector	05-05-2023
Uganda Revenue Authority, Customs Enforcement Op.	Godson Mwesigye	government	08-05-2023
Uganda Clearing Industry & Forwarding Association	Bwire Bwire	private sector	08-05-2023
Express Shipping & Logistics (ESL) Uganda Ltd.	Moses Musasiizi	private sector	08-05-2023
USAID Uganda	Margaret McMorro	IC/donor	08-05-2023
Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Prosecutor	Keffa Ndeke	government	09-05-2023
Uganda Revenue Authority, EAC AEO Programme	Martin Ojok	government	09-05-2023
WildAid East Africa	Maz Robertson	NGO	09-05-2023
Uganda Freight Forwarders Association	Nicolas Kafeero	private sector	10-05-2023
UNDP Kenya CO	Washington Ayiemba	UN	11-05-2023
Space for Giants (SfG)	Katto Wambua	NGO	18-05-2023
University of Washington (UoW)	Sam Wasser	University	19-05-2023
Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF)	Edward Phiri	IGO	22-05-2023
Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers (ICS)	Matt Gilbert	MO	23-05-2023
Grace Farms Foundation (GFF)	Rod Khattabi	Foundation	26-05-2023
Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), Lab & Forensics	Moses Otiende	government	30-05-2023
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)	M. Cadman, O. Muhwezi	UN	07-06-2023
UNDP PMU	H. Guclusoy, M. Paltsyn	UN	questionnaire
UNODC (ICCWC)	Edmund Landy Tei	IOP (PB)	questionnaire
World Bank – Global Wildlife Programme	L. Farroway, M. Zavagli	IOP (PB)	questionnaire
TRAFFIC East Africa Regional Office	J. Thomson, A. Mashalla	NGO	questionnaire
APOPO	Isabelle Szott	NGO	questionnaire

7.5 Annex 5: TE Mission itinerary & schedule of consultative meetings/visits

Location	Stakeholders/Partners	Sector	Date	Time
Nairobi – Mombasa – Dar es Salaam – Zanzibar – Kampala - Nairobi				
Mombasa	Mombasa port site visit with JPCU	government	02-05-2023	08:30 –09:30
Mombasa	Kenya Revenue Authority, JPCU Mombasa	government	02-05-2023	09:30 –11:00
Mombasa	Port Management East & Southern Africa (PMAESA)	IGO/priv. sect.	02-05-2023	11:30 –13:00
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania Truck Owners Association (TATO)	private sector	03-05-2023	11:00 –12:30
Dar es Salaam	JPCU Dar, UNODC Container Control Programme	govt./UN	03-05-2023	14:30 –16:00
Dar es Salaam	Dar port site visit with JPCU	government	03-05-2023	16:00 –17:15
Dar es Salaam	UNDP Tanzania Country Office	UN	04-05-2023	08:45 –10:00
Zanzibar	Tanzania Revenue Authority, JPCU Zanzibar	government	05-05-2023	09:15 –11:00
Zanzibar	Zanzibar Freight Forwarders Bureau (ZFB)	private sector	05-05-2023	11:30 –12:45
Zanzibar	UNDP Project Manager	UNDP	05-05-2023	13:15 –14:00
Kampala	Uganda Revenue Authority, Customs Enforcement Op.	government	08-05-2023	09:30 –11:00
Kampala	Uganda Clearing Industry & Forwarding Association	private sector	08-05-2023	11:30 –12:30
Kampala	Express Shipping & Logistics (ESL) Uganda Ltd.	private sector	08-05-2023	13:15 –14:00
Kampala	USAID Uganda	IC/donor	08-05-2023	15:45 –16:45
Kampala	Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Prosecutor	government	09-05-2023	08:45 –10:00
Kampala	Uganda Revenue Authority, EAC AEO Programme	government	09-05-2023	10:45 –12:15
Kampala	WildAid East Africa	NGO (RP)	09-05-2023	13:30 –15:00

Location	Stakeholders/Partners	Sector	Date	Time
Kampala	Uganda Freight Forwarders Association	private sector	10-05-2023	09:30 –09:45
Nairobi	UNDP Kenya CO	UN	11-05-2023	15:30 –17:20

7.6 Annex 6: Evaluation Criteria Matrix (ECM)

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
A) Project Design/Formulation			
Analysis of Results Framework			
Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?	yes/no-ratio from questioning all project stakeholders/partners	all project stakeholders/partners	analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.); TOC analysis
Was the project designed to address country priorities and be country-driven?	mention in national development priorities documents; yes/no-ratio from questioning most project stakeholders/partners	national development priorities, policies and strategies; most project stakeholders/partners	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.)
Were outcomes and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change (TOC)? Was there a clearly defined and robust TOC? Did the Theory of Change include: a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, and consideration of how to overcome barriers?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and replies from questioning all project stakeholders/partners	project documentation; all project stakeholders/partners	document analysis, TOC analysis; analyses of consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Was the Results Framework well defined? Was it sound/robust from the beginning or was it revised later (e.g., during the Inception Workshop)?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and replies from questioning all project stakeholders/partners	project documentation; all project stakeholders/partners	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.)
Did the project aim to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socioeconomic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant?	mention in project documents and national development priorities documents; replies from questioning most project stakeholders/partners	project documentation; national development priorities, policies and strategies; most project stakeholders/partners	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.)
Were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant, Time-bound/Timely/Trackable/Targeted)?	SMARTness; adequacy to standards	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFP, USAID	document and data analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Assumptions and Risks			
Were the assumptions and risks in the PIF and ProDoc articulated well? Did they adequately take into account the experiences of project stakeholders/partners?	percentage of them having clearly influenced the formulation of expected results; degree of consent among project stakeholders/partners	project documentation; most project stakeholders/partners	document analysis, TOC analysis; analyses of consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Were the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust, and did they help determine activities and planned outputs?	percentage of them having clearly influenced the formulation of expected results; degree of	project documentation; most project stakeholders/partners	document analysis, TOC analysis; analyses of consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	consent among project stakeholders/partners		

Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design			
Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?	incidence of them having clearly influenced the formulation of expected results; degree of consent among project stakeholders/partners	project documentation (e.g. ProDoc, Inception Report); all project stakeholders/partners	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.)
Planned stakeholder participation			
Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?	degree of consent among project stakeholders/partners	all project stakeholders/partners	analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.) with project stakeholders/partners
Had the planned stakeholder interactions, as set out in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, been adequately built into the project design?	degree of conformity with Stakeholder Engagement Plan and project documents; degree of consent among project stakeholders/partners	project documentation; most project stakeholders/partners	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.)
Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?	degree of conformity with Stakeholder Engagement Plan and project documents; degree of consent among project stakeholders/partners	project documentation; most project stakeholders/partners	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews etc.)
Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector			
Was there planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and/or other initiatives and complementary interventions?	number and extent of different links established	project documentation; all project stakeholders/partners; focal points from other projects and initiatives	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Gender responsiveness of project design			
Were gender issues integrated in the project's strategy, rationale and TOC? Are there any gaps?	number and degree of deficiencies identified	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, GEF OFP, NGOs, private sector	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Were gender considerations integrated in the project's design, including through a gender analysis with the specific context of the project for advancing gender equality and women's empowerment and a gender action plan with a specific implementation plan for the delivery of gender activities, with indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party?	number and extent of different gender measures taken (see Inception Report, Annex 5); adequacy to GEF and UNDP standards	GEF and UNDP pertinent documents, project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, GEF OFP, NGOs, private sector	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Was the project aligned with national policies and strategies on gender equality?	extent of alignment to national policies and strategies	pertinent national policies & strategies, project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, GEF OFP, NGOs, private sector	document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Was the gender expertise used in the design and development of the project adequate?	number and extent of identified expertise used	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO,	project document analysis; analyses of consultations

		USAID, GEF OFP, NGOs, private sector	(questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Was the UNDP Gender Marker rating assigned to the ProDoc realistic and backed by the findings of the gender analysis?	UNDP Gender Marker rating	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO	project document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Social and Environmental Safeguards			
Are the environmental and social risks identified through the SESP relevant?	number and degree of identified risks; adequacy to standards; replies from stakeholders	SESP project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO	SESP project document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Were the management measures outlined in the ProDoc SESP and any management plans effective?	number and degree of proposed measures; adequacy to standards; replies from stakeholders	SESP project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO	SESP project document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
B) Project Implementation			
Adaptive Management			
Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of annual reviews and planning?	number of significant changes made to the project;	project documentation (e.g., annual reviews, M&E and planning documents); PB, PMU	project document analysis; questioning PB, PMU
If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes? And how?	extent and presumed impact of changes made to the project	project documentation (e.g., annual reviews, M&E and planning documents); PB, PMU	project document analysis; questioning PB, PMU
Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the Project Board (PB)? Explain the process and implications.	number of written down changes made to the project and approvals thereof through the PB	project documentation (e.g., annual reviews, M&E and planning documents, PB meeting minutes); PB, PMU	project document analysis; questioning PB, PMU
Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements			
Did the project develop and leverage the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?	numbers, diversity and degree of partnerships involved in project implementation	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFP, USAID	project document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Did local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Did they have an active role in project decision-making that supported efficient and effective project implementation?	levels of contribution	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFP, USAID, local and national government stakeholders	project document analysis; analyses of consultations (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)
Did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? And how? Were there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities?	levels of contribution; yes/no-ratios from questioning most stakeholders	most stakeholders	questioning most stakeholders
Was there invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability?	levels of contribution; yes/no-ratios from questioning most stakeholders	most stakeholders	questioning most stakeholders
Did actual stakeholder interaction compare to what was planned in the ProDoc and Stakeholder Engagement Plan?	ratio of actual to planned contribution levels (incl. degrees of involvement);	project documentation (e.g., quarterly and annual progress reports); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs

Was the gender action plan appropriate and adaptive in facilitating gender mainstreaming objectives?	adequacy to GEF and UNDP standards; ratio of actual to planned gender measures;	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs
Were stakeholder engagement exercises gender responsive (e.g., measures to ensure women's meaningful participation, women-only sessions)?	percentage of gender-specific exercises/measures (from total measures);	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs
Were systematic and appropriate efforts made to include diverse groups of stakeholders (e.g., women's groups) during implementation?	diversity of stakeholder groups involved in project activities during project implementation;	project documentation; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, NGOs
Project Finance and Co-finance			
Were there variances between planned and actual expenditures and, if yes, what are the reasons for those variances?	variance between planned and actual expenditures	project documentation (e.g., financial reports, budget revisions); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Were additional sources of co-financing leveraged by the project compared to what was foreseen in the ProDoc? If yes, what volumes?	availability of additional partner agreements, incl. co-financing	project documentation (e.g., partner agreements, financial reports, budget revisions); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning co-financing partners, PMU, PB
Were strong financial controls established to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables?	adequacy to standards; follow-up payments authorized after verified satisfactory delivery of previous instalment results	project documentation (e.g., financial reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Did the project demonstrate due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits?	adequacy to standards; number and sequence of financial audits	project documentation (e.g., financial reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Are there any significant observations from financial audits? If yes, what are the major findings?	incidences of unregular financial audit findings	project documentation (e.g., financial reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Were changes made to fund allocations? Were these the result of budget revisions? And were the changes/revisions appropriate and relevant?	incidences of budget revisions and of changes made to fund allocations	project documentation (e.g., financial reports, budget revisions, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E			
Was the M&E plan well-conceived, practical and sufficient at the point of CEO endorsement? Was it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress towards achieving objectives? Have standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements been fulfilled?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Did the M&E plan include a baseline, SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Were baseline conditions, methodology, logistics, time frames, and roles and responsibilities well-articulated?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB

