

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1346	
GEF Agency project ID		101299	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Integrated Assessment and Management of the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem	
Country/Countries		Mexico, United States of America	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		9- Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program	
Executing agencies involved		Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (SEMARNAT), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		through consultation	
Private sector involvement		through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		12/3/2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		6/1/2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		7/1/2013	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2013	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.47	0.47
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.50	4.5
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	95.57	96.77
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		4.97	4.97
Total Co-financing		95.57	96.77
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		100.55	101.28
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		08/2013	
TE submission date		12/2013	
Author of TE		Mr. Cristóbal Vignal	
TER completion date		02/14/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	HS	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	ML	ML	ML
M&E Design	N/A	HS	S	S
M&E Implementation	N/A	HS	HS	HS
Quality of Implementation	S	MS	MS	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	HS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			S	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of this project is to protect the ecosystem and the environmental wealth of the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem (GOM/LME).

The GOM/LME is one of the most productive gulf areas of the world as well as an important center of marine biodiversity, marine food production and oil and gas production. Some of the threats and challenges facing the management of the GOM/LME include: serious degradation of coastal areas adjacent to urban centres as a result of pollution, habitat loss and unsustainable exploitation of marine and coastal natural resources; increasing exploitation of marine biomass by both artisanal and industrial fisheries, in the absence of an agreed long-term regional strategy for the sharing of a sustainable economic yield; increasing harmful algal blooms, oxygen depletion events, oil spills, vessel groundings on delicate coral reefs, coastal subsidence due to hydrocarbon extraction, ongoing petrogenic energy exploration, and production both offshore and in coastal areas with its attendant pollution risks; an apparent increase in the frequency of marked environmental changes in the ecosystem manifesting themselves through fluctuations in abundance and distribution of fish, birds and mammals; and an apparent opportunity for important climate change monitoring in relation to the Loop Current and the advection of nutrients and transport of Mississippi Drainage Basin effluents.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project addresses the transboundary concerns of the countries bordering the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem, defined in the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and prioritized in the Strategic Action Programme (SAP). The main objective of this project is to enhance regional efforts to address critical ecosystem and environmental problems in the GOM/LME through the development and implementation of a coordinated and integrated approach to sustainable ecosystem management. The GEF's role is to build on pertinent activities underway and assist in the development and catalyze the implementation of a regional Strategic Action Programme for the GOM/LME. This includes:

- The development of appropriate frameworks and mechanisms at both regional and national levels for consultation, co-ordination and co-operation;

- The development of institutional capacities of the key agencies and institutions in the region that contribute to the integrated sustainable management of the GOM/LME;
- The establishment of effective ecosystem monitoring systems together with mechanisms for the identification and analysis of problems and issues;
- Research to increase the understanding of the GOM/LME, its functioning, its natural evolution trends, and the factors which affect it (both biophysical and social, economic and political);
- The harmonization of policies and legislation relating to activities affecting the GOM/LME;
- Increased external support for activities to minimize and mitigate the negative impacts of development (petroleum, urbanization, tourism development, resource exploitation) through the promotion of sustainable approaches and the use of tools such as EIA;
- Measures to improve resource management;
- The development of national and regional capacities for gathering, processing and spreading environmental information;
- Measures to protect biological diversity;
- Clarification of the role of the GOM/LME as a monitoring/early warning site for global climate change.

The project carries out these actions through the 5 key following outcomes:

- (1) Outcome 1: Transboundary issues analyzed and priorities defined
- (2) Outcome 2: Country agreement on and commitment to regional and national policy, legal and institutional reforms to address the agreed priority transboundary issues
- (3) Outcome 3: LME-wide ecosystem-based management approaches encouraged and strengthened through the successful implementation of the Pilot Projects
- (4) Outcome 4: Monitoring and Evaluation System for the Project and the GoM LME established
- (5) Outcome 5: Effective project coordination

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

There were **no** changes to global environmental objectives or development objectives.

4. GEF EO 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.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

The overall relevance of the project is rated as satisfactory.

According to the TE, the relevance to target groups is clear and was confirmed through interviews and field visits. Target groups demonstrate a broader and more complete understanding of the functions of the LM,. The project links and integrates multiple actors across different fields and between both countries and is appealing to relevant institutions in both countries. A Plan for Involvement of Sectoral Stakeholders at the National, Regional, and International Levels for the project was developed in order to identify the stakeholders in the GoM LME, ensuring the flow of information on the issues of concern in the LME and to identify potential impacts and their resolution.

