

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1252	
GEF Agency project ID		594089	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO * *the project was originally a World Bank project, but in 2008 it transferred implementing agency oversight to the FAO	
Project name		Bay Of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project	
Country/Countries		Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Strategic Program 2: Expand Global Coverage of IW Foundation Capacity Building; GEF-4 IW Strategic Objective 1, GEF-4 IW Strategic Program 1	
Executing agencies involved		Lead co-executing agency: FAO; Project executing partners: Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute; India Dept. of Animal Husbandry and Dairying (Fisheries Unit); Indonesia Directorate General of Capture Fisheries; Maldives Marine Research Center; Malaysia Marine Research Centre; Myanmar Department of Fisheries; Sri Lanka National Aquatic Resources Research & Development Agency; Thailand Department of Fisheries	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		n/a	
Private sector involvement		n/a	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.699	0.699
	Co-financing	1.200	1.200
GEF Project Grant		12.082	12.082
Co-financing	IA own	0.800	0.800
	Government	5.700	7.590
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	12.411	5.850
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		31.900
Total GEF funding		12.781	12.781
Total Co-financing		20.112	47.340
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		32.893	60.121
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 2016	

<b>Author of TE</b>	FAO Office of Evaluation
<b>TER completion date</b>	February 14, 2017
<b>TER prepared by</b>	Punji Leagnavar
<b>TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)</b>	Molly Watts

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	MS	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		MS	MS	MU
M&E Design		---	---	MS
M&E Implementation		---	---	MS
Quality of Implementation		---	---	S
Quality of Execution		---	---	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		---	---	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environment Objective of the project is a healthy ecosystem and sustainability of living resources for the benefit of the coastal populations of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) (CEO Endorsement, p.1)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the BOBLME Project (PDO) is to support the development of a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) whose implementation will lead to enhanced food security and reduced poverty for coastal communities in the BOB region (CEO Endorsement, p.1)

The project included the following outcomes at the time of the CEO Endorsement:

- *Outcome 1* – Strategic Action Programme
- *Outcome 2* - Community-based Integrated Coastal Management; Improved Policy Harmonization; Collaborative Regional Fishery Assessments and Managements Plans
- *Outcome 3* - Improved Understanding of Large-Scale Processes and Dynamics affecting the BOBLME; Marine Protected Areas in the Conservation of Regional Fish Stocks; Improved Regional Collaboration
- *Outcome 4* - Establishment of an agreed to Ecosystem Indicator Framework; Coastal Pollution Loading and Water Quality Criteria

### 3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

After the project commencement, the project decided to change its Development Objective to give it a more substantive focus. Since this occurred at the very start of the project, it did not affect the project M&E. The DO was changed to: “To support a series of strategic interventions that would result in and provide critical inputs into the Strategic Action Programme (SAP), whose implementation will lead to enhanced food security and reduced poverty for coastal communities.” (TE, p.14).

The project also changed and refined its outcomes after the project started, within the first reporting period. The new Outcomes are reflected below and are used as the basis of the TE and TER:

Outcome 1: The institutional and programmatic basis for implementing the SAP has been developed.

Outcome 2: Regional and sub-regional collaborative management approaches applied to priority issues, and barriers affecting coastal/marine living natural resources in the BOBLME, and the livelihoods of dependent coastal communities are removed.

Outcome 3: Increased understanding of large-scale processes and ecological dynamics and interdependencies characteristic of the BOBLME.

Outcome 4: Institutional arrangements and processes established to support a collaborative approach to ascertain and monitor ecosystem health of the BOBLME.

Outcome 5: Sufficient institutional capacity established to coordinate regional interventions, monitor project impacts, and disseminate and exchange information

#### **4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability**

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

*Relevance to national priorities:* The BOBLME project was highly relevant to all eight countries involved since it attempted to secure the health of the coastal and marine ecosystems in the Bay of Bengal. The Bay is not only a major source of economic and biodiverse wealth, but its health is directly linked to the livelihoods of the surrounding communities and villages. In regards to policy priorities, several of the project activities (particularly building cooperation between fisheries and environmental sectors) were acknowledged as priority institutional issues for each of the national governments.

*Relevance to GEF-4 International Waters:* The project is also highly relevant for the GEF-4 International Waters priorities, specifically GEF IW Strategic Objective 1- *To foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority transboundary water concerns through more comprehensive, ecosystem-based*

*approaches to management* and GEF4 IW Strategic Program 1 - *Restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity*. The project is particularly relevant for the Strategic Program since it aims at developing the policy, legal, and institutional reforms sustainable fisheries, creating alternative livelihood options, and providing technical guidance on creating sustainable fleet agreements.