	documentation and questioning PMU, PB		
Have inclusive, innovative and participatory monitoring systems been used?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Did the M&E plan specify how the project keeps the GEF OFP informed and, where feasible, involved?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	M&E plan; PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Have the results framework indicators been monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR? Have the risks and various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g., gender strategy) been monitored on a regular basis?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Was the M&E budget in the ProDoc sufficient? And was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Was data on specified indicators, relevant GEF Tracking Tools/Core Indicators gathered in a systematic manner?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
What was the extent of compliance with progress and financial reporting requirements, including quality and timeliness of reports?	adequacy to standards; degree of compliance	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, progress & financial reports, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Was the information provided by the M&E system (i.e. M&E results) used to improve and adapt project performance?	yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Were the M&E results shared and discussed with project stakeholders and project staff (PMU)?	yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB and other stakeholders	project documentation; PMU and other stakeholders	project document analysis; questioning PMU and other stakeholders
Was there adequate monitoring of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP and in line with any safeguards management plan's M&E section?	yes/no-ratios and answers from checking project documentation and questioning PMU, PB	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Did the M&E system include proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?	adequacy to standards; yes or no	M&E plan; PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Was the project's TOC reviewed and refined during implementation?	adequacy to standards; yes or no	project documentation (e.g., TOC, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB

Did the PB fulfil its given role in M&E activities? To what extent?	effect of M&E results on activities of next reporting period (e.g., number of adjustments made)	project documentation (e.g., PIRs, yearly workplans, PB meeting minutes); PMU, other partners	project document analysis; questioning PMU and other project partners
UNDP implementation/oversight			
Did UNDP effectively deliver on activities related to project implementation (e.g., project start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation)?	degree of leadership and coordination of partner inputs	project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)	questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)
Was UNDP support to the project partners/team adequate, of high quality and timely?	degree of leadership and coordination of partner inputs; frequency of coordination meetings and exchanges	project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)	questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)
Was UNDP annual reporting candid and realistic?	ratio of positive/negative findings in annual reports	project annual reports; questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)	analysis of annual reports; questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)
Was UNDP's responsiveness to significant implementation problems/challenges adequate?	degree of leadership and problem solving skills	project documentation (e.g., PIRs, PB meeting minutes); questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)	project document analysis; questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)
Was UNDP oversight of the management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP adequate?	degree of leadership and management skills	project documentation (e.g., SESP, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)	project document analysis; questioning project partners and stakeholders (IOP, USAID, GEF OFP, PS, NGOs)
Project partner execution			
Did project partners effectively manage and administer the project day-to-day activities under UNDP overall responsibility/supervision?	percentage of results achieved; degree of cooperation and communication	project documentation (e.g., annual workplans, progress reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Was there an appropriate focus on results and timeliness?	percentage of results achieved; timeliness of achieved results	project documentation (e.g., annual workplans, progress reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Were the use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services appropriate?	conformity with ProDoc, Inception Report, PB meeting minutes	project documentation (e.g., annual workplans, progress reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Was risk well managed?	extent of risks identified and mitigation measures applied	project documentation (e.g., annual workplans, progress reports); PMU	project document analysis; questioning PMU
Was the quality of project partners' annual (work)plans sufficient?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios from checking project documentation and questioning PMU	project documentation (e.g., annual workplans, progress reports); PMU	project document analysis; questioning PMU
Was annual reporting of project partners candid and realistic?	ratio of positive/negative findings in annual reports	project partner annual reports; PMU	analysis of annual reports; questioning PMU
Was management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP and implementation of associated safeguards requirements adequate?	degree of management skills and cooperation and communication	project documentation (e.g., SESP, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU	project document analysis; questioning PMU

Risk Management			
Were new risks (including SESP risks) or changes to existing risks reported on in the annual progress reports/PIRs?	number of incidences	project documentation (e.g., annual progress reports, PIRs, SESP results); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Were risk ratings (low, moderate, substantial, high) changed during project implementation? How? Were these revisions appropriate and timely? Were management measures adjusted accordingly? And how?	number, nature and degree of changes	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, safeguard management plans, annual progress reports, PIRs, SESP results); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Did those risks (including SESP risks) affect project implementation?	number and extent of corrective actions taken	project documentation (e.g., annual progress reports, work plans, PIRs, SESP results); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Were systems, plans, tools and actions used to identify, prioritize, monitor and manage those risks (including SESP risks)?	number of instruments used	project documentation (e.g., annual progress reports, work plans, PIRs, SESP results); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Were any risks (including SESP risks) overlooked and what were the consequences of that?	number of new risks added during implementation; number and extent of corrective actions taken	project documentation (e.g., annual progress reports, work plans, PIRs, SESP results); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
Was the project's risk register properly maintained during implementation (including SESP risks)?	number of new entries made to the risk register during implementation	project documentation (e.g., annual progress reports, work plans, PIRs, SESP results); PMU	project document analysis; questioning PMU
Did the project staff (PMU) keep the Project Board (PB) informed of new risks, changes to existing risks and the escalation of risks (including SESP risks)?	number and extent of respective communications	project documentation (e.g., e-mail exchanges, annual progress reports, work plans, PIRs, SESP results); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB
C) Project Results and Impacts			
Progress towards objective and expected outcomes			
Did the project accomplish the objective and achieve the expected outcomes based on the respective indicators? What were the final achievements?	objective and outcome indicators (see project's Results Framework and its updates)	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, Inception Report, annual progress reports/PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Were the key expected outputs actually delivered? What factors affected delivery of these outputs?	output indicators; actual delivery of key outputs of the project's results framework (and its updates)	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, Inception Report, annual progress reports/PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Was outcome achievement dependent on delivery of project outputs and other factors such as project design, linkages with other activities, extent of co-financing, stakeholder involvement, etc.?	dependency of outcomes on outputs and possibly other factors	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, Inception Report, annual progress reports/PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Did the project contribute to GWP outcomes?	number of stakeholders coordination and knowledge sharing/learning mechanisms that emerged as best practices with the potential to inform GWP coordination child project	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, Inception Report, annual progress reports/PIRs, PB meeting minutes, GWP coordination child project); PMU, PB	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)