The GOM/LME project has a direct linkage to Mexico’s National Development Plan for 2006-2012, its National Sectoral Program for Environment and Natural Resources for 2006-2012, guidelines established under the National Environmental Policy for Sustainable Development of Oceans and Coasts and, more specifically to goals and projects set out in the National Strategy for the Ecological Use and Management of Oceans and Coasts. This National Strategy provides the specific framework for the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and coasts, including sea and land use planning projects to articulate public and sectoral policies to reach consensus among sectors and all government actors, considering regional strategies and local actions.

The project also directly relates to the mandates of the US National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Office of Habitat Conservation. The NMFS Office of Habitat Conservation focuses on ensuring that living marine resources have sufficient healthy habitat to sustain populations. Those mandates emphasize wetlands (including marshes, seagrasses, and mangroves), anadromous fish habitat, and habitat of other marine and estuarine species..

Finally, the project is fully compliant with the priorities identified for International Waters under GEF4 and with Strategic Objective 1 (SO1): *“To foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority transboundary water concerns through more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approaches to management, given in particular that its focus is on the development of response and mitigation*

measures to address identified priorities: land-based sources of marine pollution that create anoxic “dead” zones in coastal waters, depletion of fisheries, and degradation of coastal resources and processes. In terms of Strategic Programs in the international waters focal area for GEF 4, the project conforms to both SP1 and SP2. Strategic Program 1 is concerned with restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity. Strategic Program 2 focuses on reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with the GPA. As an Operational Programme 9 (OP9) initiative, it emphasizes the multi-focal connections that characterize the system, and seeks to create a co-operative framework, together with the necessary capacities, thereby enabling riparian countries that share the ecosystem to address both imminent threats to the water body and develop joint ecosystem-based management approaches.

The project fits within the mandate of UNIDO’s international waters projects related to industrial pollution control; sound water environment, cleaner production, controlling water pollution from land based activities mainly from domestic and industrial sources, and integrated ecosystem wide management of transboundary waters especially large marine ecosystems and river basins.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------	-----------------------------

The effectiveness of the project is rated as satisfactory.

According to the TE, project implementation was fully aligned with the project’s objectives. In addition, as per the calendar for implementation of activities, the project is considered to be ahead of schedule regarding the delivery of the different outputs. The majority of expected outputs have been achieved or are on target to being achieved, with only minor delay in the delivery of one of the pilot projects (Enhancing Shrimp Production through Ecosystem Based Management). It is estimated by the TE that given the support from the Parties to promote the project at the federal level, expected outputs have a high likelihood of being achieved.

The achievements per outcome are as follow:

Outcome 1 - Analysis of transboundary issues and definition of priorities

The Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) has been completed, ahead of schedule. The final version of the GoM LME TDA, formulated by Mexico and the USA, analyses the various transboundary environmental problems, major root causes, impacts and consequences from an ecosystem perspective and provides the scientific and technical basis for actions to be proposed in the SAP and NAPs. The TDA was completed approximately 8 months ahead of schedule and meets the requirements of the GoM Project Brief. In order to disseminate this TDA, copies were distributed at all workshops and meetings attended by the Project including major conferences in Boston and Tallahassee.

Outcome 2 - Formulation and adoption of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) and associated National Action Plans NAPs

Country agreement on and commitment to regional and national policy, legal and institutional reforms to address the agreed priority transboundary issues have been completed. Additionally, the SAP was completed, and its endorsement modalities were being finalized during the TE. They are expected to be completed in December 2013/early 2014.

The Formulation and endorsement of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) and the National Action Programmes (NAP) were at the time of TE almost complete (the document is considered to be “technically complete” by the TE). A SAP document has been prepared, building on consultative and integrative processes put in place during technical forums and multi-stakeholder SAP integration workshops. The Project also prepared an analysis of existing instruments in both countries and engaged consultations with officials to define the mechanism and approach to facilitate its signature at the highest level.

Outcome 3 - Strengthening of the LME-wide ecosystem-based management approaches through the successful implementation of the Pilot Projects

The four main activities under this outcome have been delivered. Three Pilots projects are being implemented. In order to maintain Gulf wide ecosystem connectivity, the GoM LME project promoted the creation of an International Gulf of Mexico Marine Protected Area Network. The implementation of this network aims to support the fishing industry by creating refuge areas that enable reproduction, breeding, and nursing of a number of commercial species that sustain commercial fisheries, likely contributing to the sustainable catch of commercial species.

