

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form**

<b>1. PROJECT DATA</b>				
GEF Project ID: 1471		Review date:		
IA/EA Project ID: TF053077		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)		<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name: Improving Management of NGO and Privately Owned nature Reserves and High Biodiversity Islands		GEF financing:	0.814	0.814
Country: Seychelles		IA/EA own:	0	0
		Government:	0	0
		Other*:	1.08	1.06
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	1.08	1.06
Operational Program: OP 2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems; Focal Area: Biodiversity		<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	1.89	1.87
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	BirdLife Seychelles, Royal Society for Nature Conservation, Cousine Island LTD	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Jan. 26, 2004
		Closing Date	Proposed: Nov. 2006	Actual: Dec. 2007
TER Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 24	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 36	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 12
Author of TE: Bienvenu Rajaonson		TE completion date:  Oct. 21, 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO:  Nov. 20, 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 1

\* 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	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	N/A	<b>MS</b>
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	<b>Likely</b>	<b>Likely</b>	N/A	<b>ML</b>
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	<b>S</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>UA</b>
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	N/A	<b>S</b>
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>MS</b>

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

The TE report (ICM) for this project should not be considered a good practice because it does not include an assessment of the project's M&E plan. The evidence on outcomes, progress towards objectives, and impacts is poorly presented. There is some conflation of outcomes, objectives, and impacts. The report also does not provide sufficient

evidence on project outputs to substantiate outcome ratings.
2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
No such findings were noted in the TE report.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

**3.1 Project Objectives**

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

The global environmental objectives of the project were to “improve the management of high biodiversity islands as well as increase the number of managed conservation sites in Seychelles.” Thus the project would enhance “global biodiversity benefits, lead to greater sustainability of biodiversity and permit the sharing of these benefits to be directed principally at local levels.”

There were no changes to global environmental objectives during implementation.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

The project’s development objective, or goal, was to “improve management of NGO and privately owned biodiversity-rich islands by installing a collaborative program framework and infrastructure for enhanced and sustainable conservation, financing and use of biodiversity.” This was to be achieved through “a novel partnership between neighboring NGO and privately owned islands, which have shared globally important biodiversity and similar environmental issues,” and through the “creation of a common resource and management center, linked programs, institutional and capacity building and public education and advocacy.” The model partnership was expected “to catalyze further collaboration and public buy-in, to remove other barriers [remoteness, anthropogenic impacts, ownership regimes] and to mitigate negative ecosystem changes.”

The project’s expected outcomes were:

1. Capacity developed by NGOs and private sector in Seychelles for reduction of impacts on globally threatened small island biodiversity
2. Collaborative and long term conservation programs for small islands
3. Replicable regional/international model for small-island biodiversity conservation involving NGO and private sector partners

The project had two main components with several sub-components, which were poorly tied to expected outcomes:

1. Small Island Ecosystem Management
  - Establish a collaborative Management and Resource Center
  - Institutional strengthening
  - Capacity building and training
  - Improved management of terrestrial and marine habitats and important species
  - Project management and administration
2. Public Education and Advocacy
  - Develop biodiversity awareness and advocacy programs
  - Establish community outreach, partnership and stakeholder participation programs

There were no changes to global development objectives during implementation. However, one of the original project partners pulled out after signing the Letter of Agreement. No changes were made to outcomes, but the project area was reduced from three islands to two islands.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
			Project area changed.

**c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)**

Original	Exogenous	Project was	Project was	Any other

objectives not sufficiently articulated	conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	restructured because of lack of progress	(specify)
				Project partner pulled out.

#### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance	Rating: S
<p>The project is consistent with the GEF OP 2 – Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems and the Biodiversity focal area. Seychelles ratified the CBD in 1992 and meets all other eligibility requirements for GEF funding. Project outcomes are relevant to Seychelles’ obligations under the CBD. The project developed an innovative approach for enhancing the conservation of globally important biodiversity in Seychelles by creating a partnership between two NGOs and the private sector.</p> <p>Project outcomes address national priorities on conservation and sustainable use as outlined in the Seychelles National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (1997). Outcomes are consistent with the overall goal and all guiding principles of the Environment Management Plan for Seychelles (EMPS) 2000-2010 and are also relevant to the thematic areas of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Tourism and Aesthetics, Biodiversity, Forestry and Agriculture and Sustainable Financing Program. The Government of Seychelles (GoS) has encouraged NGOs and the private sector to assume more responsibility for biodiversity conservation by allowing non-government ownership of islands hosting globally important biodiversity, and also through supporting donor-funded programs that enhances conservation measures. The Chief Executive of BirdLife Seychelles, the project proposer and executing agency, was the lead local consultant for the EMPS and thus ensured harmonization between national goals and project outcomes.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<p>The ICM states that the goal of the project, to improve the management of biodiversity on Cousin and Cousine islands, has been achieved. While the project has achieved the expected outcome of enhanced NGO and private sector capacities, evidence from the ICM and GRMs indicates that it has only made progress towards achieving the other expected outcomes. The project has improved the knowledge and monitoring of biodiversity and established management plans tailored to sites and species on each island. The project has also raised public awareness and developed some community outreach programs. Nevertheless, the attempts to develop long-term conservation plans and a replicable regional/international model for biodiversity conservation have not fully met expectations (as outlined in the ProDoc).</p> <p><u>Capacity development</u></p> <p>The project has significantly enhanced the capacities of NGOs and the private sector to manage biodiversity conservation initiatives and reduce impacts. The Praslin Center for Conservation Management is now operational and serves as a focal point for biodiversity monitoring and ecosystem management in the archipelago, and also for education, advocacy and outreach on biodiversity issues on for the local population as well as for tourists. The project implemented an international professional development program to train local conservation managers and build linkages between various conservation groups. Local NGOs knowledge about endemic biodiversity has been improved through trainings and workshops. The project also worked with the Ministry of Education to integrate awareness material into the formal education curriculum. The project was also supposed to construct a headquarters for Nature Seychelles (Birdlife Seychelles) on the main island of Mahe, but there is no information in the ICM or GRMs indicating if this output was achieved.</p> <p>There is little information in the ICM on private sector participation or capacity building, but the ICM does note that “local partnership involving the active participation of the NGOs, private sector and the Government through the ministry of Environment and the ministry of Education has been set up.” Project activities promoted eco-tourism and worked with tourism industry broadly to realize economic benefits from improved conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Long-term conservation programs</u></p> <p>Based on information in the ICM the project has made progress towards collaborative long-term conservation programs for the islands. The project has contributed in part to the implementation of the EMPS, which aims to improve management of biodiversity. The project developed Island Partnership Agreements for each island, which became effective in 2006. In partnership with local fishermen, the project has established a mechanism for better regulating</p>	

fishing activities around the two islands. The ICM also notes that the “green certification of the islands is under way.” As part of the long-term management plan, the project also developed species specific conservation plans for threatened endemic species and improved the status of some critical habitats through removal of introduced or invasive species and replacement with local endemic species. There is no evidence in the ICM that the project has succeeded in establishing “new decision making structures for island conservation” or in improving the “legal conservation status for Cousine Island” as specified in the ProDoc. These outputs would have contributed to achieving the expected outcome of long-term conservation programs for the Islands.

Replicable regional/international model

There has been limited regional replication of the project. Similar collaborative programs involving NGO owned islands - private sector tourism have been established three other islands, which exceeds the target of replication on one other island. The ICM also notes that project has disseminated results nationally and internationally through an Experience Exchange Program, which may lead to replication on an international scale. The project has also made a Guide to Seychelles Wildlife, which will be very useful for tourists, for biodiversity specialists, local communities and government departments.

**c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)**

**Rating: MS**

Significant progress has been made towards achieving project outcomes and at least one outcome was fully achieved within the original cost envelope. The full grant amount was disbursed and the expected amount of co-financing was realized, however the extent of the target area was reduced due to the loss of Aride Island. Furthermore, the project was delayed by one year, due to delays in constructing the Praslin Center. Based on information in the ICM and GRMs, all other aspects of execution were efficiently managed. The ICM rates Efficiency as Satisfactory but overlooks the project’s 1-yr delay.

**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: L**

The ICM notes that both project partners are committed to sustaining and furthering project components. The executing agency has secured outside funding to support ongoing activities in the field of biodiversity conservation. The Praslin Center has been designed to be financially self-sustaining through visitor’s fees, merchandise sales, etc. The integration of biodiversity with a tourism destination package marketed by local and international tour operators means the NGOs managing the islands are likely to be sustainable.