Relevance			
Were the project's objective and outcomes in line with national development priorities?	alignment with national development priorities	national development priorities; PMU, PB	cross-checking with national development priorities; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Was the project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, UNDAF, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), SDGs, GEF and GWP strategic programming?	alignment with UN strategic priorities (UNDP, GEF, GWP, SDGs, etc.)	UNDP, GEF and GWP strategic priorities; PMU, PB	cross-checking with UN strategic priorities; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Effectiveness			
Did the project achieve, or does it expect to achieve, the planned results (objectives, outputs, outcomes, impacts)? To what extent?	yes/no-ratios from checking project documentation and consultations analysis	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, Inception Report, progress reports, PIRs, meeting minutes); PMU, PB, project partners and stakeholders (national agencies, private sector, intl. org. partners, etc.)	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Did the project outputs effectively contribute to delivery of the project outcomes?	output indicators (if any); yes/no-ratios from checking project documentation and consultations analysis; TOC explanatory factors	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, Inception Report, progress reports, PIRs, meeting minutes); PMU, PB, project partners and stakeholders (national agencies, private sector, intl. org. partners, etc.)	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF and GWP strategic priorities, and national development priorities? What are the contributing factors?	alignment with national development policies and priorities and UN strategic priorities (UNDP, GEF, GWP, SDGs, etc.)	project documentation, national policies and strategies, UNDP, GEF, GWP strategic priorities; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GWP NP, project partners and stakeholders	cross-checking with national development priorities and UNDP, GEF, GWP strategic priorities; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
In which areas did the project have greatest and least achievements?	number and frequency of mentioned areas	PMU, PB, project partners and stakeholders	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
What are the key factors that influenced (achievement or failure to achieve) the results?	number and frequency of mentioned factors	PMU, PB, project partners and stakeholders	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Would any alternative strategies have been more effective in achieving the project's outcomes?	nature and frequency of mentioned alternative strategies	PMU, PB, project partners and stakeholders	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
What other programmes/projects/actions contributed to the achievement of the project outcomes?	nature and frequency of other mentioned programmes/projects/actions	PMU, PB, project partners and stakeholders	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Did the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human rights-based approach?	alignment with UNDP and GEF gender, women's empowerment and human rights policies/strategies	project documentation, UNDP, GEF, GWP strategic priorities; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GWP NP, project partners and stakeholders	cross-checking with UNDP, GEF, GWP strategic priorities; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Efficiency			
Were financial and human resources used efficiently and economically?	ratio of activities completed as planned with allocated staff and budget	project documentation (work plans, progress reports, PIRs, financial reports, audits, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)

Were project funds (e.g., annual project budget) delivered in a timely manner?	fund recipients' replies	fund recipients	questioning fund recipients
Were there any project extensions? If yes, could such extension(s) have been avoided?	number/length of and reasons for extensions	project documentation (work plans, progress reports, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	questioning PMU, PB
Was the project management structure (as outlined in the project document) efficient in generating the expected results? To what extent?	number and frequency of corrective actions taken in project management, adjustments made for fine-tuning, etc.	project documentation (work plans, progress reports, PIRs, financial reports, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	questioning PMU, PB
Did M&E systems ensure effective and efficient project management?	number of corrective actions taken in project management, adjustments made for fine-tuning, etc., as a result of M&E	project documentation (work plans, progress reports, PIRs, financial reports, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	questioning PMU, PB
Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental			
Will financial resources be available once the GEF assistance ends for sustaining project outcomes/achievements?	innovative financing tools/mechanisms (as mentioned in financial sustainability plan, if any); degree of commitment expressed by interviewees	project financial sustainability plan (if any); private sector shipping companies, government agencies, USAID, PMU, PB	analysing project financial sustainability plan (if any); questioning private sector shipping companies, government agencies, USAID, PMU, PB
Do other opportunities for financial sustainability exist and how well were they used by the project?	innovative financing tools/mechanisms (as mentioned in financial sustainability plan, if any); commitments/arrangements made for financial sustainability (if any)	project financial sustainability plan (if any); private sector shipping companies, government agencies, USAID, PMU, PB	analysing project financial sustainability plan (if any); questioning private sector shipping companies, government agencies, USAID, PMU, PB
Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes (e.g., level of stakeholder ownership)? How effective were the project mechanisms to ensure socio-political sustainability of the project outcomes?	number and degree of socio-political risks identified; nature and sequence of mitigation measures applied	project documentation (e.g., updated risk matrix and mitigation measures in Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Is there sufficient stakeholder/public awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?	extent of awareness of the public and other stakeholders	all project stakeholders	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Have lessons learned been documented by the project team on a continual basis?	number and sequence of documented lessons learned	project documentation (e.g., knowledge sharing reports, if any); PMU	project document analysis; questioning PMU
Are the project's successful aspects being transferred to relevant parties, potential beneficiaries, etc., for learning, potential replication and/or scaling in the future?	number and frequency of success stories shared with relevant parties and potential beneficiaries	project documentation (e.g., project success stories, if any); PMU (KM Officer)	questioning PMU (KM Officer)
Do the national legal/institutional frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits?	number and degree of legal/institutional/governance risks identified; nature and sequence of mitigation measures applied	project documentation (e.g., updated risk matrix and mitigation measures in Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)

