

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF ID:	116		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Project	GEF financing:	4.1	4.07
Country:	Indonesia	Co-financing:	6.9	6.78
Operational Program:	2	Total Project Cost:	\$12.8	\$13.43
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		1996
		CEO Endorsement		May 1 st 1997
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		30 th June 1998
		Closing Date 31 st October 2001	Proposed: October 2001	Actual: 31 st July 2004
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 31 st October 2001 3 years and 4 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 31 st July 2004 6 years 9 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 33 months
Author of TE: Thomas Walton		TE completion date: 22 nd March 2005	TE submission date to GEF OME: May 2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 2 months

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	S	S	S
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	L	L	ML
2.4. Monitoring and evaluation	S	N/A	N/A	MS
2.5. Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? The project was subjected to an OED PPAR prior to closing – the results were fed into the ICR. While this is not necessarily 'good practice' the ICR provided a thorough account of the project implementation

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

To protect, rehabilitate and achieve sustainable use of coral reefs and associated ecosystems in Indonesia, which will, in turn, enhance the welfare of coastal communities

Phase 1 objective: to establish a viable framework for a national coral reef management system in Indonesia.

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

- **What are the Development Objectives?**

The development objective of the Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program (COREMAP) is to establish viable, operational, and institutionalized coral reef management systems in priority coral reef sites in Indonesia.

The program was designed to be implemented in three phases: Initiation (COREMAP I) over 3 years, Acceleration (COREMAP II) over the next 6 years and Institutionalization (COREMAP III) in the next 6 years. This project is the COREMAP I whose primary objective was to establish a viable framework for management of national coral reef systems in Indonesia.

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

3.2 Outcomes

- **What were the key expected outcomes and impacts indicated in the project document?**

1. Program Strategy and Management. A strengthened COREMAP program policy, strategy, and action plan including evaluation of COREMAP I, preparation of COREMAP II, and a strengthened legal framework for coral reef management in Indonesia. Planned US\$2.6 million, actual US\$3.25 million or 125%.

2. Public Awareness. Undertake national and regional awareness and social marketing campaigns including public relations and dissemination. Planned US\$3.6 million, actual US\$3.72 million or 103%.

3. Surveillance and Enforcement. Establish a National Coral Reef surveillance and enforcement (S&E) system, develop operational manuals, undertake special workshops to define protective and destructive activities, provide training and test the S&E system at the national level and in three target provinces. Planned 3.7 million actual US\$2.09 million, or 118%.

4. Pilot Community-based Management in Two Sites. Facilitate design, implementation and monitoring of reef management plans by communities in the Taka Bone Rate National Park in South Sulawesi and Lease Islands in Maluku. Reef management plans included development of alternative income generation activities, and block grants/micro-credit to cover the incremental costs on implementing plans and induce matching investment in protective activities by communities. Planned US\$1.8 million, actual US\$2.09 million or 116%.

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

1. The legal framework for coral reef management was strengthened in Indonesia and the second phase (COREMAP II) was approved in May 2004. The project's relevance was substantial and its efficiency is high, and it was effective in establishing a viable framework for national coral reef management in Indonesia. The project created the institutional framework needed to implement the program, including the national Project Management Office (PMO), district working groups, and village community groups. Management responsibility was transferred from the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) to the Department of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (DKP) thus firmly establishing government ownership, a transfer that is consistent with the decentralization strategy of the GOI, replicable as COREMAP expands, and adaptable to local customs and circumstances. Most of a supportive legal framework have been drafted and the most important national level policy and strategy statements have been promulgated as a ministerial decree (September 17, 2004). At the district level two laws were passed defining permitted and prohibited

activities, and reef zoning for conservation purposes. Even so, several key pieces of legislation await approval. Community based management (CBM) was implemented in two pilot sites, but the design needs to be substantially revised to ensure its sustainability for the long term and demonstrate its viability.

2. Publicity and outreach campaigns successfully raised public awareness of the need to preserve coral reefs at all levels. The campaign won the *Golden Quill Award for Effective Communication* from the International Association of Business Communicators. In major urban areas awareness increased by 31 percentage points over the baseline of 39%. The impact in coastal areas was even greater - 61 percentage points over a baseline of only 3%. This increased participation in community discussion of marine resource management (from 25% to 45%), had a modest effect on increased adoption of reef-friendly fishing gear - 46% of fishermen with high exposure to the publicity used reef-friendly gear while only 39% of those modestly exposed did so.

