

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	9/20/06
GEF Project ID:	1444		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		<b>GEF financing:</b>	1	No information
Project Name:	Development and implementation of the lake Peipsi/Chudskoe Basin Management plan	IA/EA own:		No information
Country:	Regional: Russia, Estonia	Government:	Estonia: 0.821 Russia: 0.114	No information
		Other*:	EU TACIS : 1.82 EU Mantra program: 0.44 EU LIFE: 0.30 Netherlands: 0.05 US Baltic NGO Fund: 0.03 Denmark Infrastructure-Pskov: 0.20	No information
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	3.775	No information
Operational Program:	9	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	4.775	No information
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Peipsi Center for transboundary Cooperation	Work Program date		
		CEO Endorsement		01/09/2002
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		12/09/2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: 01/01/2006	Actual: 01/01/2006
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 36 months**	Difference between original and actual closing: 0 months
Author of TE: Lisa Supeno		TE completion date: April 2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: 06/08/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 2 months

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

\*\* TE indicates 1<sup>st</sup> disbursement on 01/03 and duration was 36 months

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO 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). GEF EO 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. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes		Satisfactory	N/A	MU
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	No rating	N/A	UA
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation		MS	N/A	U
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	U

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No. Please refer to the section on the quality of the TE.

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

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

To develop and start implementation of the Lake Peipsi/Chudskoe Basin Management Program that included the practical recommendations for the Lake Peipsi/Chudskoe nutrient load reduction and prevention as well as the sustainable conservation of habitats and eco-systems in the cross-border region. No changes during implementation.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the project document:

- “Development of the Lake Peipsi/Chudskoe Basin Management Program (further Management Program) in accord to the Estonian Water Act, European Water Framework Directive, and Russian Water Code.
- Establishing an institutional “ecosystem” of organizations, the “Lake Peipsi/Chudskoe region multi-stakeholder community”, that should incorporate agencies and stakeholder groups in the region on different levels of governance across the border to promote discussion of water management issues in both “top-down” and “down-up” directions and to ensure involvement of public in preparation and implementation of the Management Plan.
- Supporting activities to implementation of the Management Program.”

These objectives were clarified and changed during implementation to:

- Implementing a management program for the lake
- Strengthening capacity to implement project activities
- Strengthening networking and information exchange
- Implementing two demonstration projects

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

Most of the expected outcomes did not materialize because the outputs were either not completed or not implemented during the project.

Implementing a management program for the lake: The objective included five activities with such deliverables as (i) the draft Lake Basin Management Program and Action Plan, (ii) Monitoring Programme, (iii) Transboundary Diagnosis Analysis (TDA), (iv) Nutrient Reduction Plan, (v) Public Participation Plan for the Basin Management Program.

(i)	the draft Lake Basin Management Program and Action Plan: The draft of LBMP was completed only in the 4th Quarter of 2005 that left no time for its partial implementation. The TE indicates that nevertheless, some project activities greatly contributed to the agreed actions under the Program (for example, joint monitoring etc.), but no further details were provided to substantiate this.
(ii)	The official approval of both the Lake Basin Management Program (LBMP) and Monitoring Program and as well as their partial implementation did not occur during the project life span.
(iii)	The TDA was prepared by Akvaplan- NIVA A/S in cooperation with other institutions from Estonia and Russia in February 2005. Since the satellite projects were still on-going it brought certain limitations to apply to full extent the final data, findings and recommendations drawn by those projects and relevant to the UNDP/GEF project. Whilst preparing the TDA there was still an uncertainty related to the pollution sources and loads from the Russian part of the Lake Peipsi due to the delay with the EU Tacis project implementation. The developed LBMP contains a solid scientific background but is less stronger in its structure in terms of detailed definition of roles and responsibilities, communications and coordination mechanism definitions.
(iv)	The Nutrient Reduction Plan started as scheduled but also experienced the delay due to the extension of the two satellite projects, i.e. the EC Life Environment Viru-Peipsi CAMP project (Estonia) until September 2005 and the EU Tacis CBC Baltic Line 2000 project "Environmental Management of Lake Chudskoe" until the end of 2005. Even though the UNDP/GEF project expected significant inputs from those two satellite projects for the TDA, Monitoring Programme and the LBMP, the delays had a serious impact on the timeliness and quality of this component.
(v)	Two feasibility studies (on eco-farming and eco-tourism) were completed in 2005 on both sides of the lake in order to evaluate potential development in this field and possible negative effects on water quality. Under the eco-tourism study, some cities, towns, and areas were assessed and prioritized for potential eco-tourism development based on the local surveys.
<p><u>Two Demonstration Projects:</u> The TE indicates that the pilot eco-tourism projects were fully completed by December 2005. The TE also indicates that the plan for water supply and waste water treatment systems for Rapina rural municipality was also completed earlier than expected since local stakeholders wanted to comply with eligibility requirements for the coming EU investments.</p>	

#### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1 Outcomes

<b>A Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain</b></li> </ul>	
<p>The expected outcomes were consistent with the focal area and operational program strategies. Furthermore, according to the project document, the Estonian and Russian governments have signed a bilateral intergovernmental agreement on the use and protection of their transboundary waters in 1997. According to the agreement, the Estonian-Russian Transboundary Water Commission (further the Joint Commission) was established.</p>	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>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)?</b></li> </ul>	
<p>The project effectiveness was limited also by the fact that many objectives were only partially achieved and did not get to the point of becoming outcomes.</p>	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost –</b></li> </ul>	

<b>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 and did that affect cost-effectiveness?</b>
The efficiency of the project is limited because it did not fully achieve most objectives.

<b>Impacts</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?</b> None described in the TE.</li> </ul>

**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.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>1. Production of a public good</b>
<b>2. Demonstration</b>
<b>3. Replication.</b> The TE claims that the project directly and indirectly resulted in new projects, and strengthened contacts among NGOS, local authorities, and stakeholder groups because many large-scale projects were initiated in the Lake Peipsi region through using outcomes of the project capacity building and strengthening (such as trainings, joint seminars, roundtables etc. for discussing the needs and possible tools for implementation), e.g. INTERREG IIIB BIRD project with a budget of 4,0 M €, INTERREG IIIB TRABANT project with budget of 1,2 M €, BEN, PHARE CBC Waterway, PHARE CBC Community Philanthropy to highlight some spin-off activities.
<b>4. Scaling up</b>

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

<b>A. In retrospection, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
The TE indicates that the draft of Monitoring Program was developed in the 3rd Quarter of 2004. There were three joint expeditions carried out in 2003 and 2004. Furthermore, previous joint monitoring results were used for data analysis. The Draft Monitoring Program was sent to the officials for comments and feedback in order to improve the quality of monitoring. Nevertheless, the official approval of both the LBMP and Monitoring Program as well as their partial implementation did not occur during the project life span because the agreement between stakeholders was still pending due to the need to harmonize national monitoring systems and requirements.	

<b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
The TE indicates that the M&E system did not become a real project management tool to its full extent. According to the TE, the Steering Committee coordinated the adaptive management during the project implementation and it was somewhat effective. No project specific monitoring plans were available. According to the TE, the results of the mid-term evaluation looked very optimistic and general.	
<b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>No discussion on M&amp;E</b>	
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice? No</b>	

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<b>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?</b>
None. Please refer to section D under quality of TE

**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 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.

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
Not applicable.

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The assessment was poor.	U
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> No, often statements are given without proper substantiation, this is particularly evident in the outcomes discussion. In addition, ratings are provided without discussion, such as for example the ratings on M&E systems and the ratings on outcomes when the evidence presented in the TE points to most objectives partially achieved or incomplete and still the rating is satisfactory.	U
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The evaluation did not provide an assessment of the risks to sustainability or an assessment of sustainability even though it was required in the TOR of the TE (see annex 1 of the TE). The report only indicates that it is early to assess sustainability without further analysis.	HU
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Many lessons were actual findings, others were trivial or poorly written, and some could be misinterpreted, such as, for example: "By keeping	HU

political issues separately from the global environmental issues there is less risk as part of the project and tasks can better reach completion.”	
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? No information</b>	HU
<b>D. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems? Yes</b>	MS

**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.

<b>Yes:</b>	<b>No: X</b>
-------------	--------------

Explain: Most objectives were not completed as of project ending and their effective achievement remains to be seen.

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

Project brief, TE,