Has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that create mechanisms for accountability, transparency and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure?	number and degree of management processes and safeguards created; nature and sequence of mitigation measures applied	project documentation (e.g., updated risk matrix and mitigation measures in Inception Report, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? To what extent?	nature and degree of improvements made to institutional capacity	project documentation (e.g., work plans, PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Has the project identified and involved champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes?	number and diversity of champions identified; degree of their involvement	project documentation (e.g., PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Has the project achieved stakeholders' (incl. government and private sector) consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date?	yes or no	PMU, PB, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Are there environmental factors that could undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?	number and degree of environmental risks to sustainability identified	project documentation (e.g., PIRs, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Will certain activities in the project area pose a threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	number and degree of environmentally risky activities identified	PMU, government agencies, private sector, CSOs	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Country ownership			
Did the project concept have its origin within the national sectoral and development plans?	number and degree of alignment/concordance	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc), national policies & strategies; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, government, NGOs	comparison of ProDoc and national policies/strategies; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Have outcomes (or outputs) from the project been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans?	number and extent of incorporations	project documentation (e.g., PIRs), national policies and strategies; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, GEF OFF, government agencies, NGOs	comparison of ProDoc and national policies/strategies; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Were relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation?	yes or no	PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, GEF OFF, government agencies, NGOs	consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the Project Board (PB)?	yes or no	project documentation (e.g., PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, USAID, GEF OFF, government agencies, NGOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)
Gender equality and women's empowerment			
Did the project have an adequate, regularly updated and reviewed Gender Mainstreaming Strategy (GMS)/Gender Action Plan (GAP)?	adequacy to standards; yes/no-ratios from questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, Inception Report); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	project document analysis; consultations (interviews, questionnaires, etc.)

Was the project effectively contributing to gender equality and women's empowerment?	number of corrective actions taken in project work plans, adjustments made for fine-tuning, etc., as a result of monitoring the GMS/GAP	project documentation (work plans, progress reports, PIRs); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs
Were the project's gender results achieved?	GAP indicators (Inception Report, Annex 5); yes/no-ratios from questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	project documentation (GMS/GAP, work plans, progress reports, PIRs); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs
Is there any potential negative impact from the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?	yes/no-ratios from questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	project documentation (GMS/GAP, annual PIRs); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs
Cross-cutting Issues			
Does the project objective conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and other country programme documents (UNDAF, UNSDCF, etc.)? To what extent?	degree of conformity of project objective with country programme document priorities	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc), country programme documents; PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, NGOs	comparison of ProDoc with country programme documents; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, NGOs
Did the project contribute to south-south and triangular cooperation? To what extent?	extent of occurrence of south-south/triangular cooperation in project results framework	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, NGOs	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, NGOs
Did the project contribute to SDGs? To what extent?	degree of conformity of project objective with SDGs	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc); PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs	Search for SDGs in ProDoc; questioning PMU, PB, UNDP CO, GEF OFF, USAID, PS, NGOs
GEF Additionality			
Did the project provide incremental input to address relevant development challenges? To what extent?	degree of incremental input (compared to existing initiatives)	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc); PMU, PB, GEF OFF	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, GEF OFF
Can the outcomes be attributed to the GEF contribution as originally anticipated? Do M&E documents provide evidence of the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF-supported project?	M&E results supporting incremental reasoning	project documentation (e.g., M&E plan, Inception Report, PIRs); PMU, PB, GEF OFF	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, GEF OFF
Catalytic/Replication Effect			
Is there anything that might have been done better or differently? What are the project lessons learned, failures and missed opportunities to date?	number/nature of lessons compiled, incl. successes, failures and missed opportunities	project documentation (e.g., Inception Report, KM/Communications Plan, annual PIRs); all project stakeholders	project document analysis; questioning all project stakeholders
Did the project generate and disseminate its lessons well? What are the project knowledge products that were used to share lessons and experiences?	number/diversity of lessons compiled and disseminated; number/diversity of knowledge products used	project documentation (e.g., Inception Report, KM/Communications Plan, annual PIRs); all project stakeholders	project document analysis; questioning all project stakeholders
Did the project have an effective exit strategy?	adequacy to standards; yes or no	ProDoc; PMU, PB, USAID, GEF OFF	project document analysis; questioning PMU, PB, USAID, GEF OFF
Have approaches, models, knowledge and lessons developed by the project been replicated, scaled up, or otherwise transferred, or have a	number/nature/degree of replications/up-scaling	project documentation (e.g., progress reports, PIRs, KM reports, PB meeting minutes);	project document analysis; questioning all project stakeholders

potential to do so? How can the scalability and replicability of project outcomes be further improved?		all project stakeholders	
Did the project have a catalytic effect towards developing pertinent national and international policies, legislation, projects or programmes that target wildlife crime?	number/nature/degree of known specific adoptions	project documentation (e.g., progress reports, PIRs, KM reports, PB meeting minutes); all project stakeholders	project document analysis; questioning all project stakeholders
Progress to Impact			
Have significant impacts been achieved or will likely be achieved through achieving the project outcomes?	TOC and its perceived robustness	project documentation (e.g., TOC, progress reports, PIRs, KM reports, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Are there any barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact?	TOC and its perceived robustness	project documentation (e.g., ProDoc, TOC, PIRs, KM reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Did the project produce unintended impacts, both positive and negative? If so, what are their implications?	number and extent of unintended impacts identified	project documentation (e.g., TOC, PIRs, KM reports); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Have contributions been made to policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, incl. observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.)?	number and degree of identified contributions and capacity changes	project documentation (e.g., progress reports, PIRs, KM reports, PB meeting minutes); PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB
Have contributions been made by the project to the expected impacts of the Global Wildlife Program (GWP)?	comparison of expected impacts of the project and the whole GWP – degree of conformity	project documentation (e.g., TOC, PIRs, KM docs) of project & whole GWP; PMU, PB	project document analysis; questioning PMU and PB