Outcome 4 - Monitoring & Evaluation mechanisms set up including an M & E system for the project; Suite of GEF M&E indicators developed to monitor SAP implementation

An M&E system was in place for the overall Project. A full time Monitoring and Evaluation expert was involved in numerous activities and is considered by the TE to be keeping a satisfactory record of program progress. Additionally the M&E system is involved in support of workshops and administrative procedures and is also providing valuable inputs for preparation of quarterly and semi-annual reports to UNIDO, and bi-annual regional status reports to GEF. As well, information dissemination bulletins have been produced by the M&E officer, reporting on the main activities carried out by the project on a bimonthly basis.

Outcome 5 - Project Coordination and Management

According to the TE, the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) maintained its capacity to ensure the implementation of the project components, in particular the SAP.

A Steering Committee (SC) was installed in 2009 and is considered to be fully operational in its function to receive reports on achievements and oversee and support the Project’s development and implementation. The Intersectoral Committees (ISC) of both countries has been appointed by the country Focal Points. The objective of the ISCs is to improve wider cross-sectoral public participation.

The Gulf of Mexico LME project has served as element to further design cooperative efforts among academic and research institutions. The project has been involved in organizing two training courses and workshops on Governance including both US and Cuban experts.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Highly Satisfactory
-----------------------	------------------------------------

The efficiency of the project is rated as Highly Satisfactory. According to the TE, the project outputs were delivered either on target, or ahead of schedule. These have in addition been implemented in a cost-effective and efficient manner. Moreover, the project has committed/spent all of the budgeted resources on programmed activities as planned.

The project has made progress at a reasonable cost, towards the diagnosis of the identified priority needs (state of marine and coastal ecosystems, state of depleted fisheries, and magnitude of the overload of nutrients resulting from economic activities taking place inland from the Gulf of Mexico), by applying an evaluative approach that takes into account productivity of the LME, fisheries, pollution, ecosystem health and socio-economic and institutional structures in different countries associated with the problems that characterize the ecosystem.

In terms of implementation, the project has been designed to ensure that results are achieved efficiently. The design includes three pilot projects, all located in the Términos Lagoon, Campeche, Mexico, in order to achieve greater efficiency in the use of financial resources, greater synergy between them and to lay the foundation for integrated ecosystem based approaches for natural resource management. In addition, the development of pilot projects in the same area is generating practical experience to address a complex situation characterized by complex overlapping policies and institutional responsibilities relating to the conservation of protected areas, social and economic development and threats to terrestrial and coastal and marine biodiversity.

Overall, the project's progress in establishing functional approaches and effective ecosystem based management are cost effective, according to the TE, considering the impacts that land-based activities have on the LME and the complex linkages and feedback mechanisms existing between natural systems, productive uses, and the different institutional frameworks (involving federal, state and municipal) in addition to local communities' organizations.

Two aspects stand out in particular: TDA and the pilot projects. The first has been prepared in accordance with the specifications but ahead of schedule, which results both in financial savings and in savings in terms of the time available for its review and approval. The completion of the pilot projects shows these have delivered quality information, guidance on the design of specific mechanisms to address problems; broad participation of social groups involved and in general have helped to build awareness of the participants and parties on the fact that specific joint actions can result in significant improvements.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The sustainability of this project is moderately likely.

The sustainability of the project results depends largely on the political will of the Governments of the Parties to implement the actions arising from the SAP, to finance the actions needed to replicate pilot projects, and to promote continuity of stakeholder involvement. However, considering that the project involves only two countries, the project risks are manageable.

It is important that the basic documents are signed (TDA and SAP) to ensure the commitment of the Parties to provide the necessary long-term resources through formal written commitments and the timely management of the financing of the implementation phase of the SAP and respective NAPs.

In financial terms, the project's sustainability depends on the importance attached to the future actions (SAP and NAPs) in the 2012-2018 National Development Plan of the Government of Mexico and in the environmental and trade policy of the U.S. administration. The TE mentions that government officials of both countries expressed interest in favor of the continuity of the project and the TE notes that steps are on-going to ensure the inclusion of funding in the countries respective federal budgets.

The tourism industry, commercial fishing industry, the oil industry and agriculture are likely to present some resistance and objections, both locally and nationally, to the changes and reforms that the project could bring. However, environmental investments by different government agencies and various private companies have been increasing, so there is a support base able to facilitate the participation of relevant and concerned economic sectors.

