

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		9/8/05
GEF ID:	1310		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Building Wider Public and Private Constituencies for the GEF in Latin America and the Caribbean: Regional Promotion of Global Environment Protection through the Electronic Media	GEF financing:	0.998	0.998
Country:	Regional (LAC)	Co-financing:	0.959	1.329
Operational Program:	Multi-focal (OP12)	Total Project Cost:	\$1.957	\$2.208
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	TVE (and various in-country production companies) and European Union (EU)	Work Program date		Dec 1 st 1999
		CEO Endorsement		July 11 th 2001
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		July 2001
		Closing Date Feb 2004	Proposed: Jan 2004	Actual: July 2004
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 2 years 7 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 2 years 6 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 months (although TE – suggested an extension until December 2004)
Author of TE: Universalia		TE completion date: August 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 9/2/2004	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 month

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	N/A	MS
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	S	N/A	UA (changed from ML as initially rated)
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS	N/A	U
2.5 Quality of the	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

evaluation report				
-------------------	--	--	--	--

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No, Why? The TE was based on a well defined methodology, it contained a good description and assessment of project outcomes and shortcomings which were linked to lessons and recommendations. However, the reporting was rather confusing and piecemeal, with findings on outputs given without enough clear analysis of outcomes.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

1. Increase public awareness of global environmental issues and international environmental agreements (MEAs)
2. Increase motivation, interest and participation of general public and Latin American & Caribbean owners of SMEs in global environment issues, and in replicating environmentally sustainable initiatives

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

- **What are the Development Objectives?**

Same as above

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The TE tended to focus on reporting findings not on reporting against outcomes per se.

Outcome 1: Increased regular flow of information through electronic media on global environmental issues, GEF financed projects and environmentally sound business practices to SMEs, NGOs and other target groups.

Outcome 2: Increased capacity and information resources of national environmental NGOs to engage in global environmental education and support GEF outreach and communication activity

- Although the project design had capacity building as a primary outcome, in practice the projects contribution to the capacity building of network partners was limited to the provision of information resources and distribution of grants. According the Prodoc grants were supposed to fund creation of a media center; training in video production, marketing and negotiation, communications design, monitoring and evaluation and website design; short term professional placements; distribution of environmental media among NGOs in LAC; and other institutional needs approved by the project steering committee. With the exception of limited funds provided for launchings, respondents indicated no other capacity building exercises were undertaken.
- Access and exposure to programs by specific audiences such as SMEs has been limited, since the emphasis has been on broad TV exposure to all – not targeting particularly audiences. No specific activities or strategies were developed by the project during implementation to reach SMEs as suggested in the prodoc.
- Distribution approaches and strategies were only designed mid-course. The strategy did not include measurable targets or timelines.
- The project delivered the 16 half hour new TV programs as part of the local initiatives for global change series. The production involved local network members across LAC. Programs were of a high quality with the exception of some minor technical problems. Despite the limited resources for distribution programs were broadcast in all countries. The project also set up a website for the greater promotion of the programs. In the first year July 2003 – 04 the project website got on approximately 3 – 4000 visits per month (averaged).

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts Rating: MS

A Relevance

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The project outcomes were consistent with OP12 / multi-focal objectives. The justification for the project was valid as environmental problems are great in the LAC region and media interest has declined since Rio 1992. The project was relevant to stakeholders and donor agencies whose level of environmental awareness vis-à-vis other interests is often downplayed. Hence, the projects focus on capacity building for media, awareness raising with particularly focus on business, SMEs and NGOs was correct. However, the lack of sufficient capacity building and attention to targeting during implementation has eroded the relevance of the project somewhat. Despite, this the project managed to draw in a significant number of local stakeholders and provided them with an opportunity to interact with TV production companies.

B Effectiveness

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

The project focused too much on awareness and outreach at a general / broad level and failed to properly address the capacity building aspects to reach the planned outcomes. Although a certain amount of capacity was built through the production of the programs and broadcast. Overall, the effectiveness was 'marginally satisfactory'

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts 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? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems?**

There were changes in the TVE management, which caused instability and delays. The initial contract with the EU was signed in 1999. However, the approval of the GEF grant took nearly 2 years. Implementation delays caused the project to be extended to February 2004. Implementation of regional projects using sub-contractors and multilingual dimensions caused high project personnel and logistical costs. Partner organization made additional contributions over and above the amounts provided to them both in-kind and in-cash, yet the TE reports these were not reported in the project accounts. Despite the above shortcomings the project was complex – operating in many different countries and covering three major linguistic types – Hispanic, English and Lusophone. This imposed logistical and cost challenges which the project was able to manage relatively well.

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: U

The TE indicates that the programs produced are difficult to sell in the context of the highly commercial nature of TV broadcasting in LAC – making a self-sustaining strategy impossible. All broadcasts were given free of charge and the most accessible channels have been cable and state run networks. The possibility that the programs could be sold and generate revenue has proven to be incorrect. Donors need to recognize that production of such programs is in the public good and is unlikely to generate income to enable self-sustaining dissemination

B Socio political Rating: U/A

Not able to evaluate due to absence of monitoring data and baselines.

C Institutional framework and governance Rating: U/A

D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.) Rating: U/A

E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability Rating: L

Most the video resource centers have strategies for disseminating the strategies and this will continue through 2004 / 05. The centers have acquired rights to the library of environmental programs that has

allowed them to plan further activities beyond the life of the project.

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
The TE indicated that the monitoring and evaluation arrangements throughout the life of the project were generally ineffective. During implementation responsibilities changes and some activities. The project's management assumed responsibility for monitoring, but no baselines were established and there was little participation of project stakeholder in monitoring. The TE rated M&E – MS however, this rating seem to be contradicted by reported findings hence the overall M&E was unsatisfactory.	
B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?	Rating: N/A
Not applicable	
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No	

4.4 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?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to secure co-financing parallel funding contemporaneously to the initial funding request; • Need to assess the capacity and institutional capabilities of proposed partners and members of ad-hoc networks; • Need to define monitoring and impact indicators at the outset by incorporating them in the log frames; • Need to institute clear reporting and information sharing mechanisms

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.
N/A

4.5.2 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? The report tended to focus too much on outputs and less at the outcome level. This was perhaps due to the lack of M&E data available.	4
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Yes	5
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes	5

D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? A full breakdown is provided.	6
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes, although the rating given is somewhat generous (MS) given that the M&E system and baselines were not established	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:

No: X

Explain: It would be impossible to measure the project impact as no baseline was established. Furthermore, as the project was multi-country / media approach to raising awareness such activities present tough challenges with regard to impact measurement. Setting up a baselines in multiple countries would have been prohibitively expensive and possibly not cost-efficient for an MSP.

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)

N/A