7.7 Annex 7: Questionnaires used

PMU = Project Management Unit; PB = Project Board; UNDP = UNDP Country Office; GWP = Global Wildlife Programme National Project; IOP = International Organization Partner, OFP = GEF Operational Focal Point; GOVT = Government; PS = Private Sector

# EQ	Evaluation Question (EQ)	PMU	PB	UNDP	GWP	IOP	USAID	OFP	GOVT	PS	NGO
	A) Project Design/Formulation										
	Analysis of Results Framework										
1	Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	Was the project designed to address country priorities and be country-driven?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	Were outcomes and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change (TOC)? Was there a clearly defined and robust TOC? Did the Theory of Change include: a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, and consideration of how to overcome barriers?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
4	Was the Results Framework well defined? Was it sound/robust from the beginning or was it revised later (e.g., during the Inception Workshop)?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
5	Did the project aim to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socioeconomic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant?	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
6	Were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant, Time-bound/Timely/Trackable/Targeted)?	X	X	X			X	X			
	Assumptions and Risks										
7	Were the assumptions and risks in the PIF and ProDoc articulated well? Did they adequately take into account the experiences of project stakeholders/partners?	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
8	Were the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust, and did they help determine activities and planned outputs?	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
	Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design										
9	Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Planned stakeholder participation										
10	Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
11	Had the planned stakeholder interactions, as set out in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, been adequately built into the project design?	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X
12	Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?	X	X	X		X		X	X		X
	Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector										
13	Was there planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and/or other initiatives and complementary interventions?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Gender responsiveness of project design										
14	Were gender issues integrated in the project's strategy, rationale and TOC? Are there any gaps?	X	X	X			X	X			X
15	Were gender considerations integrated in the project's design, including through a gender analysis with the specific context of the project for advancing gender equality and women's empowerment and a gender action plan with a specific	X	X	X			X	X			X

	implementation plan for the delivery of gender activities, with indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party?									
16	Was the project aligned with national policies and strategies on gender equality?	x	x	x			x	x		x
17	Was the gender expertise used in the design and development of the project adequate?	x	x	x			x	x		x
18	Was the UNDP Gender Marker rating assigned to the project document realistic and backed by the findings of the gender analysis?	x	x	x						
Social and Environmental Safeguards										
19	Are the environmental and social risks identified through the SESP relevant?	x	x	x						
20	Were the management measures outlined in the Project Document SESP and any management plans effective?	x	x	x						
B) Project Implementation										
Adaptive Management										
21	Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of annual reviews and planning?	x	x				x			
22	If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes? And how?	x	x				x			
23	Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the PB? Explain the process and implications.	x	x				x			
Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements										
24	Did the project develop and leverage the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?	x	x	x			x	x		
25	Did local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Did they have an active role in project decision-making that supported efficient and effective project implementation?	x	x	x			x	x	x	x
26	Did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? And how? Were there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities?	x	x	x			x	x	x	x
27	Was there invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability?	x	x	x			x	x	x	x
28	Did actual stakeholder interaction compare to what was planned in the project document and Stakeholder Engagement Plan?	x	x	x			x			x
29	Was the gender action plan appropriate and adaptive in facilitating gender mainstreaming objectives?	x	x	x			x			x
30	Were stakeholder engagement exercises gender responsive (e.g., measures to ensure women's meaningful participation, women-only sessions)?	x	x	x			x			x
31	Were systematic and appropriate efforts made to include diverse groups of stakeholders (e.g., women's groups) during implementation?	x	x	x			x			x
Project Finance and Co-finance										
32	Were there variances between planned and actual expenditures and, if yes, what are the reasons for those variances?	x	x							
33	Were additional sources of co-financing leveraged by the project compared to what was foreseen in the ProDoc? If yes, what volumes?	x	x							
34	Were strong financial controls established to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables?	x	x							
35	Did the project demonstrate due diligence in the management of funds, including periodic audits?	x	x							