For the project to be sustainable, governments should be actively engaged. The United States has already joined the governments of the Gulf in an association (Governors Alliance), but in Mexico this is still very much in progress.

To ensure the permanent generation of validated information, Mexico should continue supporting the network of universities to contribute to maintaining the scientific activities of the project, as has been done in the United States. This aspect is also dependent on the availability of sufficient funds in the long term, which are usually provided by federal and state budgets.

To support the sustainability of its results, the project should strengthen dissemination of information to productive sectors regarding the long-term benefits that can be derived from a jointly defined regional coordination mechanism.

Finally, the current or future mangrove restoration pilots are located in a geographic zone that makes them vulnerable to weather damage. However, according to the TE, the risks associated with this are not considered to put in danger the long-term sustainability of the outcomes

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?

The TE mentions that co-financing has been committed in two major categories: in-kind activities that promoted or complemented activities within the program plan and direct involvement in program activities.

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 only delay identified concerns part of the shrimp pilot Project. However, the pilot project was reassigned to another expert, and the SC reoriented the objectives initially set. This allowed for the successful completion of the pilot. No other delays were reported.

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:

The countries' ownership is shown by their commitment, giving significant financial resources in support of the project, including in-kind contributions. The governments also provided necessary scientific expertise to the GoM LME project from national organizations, at-sea facilities for data collection, ship time, and meeting space as required. Potential donors and private sector were involved in all stages of the SAP formulation process to ensure that the SAP is responsive to donor requirements. In addition, the SAP includes a detailed financing strategy. The strategy determines traditional and innovative mechanisms (inter-governmental, governmental, non-governmental, private and financial institutions) for financing the priority activities identified in the SAP. The project focuses on identifying these mechanisms from the outset. In particular, the role of the private sector towards long-term sustainability is explored.

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.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The M&E design at entry is Satisfactory. A monitoring and evaluation system, covering the administrative aspects of the project, was in place at entry. The M&E system included the following technical characteristics:

- SMART indicators for project implementation for monitoring that delivers reliable and valid information to management;
- SMART indicators for results, and outcomes;
- Baseline for the project, with a description of the problem to be addressed, with indicator data;
- Identification of evaluations that was undertaken, such as mid-term; and
- Organizational set-up and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

According to the TE, an adequate level of resources was made available to implement the M&E system.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Highly Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

The M&E system implementation is Highly Satisfactory. The monitoring of progress and outputs was ongoing during the project. Annual implementation reports, final reports for the pilot projects, PIRs and up to date detailed budgetary information are available.

Monitoring of project components included the progress of activities, objectives and key indicators per activity. A monitoring system, based on indicators of pressure-state-response, derived from the logical framework matrix of the project was developed in order to provide access to a quick reporting tool and more precise progress indicators.

For each of the pilot projects, specific indicators were defined to monitor and measure the health and status of the ecosystems. These indicators include information on pollutants, sediment, nutrients, mangrove coverage, maximum yields per unit of effort, among others. The PCU designed and implemented a database to analyze information quickly. As part of monitoring and evaluation activities, there has been a series of newsletters to disseminate information. These newsletters

provide information about the main activities carried out by the project, on a bi-monthly basis since 2010.

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.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The quality of implementation by UNIDO is moderately satisfactory.

The TE evaluated the administrative burden placed on HQ as regards to project management as elevated. Although very limited purchases were required for the Project (equipment), approximately 25 to 35 personnel are part of the project at any given time and contracting requirements for experts are therefore high (including short term). The TE mentions that there was a relatively high turnaround of experts as compared to other projects in the portfolio, further adding to the administrative demands.

During the project implementation, several issues posed risks to the project and according to the TE, it is only due to the dedication of project staff in Mexico and administrative staff at UNIDO HQ that these issues were resolved.

Regarding the quality and timeliness of inputs and services of UNIDO, the TE found that there had been some delay in the resolution of authorization for the purchase of equipment, and in applications for resource expansion or change of suppliers, which had resulted in increased purchase price, procurement delays and possibly a cancellation.

The TE also found that there had been some deficiencies in the official notification of changes in procedure to renew contracts, to issue new contracts and on contract duration, and although these were likely linked to the implementation of a new administrative support system at UNIDO headquarters (SAP) these risked the retention of key project personnel, making it in addition difficult to have certainty in project planning activities and fulfillment of commitments.

