

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1261		Review date:		
IA/EA Project ID: 1068		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name: Community-based Coastal and Marine Conservation in the Milne Bay Province		GEF financing:	3.55	3.55
		IA/EA own:	0.50	1.03
Country: Papua New Guinea	Government:	UA	UA	UA
	Other*/ CI	UA	UA	UA
		Total Cofinancing	3.57	3.98
Operational Program: 2		Total Project Cost:	7.13	7.53
IA: UNDP	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:		Work Program date		05/17/2002
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation International, Japanese Human Development Trust Fund, National Government 		CEO Endorsement		10/02/2002
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		11/29/2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: 11/28/07	Actual: 11/2006 (field activities stopped earlier)
Prepared by: Divya Nair	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 5 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 4 years	Difference between original and actual closing: -1year
Author of TE: Graham Baines, John Drugman, Peter Johnston		TE completion date: 07/01/2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: September 2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 13 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	S		MU
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	MS		ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation		U		MU
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

No.

The report is too detailed on processes followed, financial information is unclear – it does not provide a

comparison of actual and expected spending, nor expenditure per activity.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

Yes, there appears to have been financial mismanagement – project activities started late, then ran out of funds and had to cease prematurely leading to a lot of disappointment and frustration among stakeholders (field activities ceased in October 2005).

- The TE notes that \$800,000 “could have been available for actual Project activities ...but was rendered unavailable due to poor project management in general”. It further notes that “Senior Project management argue that funds lost due to poor management and to wrong charges were over \$1.4million” (TE, pp15)
- According to PIR2006, there have been some significant reallocations: the UNDP allocated an additional US\$500,000 to the project at the beginning of 2006 and CI allocated an additional US\$191,000 for the 2006/07 financial year (beginning July 2006). This was necessitated by the project running out of funds towards the end of 2005. The reasons for this are not clear and would require a financial audit.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the PAD the Global Environmental Objectives of the project was to “conserve a representative sample of the Milne Bay Province’s exceptional high levels of marine biodiversity of global significant and its marine ecosystems and coral reefs”

No change was made.

- **What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the PAD (log frame matrix), the objectives of the project included:

- To establish a representative system of community based Marine Protected in Milne Bay for the conservation biodiversity, sustainable use and protection of marine resources to achieve sustainable development and livelihood benefits for vulnerable small island communities
- A community based marine conservation framework is established in partnership with national and provincial government, the private sector and NGOs

No change was made to the objectives from the Project Document. However, indicators and activities within these objectives were changed.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The project is meant to be a ten year intervention, divided into two phases with four different geographic zone areas, will focus on mitigating the threats to marine biodiversity through the establishment of community managed protected areas and building capacities at the provincial, local and ward committee level governments, with the aim of transferring management to local ownership for sustaining project outcomes.

The project was implemented only over a 3.5 year period. As per the TE, the major result of the project is the community entry process that it has begun and the educational material produced – no major outcomes are noted.(TE, pp44)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

<p>A Relevance</p> <p>As per the Project Document, the project falls under OP#2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is a globally important storehouse of coastal and marine biodiversity, harbouring a range of tropical marine ecosystems. The species richness of these ecosystems is extraordinarily high, and besides displaying high levels of endemism, the area supports large populations of threatened species Papua New Guinea is a signatory to numerous international conventions pertaining to the protection of biological diversity. PNG ratified the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) in 1992, having previously ratified the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) in 1976. PNG is also party to the Ramsar Wetlands Convention, the London Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping Wastes and Other Matter, and one regional treaty, the Apia Convention on the Conservation of Nature in the South Pacific. A fundamental guiding principal of PNG's Constitution is that the natural environment be used in such a manner as to benefit all present and future generations of Papua New Guineans 	<p>Rating: S</p>
<p>B Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project had a delayed start and abrupt end, causing field activities to run only over three years. Results have not yet reached a stage where they can be evaluated, replicated or where lessons have been learned (the project was planned as a pilot). The project achievements have been unsatisfactory: legislation and management plans continue to mainly be in draft form, and a number of other activities that were initially planned have not been undertaken or have stalled (eg. Capacity building programs to better manage MPAs, Elementary curriculum development) Financial management of the project appears to have been ineffective with erratic spending such that 58% of resources were spent in 2005 and all the UN funds were exhausted by early 2006. The TE also notes 'excessive' spending over some activities, which the Audit (2005) was unable to unearth (on items such as overseas travel; these have, however, been contested by CI). This was coupled with poor oversight such that Project Team Leaders did not have access to their team budgets and were taken by surprise when "activities ground to a halt when funds suddenly ran out". (TE, pp16) 	<p>Rating: MU</p>
<p>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</p> <p>The project has had numerous problems in terms of internal management (eg conflict between Conservation International and UNDP), it ran out of funds prematurely due to mismanagement and closed early.</p> <p>The TE critiques the Inception report that it finds is counter to the initial judgment and recommendations of experts (a significant change was the re-drawing of Zones), it also notes the CI found the Inception Report to be "in contravention from CI's objectives and requirements".</p> <p>Thereafter, project management by CI is reported to be "extremely poor, indeed negligent –with poor reporting, excessive charges for overhead expenses, a poor relationship with provincial government officials, and little or no effective oversight or control..."</p>	<p>Rating: MU</p>

