

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2020

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1909	
GEF Agency project ID		595633	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO (lead), UNEP	
Project name		Protection of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem	
Country/Countries		Regional (Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Morocco, Senegal)	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-8	
Executing agencies involved		FAO, Abidjan Convention Secretariat	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As co-financiers	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		4/27/2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		3/29/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		3/30/2015	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.70	
	Co-financing	1.05	
GEF Project Grant		8.09	8.09
Co-financing	IA own	0.77	
	Government	4.00	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	5.89	
	Others	0.15 (NOAA)	
	NGOs/CSOs	7.00	
Total GEF funding		8.79	8.79
Total Co-financing		17.81	42.07 <sup>1</sup>
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		25.90	50.86
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2018	
Author of TE		Raquel Cabello, Christophe Breuil, Virginie Tilot (FAO Evaluation Office)	
TER completion date		5/31/2019	
TER prepared by		Cody Parker	

<sup>1</sup> From PIR 2017. May be unreliable – cf. Section 5.1. TE does not include co-finance data.

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Neeraj Negi
--	-------------

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S <sup>2</sup>		MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		MS (on a six point scale)		UA
M&E Design		NR		MS
M&E Implementation		NR		MS
Quality of Implementation		NR		MS
Quality of Execution		NR		MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report				MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project is to reverse the degradation of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem caused by overfishing, habitat modification and changes in water quality by adoption of an ecosystem-based management approach.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

To enable the countries of the Canary Current Large Marine Ecosystem to address priority transboundary concerns on declining fisheries, associated biodiversity and water quality through governance reforms, investments and management programs.

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

There were no changes to the objectives.

## 4. GEF IEO 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rating for “Achievement of Objectives” and “Achievement of outputs and activities”

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for relevance. This TER rates relevance as Satisfactory.

The project identified the narrow scope of current national- or sector-based approaches to management of the Canary Current ecosystem as a barrier to solving the overfishing, habitat degradation, and climate change issues threatening it. Therefore, the project’s strategic and policy-focused activities aimed to enhance coordination and develop an ecosystem-based and integrated approach to the ecosystem’s management.

The project was relevant to GEF priorities by directly addressing International Waters Strategic Program 1 (Restoring and sustaining coastal and marine stocks and associated biodiversity) as well as partially addressing Strategic Programs 2 and 3 through Component 3: Strengthened policies and management and demonstration actions to address declining biodiversity and water quality. The project was also relevant to national priorities as the maintenance of the respective countries’ coastal ecosystems’ integrity and productivity, as well as increasing benefits from those ecosystems, has a direct impact on poverty reduction and natural resource sustainability, goals which all involved countries had national policies addressing.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not assign a rating for effectiveness, instead rating “Achievement of Objectives” (S), “Achievement of outputs and activities” (S), “Progress towards the achievement of the 4 GEF priority areas” (MS), and “Impact” (MS). This TER rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory due to the successful delivery of the project’s main outputs despite significant challenges with coordination and unsatisfactory performance of some of the demonstrations.

The Project Document divided the project into three components: one “process component” (1) and two similarly-structured “thematic components” (2 and 3). Components 1 and 2 were executed by FAO while 3 was executed by UNEP.

Component 1 (FAO): Multi-country process and frameworks for understanding and addressing priority transboundary concerns. This component aimed to develop a finalized Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) agreed upon by the countries, a sustainable legal framework for regional cooperation on ecosystem stewardship including a Strategic Action Program (SAP), and a mechanism for stakeholder involvement in transboundary priority setting and strategic planning. The TDA and SAP are the project’s main outcomes, and as per the TE they were both achieved. The TDA, aimed at identifying priority management issues across the Canary Current ecosystem, was built on a preliminary version developed before project start. The final TDA was published in 2016 and showed significant progress in understanding of the ecosystem and the causes of its degradation. The SAP was developed and signed by each country, supported by awareness-raising activities for country officials. However, the proposed governance mechanism appended to the SAP was of limited use, only being applicable in specific project contexts, and will need to be reworked in the proposed Phase II. The SAP itself is nonbinding and the TE suggests it be considered as a memorandum of understanding for a second phase (TE, p. 33). Thus, the

project's contribution to the establishment of a sustainable legal framework for management of the ecosystem was not as strong as expected. In terms of stakeholder involvement, results were mixed: while the project did strengthen networks between scientists and experts in the region, many project stakeholders on the national and regional level including NGOs and local communities felt their involvement in the development of the TDA and SAP to be inadequate (TE, p. 22).