The TE determined that there was, from the beginning of the phasing in of the new administrative system, and until approximately the beginning of 2013, a relatively low understanding of the administrative procedures and associated constraints intrinsic to International Organizations. This likely stems from the fact that unlike in the case of other Projects where full briefings/presentations to Project Administrators and CTAs takes place at inception, this was only

partially completed for this Project. The CTA was invited to Vienna but was only given a short administrative briefing and provided with printed material.

Apart from the purely administrative challenges, it also appeared that there was weak technical support from HQ in the field, in terms of discussing and steering, and that stronger technical support is required to ensure that an adequate understanding of progress, products and outcomes of the project are obtained, thus enhancing needs assessments.

In addition, the late intervention of HQ during the period of the change of the CTA directly affected the project and led to delays and cancellation of various activities (Including a series of meetings, summer teacher training workshops, 3rd Meeting of the Alliance of Educators, GOMA All Hands Meeting, printing of an ecotourism best practices manual, etc.). This also affected communication between the parties as during this period, official information, officially provided, was not available.

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

The quality of project execution is rated as Highly Satisfactory

The SEMARNAT of México was the National Execution Agency for the project, through the Undersecretariat of Planning and Environmental Policy leadership and had the responsibility for monitoring the execution of project activities in accordance with the agreed work plans and budgets. The US NOAA supports the SEMARNAT in the execution of the project.

The regional co-ordination and collaboration was facilitated through a Regional Project Coordination Unit (PCU), located in Mexico. A Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) was recruited to facilitate the successful technical execution of project activities and was housed in the PCU.

The management by the PCU is considered satisfactory both as regards to the supervision of experts, and in delivering outputs going well beyond expectations, and this according to the TE, notwithstanding the fact that the necessary support and resources could not always be counted on in a timely manner.

According to the TE, the PCU had full recognition of the Parties and stakeholders, governmental institutions and civil society alike, academia and the local communities where projects were implemented. It obtained additional resources for the project, and managed to deliver the outputs established in the project.

8. Lessons and recommendations

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

The following lessons are described in the TE:

- Considering that existing management approaches are not consistent with an ecosystem-based approach; that the two countries have institutional frameworks for the protection of coastal and marine resources; that there is currently no mutually agreed management programmes between the two countries to manage the resources of the GoM, nor is there an effective mechanism of regional intersectoral coordination, the anthropogenic threats on the LME make it necessary to develop and implement ecosystem-based management approaches to mitigate them effectively in the long term. This said, the Project as it has been developed and as it is being implemented is considered to be, overall, an appropriate vehicle to assist the governments to reach these objectives.
- The PCU should lead the endorsement process for the SAP to a successful conclusion as rapidly as the administrative and legal mechanisms, and political realities in both countries permit. Draft NAPs should also be completed at the earliest possible.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE:

- The Parties should strive to obtain timely approval of funding by GEF to ensure implementation continuity, before government changes in both countries take place.
- The Parties should continue to support the enhanced political visibility for the project at the level of the federal and state level agencies of both governments to ensure that achieved successes are not only known and understood, but maintained and/or replicated. This will also facilitate the long term sustainability of the results.
- The Project should continue to support, as a priority, the strengthening of the role of the Interministerial Commission on Oceans and Coasts of Mexico (CIMARES) in project leadership, to allow high-level decision makers (Ministers) to actively involve other federal government agencies in the project, attract the participation of state governments and ensure their participation in adoption of SAP and NAP. This support should also be extended to ensure that the newly established network of universities is reinforced.
- To improve project implementation and facilitate administrative processes it would be desirable to consider strengthening the management capacity of the UNIDO field office, or at least to reinforce its role in support of the project, taking into account the need to strengthen the field offices capacity to assume the subsequent technical requirements in particular as relates to ocean and coastal waters.
- Based on the above, it is also suggested to consider strengthening the role of the Mexico field office in support of the project and its future iterations to facilitate and/or accelerate administrative processes and resolve any remaining of the management and contractual challenges that were identified.

9. 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 EO 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 outcomes and impacts are assessed in detail. The achievements are well described and explained.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and evidence is well described. All ratings are given and substantiated by evidence.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability of the project is assessed in detail, and the project exit strategy is described.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The recommendations given in the report are supported by the evidence. However, there is no difference made between recommendations and lessons. Some of the issues raised in the report do not lead to recommendations (e.g; UNIDO issues)	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The actual project costs are given, as well as co-financing figures. All the costs are given per activity, and co-financing is analyzed. There is also an analysis of project cost-efficiency; however, more details and justifications are needed.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system design and implementation is assessed. However, the quality of the implementation of this system could be more detailed.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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