

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		12/01/2008
GEF Project ID:	1409		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	2209	GEF financing:	0.53	-
Project Name:	Galapagos Oil Spill : Environmental Rehabilitation and Conservation	IA/EA own:	0.035	-
Country:	Ecuador	Government:	0.2	-
		Other*:	0.235	-
		Total Cofinancing	0.47	-
Operational Program:	STRM	Total Project Cost:	1	-
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Ministry of Environment of Ecuador	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		06/14/2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 2003	Actual: 12/2007
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 24 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 78 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 54 months
Author of TE:	Hernan Torres	TE completion date: 11/2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: 04/2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 5 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 AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	-	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	-	-	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	-	-	-	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	HU	MU

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

No. The TE does not provide a complete assessment of many aspects of project implementation, such as financing and M&E. Also, the TE did not include sufficient evidence to support the assessment of outcomes.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

No GEO was specified in the ProDoc. According to it the project had the following immediate objectives:
1: Mitigate environmental damage caused to ecology of the Galapagos caused by the Jessica Oil Spill, January 16, 2001.
2: Protect the Galapagos Islands from future tanker oil spills.

No changes on the overall goal of the project.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The ProDoc describes the Development Objective as to “Contribute to the stability of human and natural environments in the Galapagos Islands”.

According to the last PIR (2006) the objective of the project was to “Strengthen local preparedness and response capacities to deal with emergencies, in order to reduce the risk of biodiversity and human life losses due to emergencies”.

The TE specifies that since this project was conceived as a short term response measure, a detailed assessment of all risks and of the institutional capacity to deal with emergency response was not carried out during the design phase. During implementation an in-depth assessment was undertaken and indicated that the capacity of a wide number of institutions needed to deal with emergencies was very low. These included health institutions, Civil Defense, Municipalities, Fire fighters, the police, and even the Galapagos National Park. Thus, emphasis was placed on a broader capacity building than originally intended but without budget modifications. This included local institutions that were trained in emergency response, emergency management, basic and advanced life support, and in specific procedures (search and rescue for land and sea, structural and wild fires, animal species rescue (it could not be executed, etc.). Institutions prepared their internal emergency response procedures, and an emergency response system was designed in each island.

During the risk identification phase, a major risk related to a faulty network of seismographs in several volcanoes of the Galapagos (that hindered its ability to register volcanic activity that could affect local biodiversity and human population, and to transfer these data to monitoring facilities in continental Ecuador) was identified.

As part of Outcome 2, the project facilitated the acquisition of replacement parts and the repair of two damaged stations and of the reception equipment in the premises of the Charles Darwin Foundation. Work was done in Crocker Hill (Santa Cruz), Bartolomé, Pta. Alfaro (Alcedo, Isabela), Pta. Morena (Isabela) and Volcán Chico (Sierra Negra-Isabela). Local institutions, particularly INGALA (the planning agency of the islands), expressed a renewed interest in searching for tools to finance the maintenance and continuous operation of the emergency response system put in place with the help of the Project. This was seen as an opportunity to complete the activities of Outcome 3 that had been slow due to lack of support from local institutions. This is a change from the strategy adopted in year 2005, when the funding of emergency response was conceived as part of the fund for invasive species that is designed under Invasive Species Project ECU/00/G31.

(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
		UNDP, which was the IA and EA, approved changes			
If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change					
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)	
As an STRM project the design phase was short. The project had to adapt and make some changes in order to achieve its objectives.					

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:	
(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?	
Although this is a STRM project, one of the components was to promote the use of alternative energy sources in the Galapagos Islands. This led to improved access to cleaner energy for the local population (for example wind farms and photovoltaic technology)	
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?	
The President of Ecuador declared the Galapagos Islands in state of emergency on 22 January 2001, and set up a security zone of 2200 square km around the stranded tanker. In addition, the Government filed criminal charges against the owner, Captain and crew of the ship and requested the Public Prosecutor to investigate liability for the damage. Cleaning of the Galapagos Islands was a national priority since they are world renowned as a storehouse of unique terrestrial and marine biological diversity and as a natural laboratory for biological evolution and speciation.	
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?	
GEF short term response measure as a mechanism was not effective to address the clean up operations- despite expedited approval procedures the resources were still too late for the clean up. But the project did achieve to decrease the risk that a future disaster like this one could have on the local biodiversity.	
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)	
NA	
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership¹	
NA.	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: S
The project overcame initial delays and difficulties and has achieved its objectives. During 2001 and 2002, the project contributed to the completion of the coast cleanup and the production of an economic evaluation of damages and an environmental impact assessment of the Jessica Oil Spill. It also developed a sensitivity map of the coasts of the archipelago and removed oil debris from the local power station. The Emergency Response Plans have been developed and are validated in four of the five inhabited islands and are to be issued as Municipal regulations. Areas that are vulnerable in terms of both biodiversity and human life losses have been identified and placed at a high priority in the Response Plans. The Institutions that form part of the response measures are trained and have access to a GIS to focus their response on these priority sites. Although the proposed emergency fund was not established, assistance was provided to secure funding for alternative energy sources that would reduce the risks of future emergencies.	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: UA
The TE does not include any assessment of project costs. It states that the cost-effectiveness of the project was "positive", even though it experienced several delays. All project components were implemented, but there is no information on how the delays affected cost-efficiency.	
d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated)	
No tradeoffs.	