*Relevance to beneficiaries:* Over 400 million people live in the Bay of Bengal catchment area, and many of them are economically dependent on the ecological services that the water body provides (through mangrove commerce, waste water processing, recreation, shelter against tropical storms, etc.). This project is relevant to them because it creates institutional frameworks to effectively manage the waters cross-nationally. For local fishing communities, this project is particularly relevant because they are highly dependent on marine resources and at risk to marine exploitation.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
-------------------	-----------------------------------

The TER rates effectiveness as *moderately unsatisfactory* which is in contrast with the TE which rates effectiveness as *moderately satisfactory*. Overall, the ultimate aim of the project was to develop the institutional structures, notably a Strategic Action Program, that would create the conditions for the Bay of Bengal to conserve its vital ecosystem habitats, and develop in a sustainable way across the eight countries involved. The project fell short of delivering an effective SAP (Outcome 1) in the end. The discussion on this and the achievement of the other outcomes is below.

Outcome 1: The institutional and programmatic basis for implementing the SAP has been developed

This outcome focused on developing a SAP, which is a rigorous process that involves a lot of analytical work, baseline studies, a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, etc. Many of the project outputs were related to the delivery of these tools, and were completed to a satisfactory degree. In 2015, the project produced the SAP document. However, at the time of the TE it had not been signed by all eight countries. So, because it has not been ratified, delivery of this outcome is incomplete. Additionally, the project failed to completely create an effective consortium that would manage the SAP after the project is over. The consortium has been created, however, at the time of the TE it had no agreed upon structure or details on how it would operate. (TE, p.24)

Outcome 2: Regional and sub-regional collaborative management approaches applied to priority issues, and barriers affecting coastal/ marine living natural resources in the BOBLME, and the livelihoods of dependent coastal communities are removed

There are several sub-components of the project, each focusing on a specific ecosystem and habitat management plan. Overall, the TE found that the individual sub-components were satisfactory but could have done things to make the project more impactful. For example, Sub-component 2.1: Community based integrated coastal management (ICM) was moderately

satisfactory. The reviews that were created were thorough, however, the TE found that the project did not progress ICM work sufficiently beyond these reviews, or showed how ICM could be cost-efficient. Sub-component 2.2.: Improved environment and capacity to formulate policies supportive of sustainable community-based integrated coastal management, was another example of an output that was moderately achieved. The TE found that beyond the policy review activity, there was “little direct work under this sub-component” (e.g. a regional policy workshop, final report on policy formulation, etc.) (TE, p.33).

**Outcome 3: Increased understanding of large-scale processes and ecological dynamics and interdependencies characteristic of the BOBLME**

Overall, the terminal evaluation found that the activities under this outcome have not helped to directly address BOBLME’s critical marine environment and fisheries issues of overexploitation, habitat degradation or pollution; nor have they informed strategies to address these issues, including the SAP. (TE, p.41) On a large scale, the impact of this outcome might be weak. However, the project still met its targets (developing a workplan to address key data and information gaps for large marine ecosystems, supporting the draft of a regional marine protected area action plan, and creation of new marine partnerships).

**Outcome 4: Institutional arrangements and processes established to support a collaborative approach to ascertain and monitor ecosystem health of the BOBLME.**

This outcome focused on developing indicator and criteria for ecosystem health and coastal pollution. The project did reach most of its targets, which were to develop regional reports, national consultations and action plans for ecosystem health indicators. However, even if those outputs were achieved, the project fell short of achieving its goal to develop an ecosystem health monitoring system and create institutional arrangements for them. The TE states: “The project has achieved little progress toward the intended outcome of an operational ecosystem health monitoring system with a standard framework of indicators... The evaluation found no activities addressing ecosystem health indicators in most of the countries” (TE, p.42).

**Outcome 5: Sufficient institutional capacity established to coordinate regional interventions, monitor project impacts, and disseminate and exchange information**

Although the TE does not evaluate the effectiveness of Outcome 5, the PIR 2015 has shown that this outcome has been met to a highly satisfactory degree, and the project team had sufficient institutional capacity to coordinate the project.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	----------------------

The project was efficient, and this TER rates efficiency as *satisfactory*. The TE does not rate overall efficiency, but rates the cost-effectiveness of the project as *satisfactory*. The reason why the project

operated efficiently administratively was because there was a “mode of delivery” that was developed by the regional coordination units, which allowed for timely flow of approvals and organization of project activities. There were some minor delays in the project start up. The delays (that were not exogenous) during project implementation were the result of slow expenditures, and the processing of contracts through the FAO system.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately unlikely
--------------------	-----------------------------

This TER finds that the sustainability of the project outcomes are rated as *moderately unlikely*, this is in contrast with the TE which rates it as *moderately satisfactory*. Overall the project didn’t go far enough to address the underlying stresses of coastal and marine ecosystems for benefits to be sustainable. The project focused on an improved understanding of the issues, but fell short of testing, proving and demonstrating solutions to those problems. The TE found that the sustainability of the project is directly linked to the external pressures surrounding the Bay of Bengal, and that human pressures, increased migration and slow pace of introducing mitigating actions are more powerful than the interventions of the project. Below is a discussion on the sustainability dimensions:

*Financial* – The project was not effective in introducing financing arrangements for managing and implementing the SAP, nor did it work with countries on how to fully integrate SAP into national planning and budget systems. In addition, there has not been any external project funding to continue and/or sustain the project activities. The continuation and strengthening of the project objective, in terms of financial sustainability, seems moderately unlikely. However, the TE does note that isolated projects and activities (such as fisheries policy work, science communication, shark conservation, and Mangroves for the Future) will probably be continued and supported financially in-kind by other NGOs.

*Socio-political*: The TE found that the project didn’t give enough attention to developing the right type of capacities to implement solutions that would be sustainable. Although the project provided individual training on coastal management, for example, it didn’t use that new capacity to pilot demonstration activities, something the TE noticed would have increased long term sustainability. In addition, the individual governments involved showed little sense of ownership of the national SAPs, which could affect the sustainability of the project given that the government could choose to prioritize other initiatives (TE, p.27).

*Institutional framework and governance*: One of the main results of the project was creating a Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Strategic Action Programme (SAP) that would be implemented for a long term, following the closure of the project. This SAP is to be implemented over 7-12 years, from 2016 to perhaps 2025 across eight countries. Because longer term sustainability is built into the SAP, it is considered to be *likely* from the institutional framework and governance perspective.

*Environmental* – There are some environmental risks that can pose as threats to the sustainability of the BOBLME project. For example, the continued degradation of the Bay of Bengal, if occurring at a faster rate, can make it more difficult for fisheries to continue using the same management practices. The

tsunami also showed that natural disasters can affect the surrounding ecosystems in an extreme way. The project sites were affected by the tsunami in 2004, and it's possible that another tsunami might occur in the same area.

## **5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

At the time of the CEO Endorsement, the project estimated that it would receive about USD 18.9 million in co-financing for the project (excluding the PPG). By the end of the project, co-financing was estimated to reach over USD 35 million, 54% more than anticipated. The additional co-financing, however, did not result in greater achievements or results. This is probably due to the fact that most of the additional co-financing was in the form of in-kind contributions from other organizations working on activities that were considered to be relevant and aligned with the BOBLME project.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The current project was planned for a five-year period and extended twice to a final end date of December 2015, after six and a half years of implementation, with no additional funding (TE, p.21). The project experienced delays during project start up and during implementation. In 2004, the Indian Ocean tsunami halted project development and the GEF approval process in the very beginning when it was a World Bank project. Then in 2007, the project was resubmitted as a FAO project and was approved in 2008. During implementation the project experienced some delays, albeit minor, because of the contract approval process. The project documents do not mention the causal linkage between the delays and achievement of outcomes.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership across the eight governments was relatively weak and this might have future effects on project sustainability. A large component of the project was to create regulatory structures for a SAP and national SAPs. The TE found that there was little interest from the governments concerning the national SAPs, and that the result of producing them might have made little to no impact. This project also had FAO as an implementing and executing agency, and therefore, without strong government co-executing agencies, it is difficult to instill a strong sense of ownership and shared responsibility.



## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The M&E design at entry had many faults that are included in the TE. This TER rates it as *moderately satisfactory*, there is no rating in the TE. The TE found that overall, the logframe was not sufficiently developed in order for it to be used as the main instrument to monitor the critical progress and results of the project. This is because the framework included higher level objectives (GEO/DO/outcomes) but did not include mid-level outputs or targets that support and reflect the achievement of the higher level objectives. These mid-level outputs were described in the text of the project document but not in the logframe. It wasn't until the middle of project implementation, 2012, that the project revised its logframe to include lower level output indicators, targets and baselines (TE, p.14). The TE notes that the "underdeveloped project design led to impediments for monitoring, internal review, evaluation and learning" (TE, p.2). The indicators could have been more direct and reflective of the changes the project was trying to achieve. For instance, the TE notes that it would have been valuable to have impact indicators on policy, such as improved management of fisheries, as opposed to development of management plan.