36	Are there any significant observations from financial audits? If yes, what are the major findings?	x	x										
37	Were changes made to fund allocations? Were these the result of budget revisions? And were the changes/revisions appropriate and relevant?	x	x										
Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E													
38	Was the M&E plan well-conceived, practical and sufficient at the point of CEO endorsement? Was it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?	x	x										
39	Did the M&E plan include a baseline, SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results?	x	x										
40	Were baseline conditions, methodology, logistics, time frames, and roles and responsibilities well-articulated?	x	x										
41	Have inclusive, innovative and participatory monitoring systems been used?	x	x										
42	Did the M&E plan specify how the project keeps the GEF OFP informed and, where feasible, involved?	x	x										
43	Have standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements been fulfilled? Have the results framework indicators been monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR? Have the risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g., gender strategy) been monitored on a regular basis?	x	x										
44	Was the M&E budget in the project document sufficient? And was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?	x	x										
45	Was data on specified indicators, relevant GEF Tracking Tools/Core Indicators gathered in a systematic manner?	x	x										
46	Were progress and financial reports compliant with reporting requirements, including quality and timeliness of reports?	x	x										
47	Was the information provided by the M&E system (i.e. M&E results) used to improve and adapt project performance?	x	x										
48	Were the M&E results shared and discussed with project stakeholders and project staff (PMU)?	x	x										
49	Was there adequate monitoring of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP and in line with any safeguards management plan's M&E section?	x	x										
50	Did the M&E system include proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?	x	x										
51	Was the project's TOC reviewed and refined during implementation?	x	x										
52	Did the PB fulfil its given role in M&E activities? To what extent?	x	x										
UNDP implementation/oversight													
53	Did UNDP effectively deliver on activities related to project implementation (e.g., project start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation)?						x	x	x				x
54	Was UNDP support to the project partners/team adequate, of high quality and timely?						x	x	x		x		x
55	Was UNDP annual reporting candid and realistic?						x	x	x				x
56	Was UNDP's responsiveness to significant implementation problems/challenges adequate?						x	x	x				x
57	Was UNDP oversight of the management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP adequate?						x	x	x				x
Project partner execution													
58	Did project partners effectively manage and administer the project day-to-day activities under UNDP overall responsibility/supervision?	x	x										
59	Was there an appropriate focus on results and timeliness?	x	x										

60	Were the use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services appropriate?	x	x								
61	Was risk well managed?	x									
62	Was the quality of project partners' annual (work)plans sufficient?	x									
63	Was annual reporting of project partners candid and realistic?	x									
64	Was management of environmental and social risks as identified through the UNDP SESP and implementation of associated safeguards requirements adequate?	x									
	Risk Management										
65	Were new risks (including SESP risks) or changes to existing risks reported on in the annual progress reports/PIRs?	x	x								
66	Were risk ratings (low, moderate, substantial, high) changed during project implementation? How? Were these revisions appropriate and timely? Were management measures adjusted accordingly? And how?	x	x								
67	Did those risks (including SESP risks) affect project implementation?	x	x								
68	Were systems, plans, tools and actions used to identify, prioritize, monitor and manage those risks (including SESP risks)?	x	x								
69	Were any risks (including SESP risks) overlooked and what were the consequences of that?	x	x								
70	Was the project's risk register properly maintained during implementation (including SESP risks)?	x									
71	Did the project staff (PMU) keep the PB informed of new risks, changes to existing risks and the escalation of risks (including SESP risks)?	x	x								
	C) Project Results and Impacts	x	x								
	Progress towards objective and expected outcomes										
72	Did the project accomplish the objective and achieve the expected outcomes based on the respective indicators? What were the final achievements?	x	x								
73	Were the key expected outputs actually delivered? What factors affected delivery of these outputs?	x	x								
74	Was outcome achievement dependent on delivery of project outputs and other factors such as project design, linkages with other activities, extent of co-financing, stakeholder involvement, etc.?	x	x								
75	Did the project contribute to GWP outcomes? How?	x	x								
	Relevance										
76	Were the project's objective and outcomes in line with national development priorities?	x	x								
77	Was the project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, UNDAF, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), SDGs, GEF and GWP strategic programming?	x	x								
	Effectiveness										
78	Did the project achieve, or does it expect to achieve, the planned results (objectives, outputs, outcomes, impacts)? To what extent?	x	x				x				
79	Did the project outputs effectively contribute to delivery of the project outcomes?	x	x				x				
80	Did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, GEF and GWP strategic priorities, and national development priorities? What are the contributing factors?	x	x	x	x	x					
81	In which areas did the project have greatest and least achievements?	x	x				x				
82	What are the key factors that influenced (achievement or failure to achieve) the results?	x	x				x				

83	Would any alternative strategies have been more effective in achieving the project's outcomes?	x	x			x				
84	What other programmes/projects/actions contributed to the achievement of the project outcomes?	x	x			x				
85	Did the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and a human rights-based approach?	x	x	x	x	x				
	Efficiency									
86	Were financial and human resources used efficiently and economically?	x	x							
87	Were project funds (e.g., annual project budget) delivered in a timely manner?	x	x							
88	Were there any project extensions? If yes, could such extension(s) have been avoided?	x	x							
89	Was the project management structure (as outlined in the project document) efficient in generating the expected results? To what extent?	x	x							
90	Did M&E systems ensure effective and efficient project management?	x	x							
	Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental									
91	Will financial resources be available once the GEF assistance ends for sustaining project outcomes/achievements?	x	x				x		x	
92	Do other opportunities for financial sustainability exist and how well were they used by the project?	x	x				x		x	
93	Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? How effective were the project mechanisms to ensure socio-political sustainability of the project outcomes?	x	x						x	x
94	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
95	Have lessons learned been documented by the project team on a continual basis?	x	x							
96	Are the project's successful aspects being transferred to relevant parties, potential beneficiaries, etc., for learning, potential replication and/or scaling in the future?	x	x							
97	Do the national legal/institutional frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits?	x	x						x	x
98	Has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that create mechanisms for accountability, transparency and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure?	x	x						x	x
99	Has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? To what extent?	x	x						x	x
100	Has the project identified and involved champions (i.e., individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes?	x	x						x	x
101	Has the project achieved stakeholders' (incl. government and private sector) consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date?	x	x						x	x
102	Are there environmental factors that could undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?	x	x						x	x
103	Will certain activities in the project area pose a threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	x	x						x	x
	Country ownership									
104	Did the project concept have its origin within the national sectoral and development plans?	x	x	x			x	x	x	x
105	Have outcomes (or outputs) from the project been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans?	x	x	x			x	x	x	x