**b. Socio political**

**Rating: L**

There were no noted socio-political risks to the sustainability of project outcomes. The project had significant local stakeholder support and participation. The project has contributed to infrastructure development (Island Conservation Centre), and capacity enhancement of NGOs and private sector entities. These outcomes are likely to be sustained.

**c. Institutional framework and governance**

**Rating: ML**

The ICM notes “the fact that the islands are privately owned and consequently privately- run reduces the risk which may affect the project achievements.” While poor management and lack of oversight may present risks to the sustainability of outcomes, the risk appears to be low given the experience of the executing NGO, Nature Seychelles. However, there is greater risk that the legal and governance framework for the Island Agreements and voluntary fishing is not sufficient to enforce regulations and sustain outcomes.

**d. Environmental**

**Rating: L**

There were no critical environmental risks to outcomes identified in the ICM. Nevertheless, natural disasters which tend to have disproportionate effects on small islands may harm species diversity and destroy infrastructure.

**4.3 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? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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?

Co-financing accounted for over half of project costs and was essential for achieving outcomes and ensuring sustainability. The actual contribution of Cousine Island (\$0.12) was as planned. RSNC (Aride Island) had committed \$0.18 M in the ProDoc, but dropped out of the project after signing the Grant Agreement. The main project partner

<p>Nature Seychelles (formerly Birdlife Seychelles) then contributed a total \$0.94 M (compared to a committed amount of \$0.78 M) to cover the loss. The total actual co-financing was \$1.06 M, slightly less than the total committed of \$1.08 M. Co-financing contributions were both in-kind (works, goods, services, and operating costs) and in cash.</p> <p>Based on the ProDoc budget, co-financing was targeted at two large construction projects, the collaborative Management and Resource Center on Praslin, and the Construction of BirdLife Seychelles headquarters on Mahe. The BirdLife Seychelles headquarters was part of the baseline scenario.</p>
<p><b>b. Delays.</b> 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?</p> <p>The project's original closing date was Dec. 2006. Following the March 2006 supervisory mission the IA agreed to a 1-year project extension. This enabled the project to complete construction of the Conservation Center at Praslin. The Center plays an important role in coordinating biodiversity conservation initiatives in the Praslin archipelago and the extension supported achievement of the expected outcome of enhanced NGO capacity. The reasons for the delay are not elaborated in the ICM or in the GRMs.</p>
<p><b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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.</p> <p>This project has not experienced noticeable country ownership at the national government level. Local ownership and local NGO involvement has been stronger. The project was proposed and executed by a local NGO, BirdLife Seychelles. The islands targeted by the project are privately owned and co-financing was contributed by NGOs rather than national agencies or ministries. According to information in the TE report, the project enjoyed the "active participation" of private sector stakeholders. Partnerships have also been developed with the MoE and the MoEd, and these ministries have adopted or used several project outputs.</p>

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

<p><b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating (six point scale): MU</b></span></p> <p>The ProDoc contained only a cursory M&amp;E plan. The plan specified only the two main components and a list of "preliminary" indicators. These indicators were largely output level indicators. The plan did not include a logical-framework clearly linking activities/outputs to expected outcomes.</p> <p>Regular monitoring and reporting duties were assigned to the project coordinator. There was no separate staff or budget for project M&amp;E. Project monitoring was to include annual independent financial audit, a mid-term review, supervisory visits, and routine reporting to the IA. The project's technical working group was supposed to prepare a more detailed set of indicators during inception.</p>
<p><b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating (six point scale): UA</b></span></p> <p>There is minimal information in the TE report (ICM) and GRMs on implementation of the project's M&amp;E plan. The GRMs (2006 &amp; 2007) rate M&amp;E implementation as Satisfactory, but they may have been referring to the biodiversity monitoring program. The 2007 GRM notes: "All monitoring tools developed by the project will serve as lessons learned for biodiversity management to other small islands." The ICM does indicate that various aspects of project monitoring (GRMs, financial and management audits, mid-term reviews, missions, etc.) were implemented according to plan. However there is no discussion of the project's log-frame, whether it was revised, or how it was used to feedback into project management.</p>