3 & 4. Micro-enterprise activities as alternatives to reef fishing were very successful. The number of community groups using micro-credit increased from 32 to 90, the original seed funds revolved at least once and grew from about US\$21,500 to US\$35,000 at the end of the project - and they continue to revolve. Although a **significant reduction in the level of illegal fishing activities** is reported in the ICR the lack of control areas and a reliable counterfactual make these claims somewhat subjective. In Take Bonerate there is a reported 85% reduction in illegal fishing. **Six villages have produced their own coral reef management plans** that have been endorsed by the village heads and Village Councils.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance

Rating: HS

- **In retrospect, were the project's objectives, its design, expected outcomes (original and/or modified) consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The ICR and OED reports stress that the relevance was 'substantial'. Objectives of the project were relevant to OP2 and the CAS of Indonesia/ The projects focus on policy reform, enforcement and creating demand for good governance at the local level was congruent with the Government of Indonesia (GOI) overall objectives. The project was consistent with the three broad objectives of the Banks Environment Strategy (i) improving peoples quality of life (ii) improving prospects for growth; (iii) and protecting quality the regional and global commons.

B Effectiveness

Rating: S

I. To what extent did the project achieve the expected outcomes as described in the project document?

OED PPAR and OED ICR review provide substantial analysis and rate effectiveness as 'satisfactory'. **Component / Outcome 1: Program Strategy and Management:** The legal framework for coral reef management was strengthened in Indonesia and the second phase (COREMAP II) was approved in May 2004. The project created the institutional framework needed to implement the program, including the national Project Management Office (PMO), district working groups, and village community groups. Management responsibility was transferred from the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) to the Department of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (DKP) thus firmly establishing government ownership, a transfer that is consistent with the decentralization strategy of the GOI, replicable as COREMAP expands, and adaptable to local customs and circumstances. Most of a supportive legal framework have been drafted and the most important national level policy and strategy statements have been promulgated as a ministerial decree (September 17, 2004). At the district level two laws were passed defining permitted and prohibited activities, and reef zoning for conservation purposes. Even so, several key pieces of legislation await approval. Community based management (CBM) was implemented in two pilot sites, but the design needs to be substantially revised to ensure its sustainability for the long term and demonstrate its viability.

The project also took advantage of the GOI overall decentralization policy and has linked COREMAP activities to local institutions and community initiatives that are related to the decentralization in other sectors. This is likely to reduce institutional duplication and make the program / project institutional benefits more appropriate to local contexts and thus more sustainable.

Component / Outcome 2. Publicity and outreach campaigns successfully raised public awareness of the need to preserve coral reefs at all levels. The campaign won the *Golden Quill Award for Effective Communication* from the International Association of Business Communicators. In major urban areas awareness increased by 31 percentage points over the baseline of 39%. The impact in coastal areas was even greater - 61 percentage points over a baseline of only 3%. This increased participation in community

discussion of marine resource management (from 25% to 45%), had a modest effect on increased adoption of reef-friendly fishing gear - 46% of fishermen with high exposure to the publicity used reef-friendly gear while only 39% of those modestly exposed did so.

Component / Outcomes 3 & 4. Surveillance and Community-based Management: The project made satisfactory progress in the implementation of the MCS and CBM – the ICR claimed MCS was effective at reducing illegal fishing in several sites. The OED PPAR confirms that local community involvement in the pilot sites was strong and this contributed to the control of illegal activities. But some communities initially felt that COREMAP was too focused on ‘policing’ and not enough on CBM. The project has worked hard to correct that view. The project piloting of the CBM was modest (2 sites) but it involved communities and NGOs – to date the project managed to ‘test’ some CBM methods, which can be further developed in phase 2 and also learnt some lessons (see section below). The OED PPAR and OED ICR review noted it was unrealistic to expect Community Based Management (CBM) to develop and produce useful lessons and guidelines over only three years - a much longer time frame was required.

A significant reduction in the level of illegal fishing activities is reported in the ICR the lack of control areas and a reliable counterfactual make these claims somewhat subjective. In Take Bonerate there is a reported 85% reduction in illegal fishing. Six villages have produced their own coral reef management plans that have been endorsed by the village heads and Village Councils.