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

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= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: ML
Financial sustainability for the implementation of the emergency response plans was not achieved (the emergency fund was not established). On the other hand, various finance mechanisms have been assessed by the project and all participating institutions are committed to provide all required materials and equipments if another disaster occurs.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: L
The benefits of the project are recognized by all social groups and by the political authorities of the archipelago	

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

² Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

consisting of the Provincial Governor and the mayors of communes.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
The project failed to locate an institution to act as the lead agency for the purpose of updating the emergency response plan and raise funds to upgrade equipment and materials. However, the organizations involved are willing to continue to participate according to the schedule established by the emergency response plans and will provide the equipment and materials as they have done so far.	
d. Environmental	Rating: NA
NA	
e. Technological	Rating: L
Renewable energy projects have start implementation in two of the Galapagos Islands. It is too soon to assess the sustainability of these initiatives, but they will have a direct beneficial impact by reducing the demand of oil.	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders	
No incentives have been provided.	
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors	
Galapagos National Park Officers are now in a position to better manage emergencies affecting the protected areas of the province: Galapagos National Park 761,000 hectares and Marine Reserve (144,000 square Kilometers) Both park rangers and firefighters have received advanced training in the response to wild fires, that are relatively frequent in park zones adjoining populated areas, and procedures have been developed and incorporated into the emergency response plans for two islands.	
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?	
Emergency preparedness and response plans are ready to be issued as municipal regulations in two municipalities. A detailed GIS was made with information regarding sources of risk in the populated islands and vulnerable coastal habitats. This information was used as the basis for the formulation of emergency response plans for two islands. These plans are ready to be issued as regulations by the municipalities of Santa Cruz and Isabela.	
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)	
The plan to establish a disaster fund was not fulfilled. The TE does not mention any prospects of future financing, but the adoption of the Emergency Response plans by local governments and institutions entail a commitment towards funding their implementation. For example, the Navy has incorporated emergency preparedness expenses as part of its regular budget for operations in the Galapagos Islands.	
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?	
The TE makes no mention of project champions.	

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?	
The TE does not include any information regarding co-financing. The last PIR (2006) indicates that there was an increase in co-financing from UNDP, from \$60,000 to \$130,000.	
b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?	
The closing date was moved – from December 2003 to December 2007 in three different extensions. Initially the project –designed as a short term response to the oil spill had been envisaged to take two years. However the project was approved four months after the oil spill and by then a large amount of the clean up had been accomplished. This allowed a more in depth assessment of the baseline level of preparedness for the Emergency responses and the opportunity to design a strategy for improving it. Results indicated that a much more complex intervention was required than originally designed and that capacity in a wide number of stakeholders needed strengthening. Thus the project was extended first to 2004, then to 2005, to allow the time for capacity building, training and consultation –all tasks that require long time frames. At the end of 2005 although technical activities were completed on time as per that year operational planning, additional activities were considered necessary to guarantee the sustainability of the emergency response capacity	

³ Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

installed in the islands. This included exploring strategies for the long term funding of response capacities replacement and maintenance of equipment, etc. As a result the project was extended to end 2006. New groups of Policemen and Navy officers took office in March 2006, and these needed to be trained and made aware of the existence and operation of the system.
c. 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 project was developed as a local and national initiative in response to the oil spill in the Galapagos islands. The Ministry of Environment and several local organizations (particularly ones working in emergency assistance) were very active in the implementation of this project.