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS</b></p> <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>The Implementing Agency was the World Bank. Oversight and supervision by the WB was adequate for the project. The WB provided the appropriate technical and financial management support to help the project team achieve results. Project monitoring was conducted through annual supervisory missions, field visits, financial audits and GRMs. The WB has helped advocated for the project with the national government and helped the project develop international links. Management by the WB was responsive to the realities of project implementation. When the project fell behind on constructing the Praslin Center the WB facilitated a project extension and a budget reallocation, which helped the project achieve this critical output.</p> <p>While the choice of executing agency was appropriate, given Nature Seychelles experience with internationally funded</p>

projects, greater input and guidance during project preparation could have improved project effectiveness. The primary design issue was that the project's rather ambitious outcomes were poorly tied to its component activities and expected outputs. The project document did not include a logical framework matrix, which might have helped to identify this missing link of the logic chain. Another issues is that the project was proposed by the NGO Birdlife Seychelles (later became Nature Seychelles) without adequate input from other stakeholders. This may have reduced the potential for sustaining the islands' long-term conservation plans and Island Agreements.

**c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>1</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale) S**

*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.*

The executing agency for the project was Nature Seychelles (formerly BirdLife Seychelles). The ICM notes that execution of this project by an NGO was a first for the Seychelles and consequently this project has laid the groundwork for future NGO-executed projects in the country. Based on information in the ICM and GRMs, project activities were, on the whole, efficiently executed. The project manager was experienced with World Bank implementation and financial management procedures, which reduced the need for WB support and inputs. Project activities were viewed as an extension of the activities of Nature Seychelles, better ensuring that project outcomes will be sustained.

Based on the TE report, internal project monitoring was adequate, with close review of outputs from partners and consultants. The quality of reporting is rated satisfactory. The ICM states that “reports have reviewed performance by the project partners, monitored key indicators of progress in fulfillment of program goals and identified major key indicators of progress.” Based on information in the ICM and GRMs, the project execution was in full compliance with WB processes and procedures regarding finances and procurement.

The only problem in execution appears to have been the delay in completing construction of the Praslin Center. This entailed both a 1-yr extension and a reallocation of the budget, as the originally budgeted amount proved insufficient for realizing the Center.

**5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT**

**a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?**

Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Support to strengthen ecosystem management on small islands	Monitoring and management plans for key species/habitats	Capacity developed by NGOs and private sector in Seychelles for reduction of impacts on globally threatened small island biodiversity.	Increased number of managed conservation sites in Seychelles.
Infrastructure investment in a Resource Center and Headquarters	Strengthened legal and policy frameworks for island conservation	Collaborative and long term conservation programs for small islands.	Increase in populations of endemic species.
Institutional strengthening and capacity building activities	Collaborative management and resource Center constructed and staffed (Praslin Island) and headquarters constructed for Nature Seychelles on Mahe	Replicable regional/international model for small-island biodiversity conservation involving NGO and private sector partners	Local realization of socio-economic benefits from strengthened conservation of biodiversity.
Surveys of critical species, habitats and threats	Stakeholder participation programs and partnerships with private sector entities.		
Support to restore priority habitats			
Public education,			

<sup>1</sup> 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.

outreach, and advocacy activities			
-----------------------------------	--	--	--

**b. What are the actual (*intended or unintended*) impacts of the project?**

Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts and to *impact drivers* (Impact drivers are the *significant factors* that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

There is evidence that project activities have already had some positive environmental impacts. Populations of 7 endemic and threatened species have increased due to project efforts in rehabilitating and restoring critical habitats. Regulation of fishing activity in the waters surrounding the two islands (Cousin and Cousine) has likely reduced stresses on offshore marine ecosystems. The number of conservation sites on the two islands under effective management has increased and the rehabilitation of some habitats has improved local environmental status.

The capacity of the NGO partners has been significantly enhanced and the infrastructure for conservation management has been improved with project resources and support. These outcomes will support the realization of future impacts stemming from more effective, and better coordinated, management and conservation of biodiversity on the islands. The project has also contributed much towards increasing local awareness and understanding of biodiversity concerns.

There is also evidence of impacts from the direct linkages developed by the project between biodiversity conservation and tourism. The NGO-private sector partnerships set up through the project have already boosted eco-tourism in area, and led to job creation. The project has also contributed to a regional partnership involving three other privately-owned islands Darros, Bird and Denis where the NGO-private sector collaborative model has been successfully replicated.