Component 2 (FAO): Strengthened policies and management, based on improved knowledge and demonstration actions, to address priority transboundary concerns on declining marine living resources.

This component aimed to strengthen knowledge and management capacities as well as regional policies and regulations to address concerns on living resources, and included demonstration projects on collaborative management of pelagic and benthopelagic fish and trawling selectivity. The project made significant contributions to scientific understanding of the Canary Current Ecosystem (TE, p. 22). On the other hand, stakeholders had very high expectations and were somewhat disappointed by the results; the TE attributes this to the long timeframe required to prepare scientific publications and notes the large trove of still-unprocessed data and samples generated by the project, suggesting its long-term contribution may be more significant than initially perceived. Despite the knowledge-building achievements of the research activities, however, their timing meant that results were not always ready early enough to be included in the published TDA/SAP. (TE, p. 25). While two of the four demonstration projects were executed successfully, the fishery-based demonstrations “did not yield enough tangible results” to adequately demonstrate the added value of the project's approach (TE, p. 43). Furthermore, some demonstration activities were continuations of pre-project initiatives and were therefore not specifically geared toward optimized development of the TDA/SAP as planned.

Component 3 (UNEP): Strengthened knowledge, capacity and policy base for transboundary assessment and management of habitat, biodiversity and water quality critical to fisheries. Like component 2, this component focused on research and demonstration primarily in service of development of the TDA/SAP.

A compilation and analysis of data on legislative aspects for biodiversity, water quality and environmental protection in the Canary Current ecosystem region was developed and published, and provides a “good starting point” for proposing improvements to promote the integrated management approach (TE, p. 25). The mangrove demonstration project was executed successfully and resulted in a Charter which was submitted as an Additional Protocol of the Abidjan Convention (PIR 2017, p. 6). The results of the research on mangrove decline were also directly incorporated into the TDA. However, other areas intended to be covered by research activities, such as seabed changes and wetland degradation, were ultimately not directly addressed (TE, p. 25).

Overall, the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan, the primary outputs of the project, were completed successfully, and supported valuably by some of the research completed. The project also resulted in increased communication in some cases between national ministries of environment and ministries of fisheries, which was strengthened through collaboration in Working Groups and demonstration subprojects (TE, p. 23). However, not all project activities were implemented or well-coordinated with the development of the TDA/SAP, and a definitive framework for the long-term

implementation of the SAP was not developed. Therefore, effectiveness is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE does not assign a rating to efficiency, although it rates “Cost-effectiveness” as Satisfactory. This TER rates efficiency as Moderately Unsatisfactory due to significant delays in contracting and the completion of studies, and underfunding of project activities related to stakeholder involvement in planning.

The project experienced several problems affecting its efficiency. The project was delayed by nearly 2 years, as a result of which project and personnel management costs ended up at 27% of the total budget, far higher than expected. M&E budget was also exceeded due to increased travel to improve stakeholder participation later in the project. UNEP had recently changed its internal operations management system, which led to various issues and delays including with recruiting consultants, honoring payments to service providers, etc. (TE, p. 20). Expenditure data for UNEP was not made available. At the time of the TE in December 2016, there was still a balance of \$600,000 of GEF grant remaining. Budget implementation was very low for activities under Component 1 related to future governance of the ecosystem and involvement of stakeholders in strategic planning (TE, p. 21). This may be related to the reportedly insufficient involvement in the project reported by stakeholders overall. Capacity building activities under Component 2 also received much less funding than planned (three times less). These shortcomings may account for the unspent money. Aside from those areas, budget execution was mostly as planned, although two demo projects also received much less funding than expected. The reasons for this underfunding are not explained, but it may be related to the large overexpenditure in personnel costs. Significant partner co-financing was reportedly mobilized, although the TE expresses doubt about the extent to which it was used (see section 5.1).