4.5 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): U
<p>The ProDoc available for review did not include any information on targets and indicators.</p> <p>According to the ProDoc UNDP Ecuador in consultation with GNPS and the Project Director would establish a Project Steering Committee, represented by institutions directly involved in the response to the oil spill. The Project Director would call Project Steering Committee meetings for guidance and approval of the Project Work Plan, and any revisions of the Work Plan thereafter. It specified that “it is expected the Work Plan will evolve to best meet the project objectives, in response to emerging survey data”.</p> <p>The Director would provide a monthly update to the Ministry of Environment, and UNDP Ecuador, to be forwarded to UNDP/GEF, regarding expenditure and impact of project activities. The Ministry of Environment and the GNPS would select a Chief Technical Advisor. The CTA would receive full support for financial reporting, procurement and hiring expertise, and would be responsible for submitting monthly progress reports to the Project Director, UNDP Ecuador, the Project Steering Committee and UNDP/GEF.</p>	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): MS
<p>According to the TE, this project was able to successfully adapt to achieve project objectives. The logical framework has been used as a road map of the project rather than as a management tool. Also, there has been a permanent monitoring of project activities (workshops and training, preparation of supporting material performed by consultants, and so on), which progressed according to schedule.</p> <p>A Mid-Term Review was conducted through an independent consultant. It suggested adjustments to the project to improve performance. In addition, there have been other formal evaluations of the Project, which have enabled monitoring progress and achievement of results.</p> <p>The TE also finds that the assessment carried out at the beginning of the project provided important feedback for implementation purposes.</p>	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?	
UA.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?	
According to the TE, this project was successfully monitored and it makes no mention of lack of funding for M&E activities.	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?	
Since the project development time was short (this is a STRM project), assessments of existing capacities and further information gathered during project implementation were crucial to change the focus of the project. For example, due to the assessment findings, emphasis was placed on a broader capacity building than originally intended but without budget modifications.	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.	
The TE does not provide enough specific information on the M&E system beyond explaining that the information gathered throughout the project implementation was effectively used to adapt the project activities to the local realities.	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
<p><i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i></p> <p>According to the TE, UNDP has been an appropriate implementing agency for the project. In addition, it has maintained permanent coordination with other UNDP projects, such as the Alternative Energy Project for the San Cristobal Island and the Project on Control of Invasive Species.</p>

<p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale) S</p> <p><i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.</i></p> <p>This project was implemented under the Direct Execution of UNDP. This arrangement was advantageous since it allowed the project the needed flexibility to adapt to the changes that were experienced during implementation. UNDP kept a proper execution of the project from an administrative and financial point of view. The recruitment of staff, consultants and experts was done timely and efficiently. The budgets and procedures to administer them were consistent with the project requirements.</p>

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<p>a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects</p> <p>The TE mentions 2 lessons: -The main lesson is that when dealing with disasters that may affect biodiversity, the effect it can have on the local human population should also be considered. In this way, the benefit of a measure of protection of biodiversity will have local support needed to make it effective. - With regard to project implementation, the method DEX is one of the best alternatives when it comes to implementing a project in a situation as environmentally, socially and economically complex as that found in the Archipelago of Colon (Galapagos Islands).</p>
<p>b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation</p> <p>The TE recommends the following actions: a) publish a proceedings manual to deal with emergency, summarizing the project’s products; b) explore the possibility of developing an additional phase to strengthen what has already been achieved; and c) to identify a specific organization that will be willing to harbor a coordination unit for the Emergency Response System and the action planning instruments represented in the Emergency Response Plans.</p>

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

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 terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE includes a concise description of the achievement of the project objectives and of project implementation, but some of the project’s objectives were not treated (training for capacity building).</p>	MU
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? Information presented in the TE is less detailed than what is presented in the last PIR. Its conclusions and overall positive assessment are not adequately substantiated. It is also missing important information regarding the project budget.</p>	U
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE assessment of project sustainability includes all required criteria, but does not provide a very deep analysis.</p>	MS
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they</p>	MU

⁴ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

<p>comprehensive? Lessons included in the TE are very general. They are formulated superficially and do not provide valuable information for other projects, in Galápagos or elsewhere.</p>	
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE does not include any information on project costs.</p>	HU
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The assessment of the M&E system is not comprehensive; it is mainly limited to brief mentions of the LogFrame and mid-term review. The TE finds that the assessment carried out at the beginning of the project provided important feedback for implementation purposes. But this positive statement about the M&E system is not substantiated.</p>	MU

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

-

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)