Micro-enterprise activities as alternatives to reef fishing were very successful. The number of community groups using micro-credit increased from 32 to 90, the original seed funds revolved at least once and grew from about US\$21,500 to US\$35,000 at the end of the project - and they continue to revolve (see OED ICR review).

The main shortcomings related to the sequencing of MCS and CBM activities, and the focus on the MCS on the wrong threats: the design of the monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) system was inappropriate for the type of risks found to be present in the pilot areas. The quantity and sophistication of the equipment procured far exceeds what was needed and its high cost of operation and maintenance is not sustainable - thus in COREMAP II the MCS approach will be scaled-down to enable greater local ownership. CBM should have preceded implementation of MCS so that communities felt it was a viable management tool. Instead, poor conceptualization and coordination allowed MCS to overtake CBM and it thus became resented as a "policing" activity rather than a supporting one. This lack of phasing also reduced the program's effectiveness to reduce illegal fishing.

II. Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? Explain **Rating: MS**

The project design was ‘marginally satisfactory’ to address the threats outlined at appraisal. This rating relates to the problems encountered with the MCS focus vis-à-vis CBM. The ICR asserts the MCS overestimated external threats to reef resources and underestimated local threats. As a result a large amount of expensive equipment was procured and operational and maintenance costs were beyond what was sustainable. Had the design of the MCS waited until working relationships at the local level been established through the CBM then a much less expensive system of policing could have been devised to address local threats. These issues are being corrected in the COREMAP phase 2.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: S**

- **Include an assessment of outcomes in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Where there any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems that delayed or affected in other ways the implementation of the project?**

The OED PPAR rated efficiency as ‘high’ and OED ICR concurred with the PPAR rating.

The efficiency of the project is high. Its appraisal was underpinned with an unusually thorough and detailed economic analysis of coral reef degradation in Indonesia,¹ which was updated for the (draft) appraisal of the

¹. See Cesar, H. S. J., (1996): *Economic Analysis of Indonesian Coral Reefs*. Working Paper Series “Work in Progress”, World Bank, Washington DC.

Phase II project (see Annex B). The analysis considered the potential net benefits of healthy coral reefs in the form of sustainable fisheries, coastal protection (erosion control), tourism and recreation, and estimates the extent to which these benefits will be affected by ongoing damage trends, including poison fishing, blast fishing, coral mining, sediments (from logging and mining activities), and overfishing. The analysis also considered the sensitivity of these benefit estimates to assumptions about fish yields over time, which will depend on the effective enforcement of CRMPs. On this basis, the region (in its draft ICR) estimates that the economic rate of return (ERR) for the Taka Bone Rate site is 19 percent, with a 'high' estimate of 49 percent and a 'low' one of 1 percent. The ERR for the Padaido site is 12 percent, with a 'high' of 23 percent and a 'low' of 1 percent. The ERR for the Taka Bone Rate site is comparable to that obtained at appraisal, of 17 percent in the 'standard' scenario (see OED PPAR).

There were some cost overruns which were caused by political unrest – The total cost overruns in component one were covered by the borrower. The redistribution of funding among the other components (there was a net reallocation from program strategy and management to MCS and CBM, with public awareness nearly as originally estimated) utilized cost contingencies and thus overall GEF and Bank financing was as appraised allowing for exchange rate fluctuations. The project closing date was extended three times and closed 33 months later than planned. Major reasons for the extension were initial delays to field programs caused by ethnic conflict followed by further delays as a result of the decentralization of Indonesia's government administration from central and provincial to district level. Within the project, further delays were caused by poor coordination and capacity constraints and difficulties in establishing technically viable community-based management activities (see OED ICR review).