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: Unable to Assess
---------------------------	--------------------------

The terminal evaluation rates sustainability as Moderately Satisfactory, without providing a detailed assessment. This TER is Unable to Assess project sustainability.

Although the TE rates sustainability as Moderately Satisfactory, this seems to assume continuation through a second project phase as it is cautioned that “the capacity building process is still not complete”, and that sustainability is “not yet achieved from an institutional perspective” (TE, p. 40).

The achievements of the project will almost certainly be sustained by contributing to a Phase 2 project if it goes forward, but are likely to be lost if it does not. The project did contribute to preparations for a second phase, but as it is unknown at this time whether it will be approved or implemented, sustainability of project outcomes is rated as Unable to Assess.

## 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 terminal evaluation does not report materialized co-financing. PIR 2017 reports an estimated total of \$42 million in co-financing, more than twice the amount expected in project documents, as a result of successful partnerships with other development projects in the region after project start, including significant additional commitments from original partners such as the FAO-Norway EAF-Nansen project. This also includes a reported additional \$17 million in in-kind contributions from national governments. However, these figures may not be accurate, or may refer to commitments rather than actual expenditure. The TE asserts that apart from some contributions to scientific research activities, national governments mobilized "few resources" to support project activities and the National Coordination Units, that country co-financing has been "very difficult to implement", and that much of the partner co-financing has "not been, or only slightly, implemented", which is partially blamed on the delay between project design and project start (TE, p. 33). The underfunding of the National Coordination Units in particular hampered coordination and country ownership of project 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 project, initially planned for completion in March 2015, was extended twice: to December 2016 (on the recommendation of the midterm evaluation) and then to December 2017. The reason for the second extension is not clear. The poor performance of underfunded National Coordination Units is one of the important causes of the delay (TE, p. 31). No specific impact on project outcomes or sustainability is noted as a direct result of the delays.

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 TE rates country ownership as Moderately Satisfactory overall, mainly due to all the countries signing the Strategic Action Program and expressing a desire to continue it (TE, p. 40). However, it is also noted that country ownership of the project's ecosystem management approach remains insufficient. One reported cause was a lack of attention to the creation and coordination of various national project structures during implementation. Problems with internal communications including issues with document translation were also noted as negatively impacting national ownership, as was a failure to adequately link the TDA/SAP process to related national- or regional-level initiatives (TE, p. 43). This remains a threat to full national commitment to the project, and it is recommended that the next phase include more nationally supported, action-oriented activities. Possibly due to low country ownership,

National Coordination Units, planned to be financed through country co-financing, were underfunded, which is noted as hampering coordination and synergy with local projects as well as delaying the project.

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not rate M&E design specifically but rates M&E overall as Satisfactory. This TER rates M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory.

The project document contains a thorough M&E plan, specifying the preparation of quarterly, semiannual and annual evaluation reports and an appropriate budget. A midterm review was also scheduled for the end of Year 2. A detailed overview of the responsibilities of FAO, UNEP, the regional project coordinator, the regional steering committee and the national focal points is provided. FAO was to take the lead on M&E overall, with UNEP providing inputs for component 3. Given the project’s focus on policy strengthening and capacity building, indicators are mostly process-based (e.g. agreement signed, assessment finalized), which is sensible overall, although some measure of efficacy could have been included in some indicators to ensure that the partnerships and plans established were effective and facilitate intervention if they were not. Each demo project includes its own M&E plan. A measurable stress-reduction based indicator was included for demo 2, but the other demos also used process indicators such as the development of agreements or plans; many of these, such as “Marine Protected Areas evaluated as demersal fisheries co-management tools”, are not SMART.