The M&E budget at the design was USD 1 million; which, for a 5 year, 8 country project can be considered a bit high. This is because USD 500,000 was allocated to revise the environmental baseline (the provision of studies, etc.) post-tsunami. The project however, did not receive money for a PPG which would normally analyze the baselines.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The project did not experience any substantial inefficiencies in terms of implementing an M&E program. However, there were some things it could have done better. For example, the PIRs and MTEs are good 'signposts' for projects to re-evaluate and see if they are continuing in the right direction and course correct if necessary. For this project, the MTE provided several recommendations that were not integrated by the project and could have affected the delivery of the final outcomes. One of those recommendations was that the BOBLME project should engage closer with local/national institutions, such as the FAO country office, and the National Coordinators. Another was that the project should have more flexible contract agreements, that would engage other organizations as partners rather than

contractors – fostering a larger sense of partnership. These recommendations didn't seem to be upheld, and in the end could have negatively affected project sustainability.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

The TE notes that the FAO took on the dual roles of being a GEF agency and project executing agency (it had many executing partners in the eight countries). The TE does not separate quality of implementation and/or execution. This TER reviews both of them in tandem. The rating for both quality of implementation and execution is *satisfactory*.

The project had a complicated management structure, since it worked across eight countries. The FAO was the implementing agency for this project, and management was handled by the FAO office in Rome (Headquarters) and Bangkok (Regional office). The project execution was handled by a FAO Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) in Phuket which engaged with countries across the eight countries through a National Coordinator.

The TE stated that the project implementation and execution was efficient. The FAO Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) managed everything from activity planning, information management, technical assistance and administration, all in very close cooperation with the FAO regional and global offices, local entities, and the steering committee. The TE mentions that the RCU developed a system of work planning, budget, reporting, and M&E that made project execution very efficient. It presents evidence that the execution was highly satisfactory, such as “the small team at the RCU has done a remarkable job in organizing and administering many hundreds of activity contracts, apparently with great diligence and efficiency, and with good quality controls...this produced high quality outputs in a highly efficient manner” (TE, p.19). Contracts were a central component in executing the project well because the majority of project activities were contracted activities (224 in total) – including, studies, trainings, events and reports.

The TE noted that the project could have been more effective if the RCU had localized decision making. One way it could have done so is with the FAO country offices. The MTE made this recommendation and the project team did not enforce it. As well, many of the national coordinators were kept out of the loop in many important decision (contracting, etc.) that their effectiveness was hindered.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------------------	----------------------

Same as above

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

**Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.**

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project did not result in any environmental impacts directly, but through the provision of studies, capacity building, and institutional strengthening, the longer term impacts will be that the coastal and marine ecosystems in the Bay of Bengal will be conserved and protected.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not note any socioeconomic impacts occurring.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities – The TE mentions that perhaps the main impact the project had was building the capacity of participants through trainings, consultative reviews, and planning workshops. These individuals have all acquired knowledge and skills that will enable them to work more efficiently and effectively (TE, p.43).

b) Governance – There are very limited governance impacts resulting from the project. The TE noted that “The project exploited many fora to raise awareness and has reviewed existing policy and management practices, but has not brought about changes in policy, institutional arrangements or practice” (TE, p.23). It also says, “It is evident that the current project has had limited impact on policy settings” (TE, p.48)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

There are no references of unintended impacts in project documents.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

There are no references of broader adoption in project documents.

## **9. Lessons and recommendations**

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The key learnings from the TE are:

- The emphasis on knowledge was excessive relative to its importance for improved management. This hindered the project to drive effective institutions and management systems that can use that knowledge to deliver better management
- The overemphasis on establishing regional institutional arrangements has resulted in insufficient attention to national and local capacities a more efficient strategy would have been to address local and national issues and to build regional collaborations as a next step
- The project design was weak from the start and that affected the ability of the project to appropriately monitor its progress; it payed more attention to the higher level outcomes and targets, then making sure that the outputs supported the achievement of that outcome. The logical design/results framework should have included all levels of the logic model from the beginning.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations for continuing the project in future phases:

- If an additional phase of the project is planned, it should incorporate small regional coordination mechanisms, and each of the eight countries should have a distinct national program in order to build their own national SAPs.
- Any new national SAPs should be integrated into It is important for each NSAP to be developed in line with the country's planning and management systems, including national development programming and budgeting, with medium-term and annual timetables. Each NSAP should be planned as an integral part of the government's program, linked to the relevant agencies' work plans and budgets, and operate under the appropriate institutional, law, policy and planning framework.
- Continue to use the Steering Committee as a main body for decision making and collaboration for the BOBLME project – National Steering Committees should be developed.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The project did a good job of explaining the achievement of the outcomes, however, it failed to provide an analysis of Outcome 5.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence is presented well, however the TE decided to rate the project on the achievement of higher level outcomes and the impact of those outcomes, as opposed to the achievement of the outputs and activities that support the outcome.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE assesses sustainability well, and provides good information about each dimension.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are well presented by evidence and the narrative of the projects	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No, the TE does not present a final budget breakdown per activity nor does it provide a breakdown of co-financing; instead it gives the overall figures for the budget.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Highly satisfactory, the TE was critical of the M&E systems and presented evidence and a thorough analysis of the design; it does not analyze the implementation of the M&E system however	MS
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

## 11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

Co-financing letters, MTE