4.1.2 Impacts

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

<p>A Financial resources</p> <p>UNDP made a further US\$500,000 and CI made a further US\$191,000 available. This has kept the project going at a minimal level, but further funding is required. Discussions between national and provincial governments, UNDP & CI are ongoing. (PIR06)</p>	<p>Rating: ML</p>
--	--------------------------

B Socio political		Rating: ML
The abrupt end to project activities appears to have lost community support and political will, and has created disenchantment (PIR06, TE pp20). Yet, if new funding is provided it is possible that stakeholders will want to 'complete' what was begun.		
C Institutional framework and governance		Rating: ML
The project was expected to 'strengthen the provincial policy and institutional framework for marine conservation', but as per the TE, in general, the project did not pay attention to this aspect and instead precluded joint efforts, collaboration, consultation with or transfer of functions to the Provincial Government. (TE, pp12)		
D Environmental		Rating: NA
Project outcomes have not reached fruition – there is no information on additional environmental risks that have emerged since the project was approved.		
Risks mentioned in the Prodoc included: illegal harvesting, over-harvesting for subsistence, the national moratorium is lifted and Milne Bay artisanal fishermen turn to lucrative live reef fish trade (LRFT) for cash income.		

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good - some publications (including in local languages) were made early in the project. That work has since stopped, and feedback on their effectiveness is not available.
b. Demonstration
c. Replication
d. Scaling up

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

A. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): MS
As per the PAD and its Log Frame, the M&E plan at entry was detailed, specific, it tried to incorporate numerous sources of information and included time frames to assess various activities.	
As stated in the PAD, the framework was comprehensive "The project includes a strong monitoring component to assess its effectiveness in protecting biodiversity, the benefits accruing to communities and other primary beneficiaries, underlying causes of project outcomes (whether positive or negative), and level and quality of public participation in activities so as to guide site management interventions"	
Yet, the M&E plan at entry appears to be overly ambitious. For example, it anticipated the biennial biological survey would be conducted to measure the reef condition – this was not done after the initial baseline survey.	
B. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): MU
The project has comprehensive PIRs, but given limited progress these reviews have little to report on.	
The major concern raised by the TE is that information obtained during Reviews and monitoring was not used by project staff.	
There appear to have been communication gaps between CI Port Moresby and CI Washington DC such that even when red flags were raised there was low follow-up. UNDP's system of financial control appears to have failed. It did not catch the excessive expenditure in time (E, pp42).	

C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? UA. No budget for M&E was included in the Prodoc.
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? UA
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

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?

4.6 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 document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc. NA

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? No assessment of environmental results. The assessment is at the output level.	MS
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	S
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Too early to discuss sustainability	S
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes.	S
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? It reports only totals.	MS
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes.	S

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. 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, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
The project is reported to have mobilized a slightly higher level of cofinancing than was expected.

Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
The project finished early as it ran out of funds – this was due to poor financial and general management.

4.7 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:	No:X
Explain:		

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

PIRs, Prodoc