Considering the general robustness of M&E design despite some insufficiently SMART indicators, this TER rates M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not rate M&E implementation specifically but rates M&E overall as Satisfactory. This TER rates M&E implementation as Satisfactory.

The TE states that the M&E system was “satisfactorily implemented”. On the other hand, it assessed the indicators used as ineffective, noting that using more detailed indicators, especially with regard to the monitoring of National Inter-ministerial Committees and partnerships, would have allowed more accurate assessment of progress and facilitated adaptive management (TE, p. 23). For example, one key indicator was “Functional National Inter-ministerial Committees”; this could be considered achieved as

the NICs were set up and therefore “functional”, but they were reportedly established late in the project and were ineffective (TE, p. 29). It is also suggested that M&E focused too heavily on project managers, meaning other stakeholders were insufficiently involved, and that partly as a result of this, the unhappiness of some stakeholders in their level of input to the project was not perceived until the terminal evaluation. However, it does appear that the implementing agencies acted to improve in this regard, with the M&E budget nearly doubling as the number of country visits to consult with stakeholders increased (TE, p. 18). In addition, all planned reports appear to have been completed and Project Implementation Reports are adequate. M&E implementation is therefore rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

The TE does not assign a rating to quality of project implementation. This TER rates project implementation as Moderately Satisfactory, considering the overall strong support provided by the agencies despite some operational difficulties that negatively impacted implementation.

The project’s lead implementing agency was FAO, with UNEP as the implementer for Component 3. Collaboration between the two agencies was reportedly strong, which especially aided in the preparation of Steering Committee meetings and keeping the project activities integrated and relevant to the development of the TDA/SAP. Both FAO and UNEP provided significant support to the Regional Coordination Unit in the implementation of project activities, though it is noted that this support could have been more continuous and relevant to more areas of expertise. The FAO also managed to create synergies with related initiatives through collaboration between the FAO Fisheries Department and other FAO departments, although the TE suggests that a “better” use of the project’s Task Force mechanism could have deepened these synergies (no specific recommendation is provided.) On the other hand, high turnover of UNEP lead experts hindered the launch and continuity of some project activities. In addition, a change in UNEP’s internal financial system led to delays in the implementation of activities under Component 3 (TE, p. 29).

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

The TE does not assign a rating to quality of project execution. This TER rates execution as Moderately Satisfactory.

The Sub-regional Fisheries Commission, based in Dakar, was identified in the project document as the “main counterpart agency” of the project which would host the Regional Coordination Unit. In fact, this did not happen and the Regional Coordination Unit was established in space provided by the Senegalese government; the TE identifies the Sub-regional Fisheries Commission as a partner, with FAO as the executing agency (TE, 18). The Abidjan Convention Secretariat was responsible for execution of the UNEP component, but is not specifically assessed beyond noting that its involvement in the Steering Committee and collaboration with FAO was considered satisfactory by partners, and that it was effective in integrating project outputs into the TDA/SAP (TE, p. 29).

Assessment of project execution in the TE centers around the Regional Coordination Unit, which was composed of a Regional Coordinator (recruited by FAO) and Thematic Officers for components 2 and 3 (recruited by FAO and UNEP respectively). There were issues with recruitment and turnover of project staff, which contributed to delays, but this largely blamed on budget limitations on staff hiring imposed by GEF (TE, p. 30). There was also a lack of coordination between Regional Coordination Unit staff, particularly towards the end of the project, exacerbated by physical distance and a lack of regularly scheduled meetings, although they could have been conducted by teleconference. The TE also identifies “inadequacies [in] the project’s internal communication system”, including problems with translations of documents, as hindering national ownership of the project (TE, p. 43). Overall, coordination across the various project stakeholders – especially between the Regional and National Coordination Units and national decisionmakers – was insufficient. Nonetheless, the staff of the RCU are praised for their commitment and largely credited with the successful achievement of the project’s main outcomes (TE, p. 30). Therefore, quality of project execution is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

***Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project has not yet made a significant impact on environmental status, as it was focused more on policy change and scientific knowledge generation with only small-scale demonstration subprojects. The project’s main environmental contribution has been research in the development of

the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, which produced some valuable data and publications especially regarding mangroves, water quality, and stocks of various marine life, including the discovery of a new species of marine mammal (TE, p. 27).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE reports that as a part of the project, socioeconomic themes were “analyzed and addressed”, which has “broadened the scope of the experts' vision and provided a better understanding of the interactions between the various sectors in support of the integrated and sustainable management of fisheries resources” (p. 27). However, no direct impacts of this are specifically noted.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

#### a) Capacities

The project reportedly significantly increased scientific knowledge and capitalized on existing biodiversity, habitat and water quality knowledge through the Working Groups developed. The project also strengthened the capacity of researchers and research institutions from the region to undertake marine scientific campaigns, as research missions doubled as training missions for local scientists. Researchers and other stakeholders from the region also received training and attended workshops and in some cases study programs abroad. In some cases, the trainings were not effective, e.g. because they were incorrectly targeted or insufficient, but some, such as workshops in GIS and cartographic data sharing, were greatly appreciated (TE, p. 26).

#### b) Governance

The Strategic Action Plan is nonbinding and therefore forms more of a roadmap than a direct impact on governance at this stage. The TE predicts that some of the demo projects will “gradually influence” national and/or sub-regional policies, particularly on marine protected areas and mangroves (TE, p. 23). Indeed, a provision regarding mangroves was added to the Abidjan Convention, in addition to several other Regional Action Plans on habitats and water and sediment quality, as a result of project activities (TE, p. 35). More concrete governance changes would be expected with the future implementation of the SAP.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are noted.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

All countries have signed on to the Strategic Action Program and want to move forward with a second project phase addressing implementation of the SAP. Significant adoption of the project's achievements will rely on the proposed second phase.

## **9. Lessons and recommendations**

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

The "Working Groups" mechanism used by the project, in which several working groups composed of national experts were formed around various themes, contributed to the project not only through information gathering and reports, but also facilitated exchanges between experts and helped bridge divides between ministries of environment and ministries of fisheries. This structure was reportedly highly effective and efficient, and is recommended to be continued in the second phase.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

- To continue the ecosystem-based management approach of the Canary Current LME, prepare the second phase of the project, while clarifying its identity in relation to other national and regional initiatives that could support the implementation of the SAP.
- To contribute to scientific knowledge and to facilitate mobilization of partnerships for the second phase, use the remaining funds from the project for additional (unspecified) activities.
- To capitalize on the investments made by the project in data and sample collection, the second phase should finalize data processing, analysis and valorization.
- To build national capacities, in its second phase the project should contribute more to training of different national and regional stakeholders.
- To improve the effectiveness of project management mechanisms, it is recommended to increase the resources allocated to management, to review certain GEF procedures in order to

facilitate the recruitment of sufficient staff and appropriate status of technical project staff, and to strengthen backstopping services.

- To meet all the conditions necessary for the implementation of the SAP, during the second phase of the project promote a partnership strategy and appropriate means to broaden and revitalize collaboration with the partners involved on topics addressed by the SAP, with a view to developing synergies and complementarities.
- To promote greater ownership among policy makers and to strengthen the CCLME's regional cooperation dynamic for ecosystem management, it is recommended that the second phase of the project include more action-oriented activities.
- Considering that CCLME countries will have to play a decisive role in the implementation of the SAP, examine ways and means to increase the effectiveness of national project structures, including inter-ministerial committees (NICs).

## 10. 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 IEO 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 report assesses achievement of objectives thoroughly.	<b>S</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is sometimes inconsistent, for example, pointing to the large amount of co-financing mobilized in one section while stating that little co-financing materialized in another. Some ratings are lacking adequate substantiation.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report touches on sustainability only briefly.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are thorough and supported by the rest of the report.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No actual project costs or co-financing are reported, although a brief discussion on co-financing is provided.	<b>U</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The project discusses M&E systems but more detail would have been appreciated.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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

*No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.*