Impact drivers: Based on information in the ICM, stakeholder support and participation was an important driver influencing project outcomes. The project's successful achievement of outcomes depended on active participation by the private sector and the willingness of conservation NGOs to engage with private sector groups. The numbers of visitors to the islands is being maintained at 10,000/yr. While this is considered to be within the islands' carrying capacity for tourism, it is still quite high, and there may be negative environmental impacts which offset the project's environmental benefits.

**c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?**

Financial and socio-economic risks to the sustainability of impacts are low given that the executing agency, Nature Seychelles, has secured ongoing funding to support its activities and has cultivated strong stakeholder support. There is a greater risk that fishing regulations and Island Agreements may not provide a strong regulatory framework to ensure sustainable use of resources and reduce threats to endemic marine species. There were no critical environmental risks identified in the TE report that would affect the sustainability of project impacts.

**d. Evidence of Impact**

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> <sup>2</sup> at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?	X		
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope <sup>3</sup> of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
The ICM reports an increase in the populations of at least 7 monitored species. Also, the annual number of tourists has been maintained at the ceiling of 10,000/yr.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic</u> level?		X	
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
No systemic reduction was reported, but the management model has been replicated at three other sites, so there may be a broader reduction in stresses.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)	X		
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the			

<sup>2</sup> Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

<sup>3</sup> Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
The ICM reports that several habitats were restored and rehabilitated.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?		X	
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?	X		
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
The ICM reports local job creation (outside the tourism industry) as a result of the project.			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?			
The ICM did not provide evidence of negative impacts.			
<b>e. Monitoring of impacts</b>			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?	X		
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?	X		

## 6. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<b>a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The most important lesson learnt is that civil society organizations can successfully implement GEF MSP projects. This principle may not only be applied to medium size projects but could also be extended to full size project ones.</li> <li>Partnership between Civil Society and Government is efficient if the project is included within priorities of the State and contributes to the execution of a National Environmental Plan. Specifically, certain legal barriers can more easily be removed and activities related to education, public awareness and tourism package promotion can also be facilitated in order to obtain effective results and impacts.</li> <li>Time elapsing between project inception and physical implementation should be as short as possible to ensure that budgets and real costs stay the same. External consultants, reviewing project documents on behalf of the GEF Secretariat or GEF Council must be familiar with project areas, recipient countries and organizations, as well as GEF and World Bank rules and regulations.</li> <li>The limitation of the tourist number visiting a site of delicate biodiversity can change mass tourism into luxury tourism, which not only preserves the sensible biodiversity in the site but also generates significant revenues. This lesson should be applied for privately owned sites as well as for government-managed sites.</li> </ol>	
<b>b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grant recipient must employ a project coordinator/manager that is familiar with World Bank procurement and disbursement regulations and/or requires related training and follow up and guidance from WB Procurement Specialist.</li> <li>The elaboration of a good practice manual for scientific and technical monitoring system focused on species targeted by the project has been found very useful. The publication of such a manual would facilitate</li> </ol>	



experience exchange and replicability of project results to other similar ecosystems.

3. Project design phase should include modalities that ensure proper selection of project partners to prevent from pull out at project implementation, through for instance stakeholder meetings and focus groups. Designing a project which includes a group of more than two islands having more or less the same problematic is feasible and likely cost effective.

**7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**7.1 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.**

No other sources were available.

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.

<b>7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b></p> <p>The report assesses progress towards objectives, measures progress with respect to outcome indicators, and includes a brief discussion of impacts. There is some conflation of objectives, outcomes, indicators, and impacts. The assessment of outcomes is based on a poor set of indicators, rather than evaluation of actual outputs/outcomes against expected outputs/outcomes.</p>	MS
<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>The ICM ratings are consistent with the IA ratings on the final GRM. The ICM does not provide sufficient evidence on project outputs to substantiate the overall outcome rating.</p>	MU
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b></p> <p>The report contains a brief assessment of sustainability, but no mention of an exit strategy or next steps.</p>	MS
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b></p> <p>The lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented in the ICM and are fairly comprehensive.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b></p> <p>The ICM includes actual costs and co-financing in total and by type of cost, rather than by activity.</p>	MS
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b></p> <p>The ICM does not contain an assessment of the project's M&amp;E system</p>	U

**8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.**

No other sources were consulted.