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: ML
Financial sustainability has been secured through the follow on COREMAPII project. The follow on project will work to make the MCS and CBM interventions more sustainable. At the end of phase 1 the MCS was not sustainable and the phase 2 will work to revise the MCS with the key institutional stakeholders and the local communities and local government partners. Financial sustainability is conservatively rated as moderately likely assuming that phase 2 pays attention to the issue.	
B Socio political	Rating: L
The project phase 1 placed particular emphasis on building partnerships with local communities, local government to support the CBM component (still under development) and strong public awareness and education component (successful completed). An autonomy law was passed in 1999 (decentralization), which provided more authority to district governments to manage local programs. Hence the phase 2 project now has much more decentralized feel and has a 'stronger footing' as some layers of bureaucracy will be removed particularly in relation to the MCS and CBM operations which will mean that the two operations dovetail more effectively at the community level. Therefore, sustainability is rated likely.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
OED PPAR rated institutional development as substantial. The project created a new institution – Ministry for Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAFs) responsible for coral reef resources – where there had been none in existence before. Phase 1 of the project successfully completed the creation of an entire institutional and legal framework needed to implement the program. Phase 2 and 3 will continue to strengthen the MMAF, as well as local institutional arrangements for the governance of resources. The current program has linked into the ongoing GOI objectives for decentralized governance – therefore there is a good chance that as the COREMAP expands in Phase 2 and 3 it will be fully congruent with local customs and governance systems. Sustainability is therefore rated 'moderately likely'.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: L
Assuming CBM / MCS systems can be expanded through Phase 2 and 3 it is likely that ecological benefits will be sustainable. However it is important that financial, social and institutional sustainability issues are addressed thoroughly in the forthcoming phases. To date ecological outcomes were encouraging with reported reduction in illegal fishing. But the lack of adequate monitoring / baseline means that the outcome reporting was rather subjective and anecdotal – this requires correcting as the project moves into the phase 2 otherwise there will be a risk that it cannot prove the effectiveness of the CBM approach.	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: NA
CBM / MCS systems involving communities and local government (tied to GOI decentralization) are likely to be replicable in other areas of Indonesia. Phase 2 and 3 will build on the CBM component – it was recognized that 2 – 3year phase 1 period for establishment of the CBM was unrealistically short. However,	

at the moment the lack of clear outcomes from phase 1 make it unrealistic to give a rating for replication potential. This should be assessed exhaustively at the end of phase 2.

4.3 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?	Rating: U
Monitoring and evaluation paid poor attention to developing a baseline. This is unfortunate as the project has sufficient resources, time and worked in relatively few pilot sites (2). Unless coordination increases in the latter phases between activities, baseline environmental and socio-economic surveys, and monitoring the COREMAP program is unlikely to be able to demonstrate impact and validate the CBM rationale (see OED PPAR). Anecdotal reporting is simply not good enough.	
B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?	Rating: HS
Despite the lack of baselines, the process orientated monitoring (outputs) and supervision was very strong. The project was highly complex and operated in a difficult institutional and political context. However, it had a flexible and effective response to problems (e.g. the Indonesian financial crisis and government problems). The decisions by the GOI to promote decentralization meant the project implementation team took the opportunity to shift the project central focus to the districts and local governments – unfortunately financial management remained centralized which resulted in delays – but this is expected to be resolved in Phase 2. The project team took advantage of the opportunity for an independent OED PPAR to feed into the final ICR and to assist the project in fine-tuning Phase 2. This demonstrates a good use of evaluative resources. In summary, the project adaptive management was highly satisfactory.	
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No	

4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

Strengths	Weaknesses
Both the ICR and the PPAR contain lessons that are based on evidence and flow logically from the project implementation experience.	ICR should have focused on maximum of 5 key lessons instead it provides in excess of 10. Many are related to each other and warrant combining. However, this is a minor problem.
What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance of adaptability and time for pilot projects: sufficient time must be allowed for communities to internalize what is needed, and to reach agreement on a common approach to fisheries and reef management including enforcement. 2. Need to integrate project activities with impact data gathering and monitoring 3. Communities should be the focus of coral reef ecosystem and fisheries management activities 4. Coral reef ecosystems and fisheries management will benefit from decentralization: although there is a need for a strong legal and enforcement regime (carrots and sticks) 5. Monitoring and enforcement activities must be cost-effective to be sustainable 6. Marine Protected Areas require long terms funding and institutional commitments from both donors and governments – best suited to program with funding for 10 years or more. 	

4.5 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

4.5.2 ratings	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	5
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	4
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	5
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	4

4.6 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes: X (after phase 2 completion)

No:

Explain: The project has been thoroughly assessed by OED. A technical assessment should be carried out after the completion of phase 2 in order to take stock of the progress made before phase 3 (final phase begins). This would be relevant because the project represents more of a programmatic approach than a 'traditional project' mode.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No

4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

OED (2005) ICR Review.

OED (2004) PPAR

GEF (2004) Indonesia: Local Benefits Case Study. GEFOME. Washington DC.