106	Were relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation?	x	x	x			x	x	x		x
107	Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the PB?	x	x	x			x	x	x		x
Gender equality and women's empowerment											
108	Did the project have an adequate, regularly updated and reviewed Gender Mainstreaming Strategy (GMS)/Gender Action Plan (GAP)?	x	x	x			x	x			x
109	Was the project effectively contributing to gender equality and women's empowerment?	x	x	x			x	x		x	x
110	Were the project's gender results achieved?	x	x	x			x	x			x
111	Is there any potential negative impact from the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?	x	x	x			x	x		x	x
Cross-cutting Issues											
112	Does the project objective conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and other country programme documents (UNDAF, UNSDCF, etc.)?	x	x	x			x	x			x
113	Did the project contribute to South-South and Triangular Cooperation? To what extent?	x	x	x			x	x			x
114	Did the project contribute to SDGs? To what extent?	x	x	x			x	x			x
GEF Additionality											
115	Did the project provide incremental input to address relevant development challenges? To what extent?	x	x					x			
116	Can the outcomes be attributed to the GEF contribution as originally anticipated? Do M&E documents provide evidence of the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the GEF-supported project?	x	x					x			
Catalytic/Replication Effect											
117	Is there anything that might have been done better or differently? What are the project lessons learned, failures and missed opportunities to date?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
118	Did the project generate and disseminate its lessons well? What are the project knowledge products that were used to share lessons and experiences?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
119	Did the project have an effective exit strategy?	x	x				x	x			
120	Have approaches, models, knowledge and lessons developed by the project been replicated, scaled up, or otherwise transferred, or have a potential to do so? How can the scalability and replicability of project outcomes be further improved?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
121	Did the project have a catalytic effect towards developing pertinent national and international policies, legislation, projects or programmes that target wildlife crime?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
Progress to Impact											
122	Have significant impacts been achieved or will likely be achieved through achieving the project outcomes?	x	x								
123	Are there any barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact?	x	x								
124	Did the project produce unintended impacts, both positive and negative? If so, what are their implications?	x	x								
125	Have contributions been made to policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, incl. observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.)?	x	x								
126	Have contributions been made by the project to the expected impacts of the Global Wildlife Program (GWP)?	x	x								
Total number of evaluation questions		122	117	46	14	30	50	45	34	20	51
		PMU	PB	UNDP	GWP	IOP	USAID	GEF	GOVT	PS	NGO

7.8 Annex 8: Summary of questionnaire results

The replies to individual ECM questions have been categorized as “yes”, “+/-”, or “no”. A “+/-” was counted as half a “yes”. In this way, the percentage of “yes”-votes was calculated from all replies. For this calculation, a minimal number of five stakeholder replies was required.

# EQ	Evaluation Question (EQ)	% yes	n
	A) Project Design/Formulation		
1	Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?	89	9
2	Was the project designed to address country priorities and be country-driven?	100	7
3	Were outcomes and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change (TOC)? Was there a clearly defined and robust TOC? Did the Theory of Change include: a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, and consideration of how to overcome barriers?	90	5
4	Was the Results Framework well defined? Was it sound/robust from the beginning or was it revised later (e.g., during the Inception Workshop)?	90	5
5	Did the project aim to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socioeconomic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant?	90	5
10	Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, who could affect the outcomes, and who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?	91	11
	B) Project Implementation		
25	Did local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Did they have an active role in project decision-making that supported efficient and effective project implementation?	85	13
27	Was there invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability?	100	6
53	Did UNDP effectively deliver on activities related to project implementation (e.g., project start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation)?	100	5
54	Was UNDP support to the project partners/team adequate, of high quality and timely?	100	6
	C) Project Results and Impacts		
93	Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? How effective were the project mechanisms to ensure socio-political sustainability of the project outcomes?	33	6
94	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?	82	14
99	Has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? To what extent?	70	10
100	Has the project identified and involved champions (i.e., individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes?	92	6
103	Will certain activities in the project area pose a threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	0	5
104	Did the project concept have its origin within the national sectoral and development plans?	94	9
109	Was the project effectively contributing to gender equality and women's empowerment?	100	6
111	Is there any potential negative impact from the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?	0	5
113	Did the project contribute to South-South and Triangular Cooperation? To what extent?	100	5
117	Is there anything that might have been done better or differently? What are the project lessons learned, failures and missed opportunities to date?	59	11
118	Did the project generate and disseminate its lessons well? What are the project knowledge products that were used to share lessons and experiences?	82	11
121	Did the project have a catalytic effect towards developing pertinent national and international policies, legislation, projects or programmes that target wildlife crime?	92	6
	D) General Questions		
a)	Did your work benefit from the project and, if yes, how?	88	12
b)	Is this what you needed and wished for or would that have been something else?	75	12
c)	Have significant changes been introduced into your daily work and, if yes, what are they?	50	12
d)	Has your daily work become more effective in detecting illegal goods and contraband and, if yes, how?	45	11
e)	Do you understand how the project aims to reduce maritime trafficking?	50	13
f)	Did the project/components you were contributing to perform well?	88	13
g)	Was the project managed/administered well?	89	19
h)	Did you understand your contribution to the project and how it fits into the project logic?	89	9
i)	Did you encounter any obstacles in delivering your contribution?	75	8
j)	Have you been able to fully deliver your contribution? If not, why not?	67	9

7.9 Annex 9: TE Rating scales

These are the rating scales used for the ratings given in the Evaluation Ratings Table (see Executive Summary).

Ratings for assessment of M&E, UNDP Implementation/Oversight and Implementing Partner Execution, and Outcomes	Ratings for Sustainability
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability
5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings	3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings	2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings	1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability
2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings	U/A = Unable to assess expected incidence and magnitude of risks
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	
Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	