

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		195	
GEF Agency project ID		531	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Biodiversity Conservation and Management in the Coastal Zone of the Dominican Republic	
Country/Countries		Dominican Republic	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		ONAPLAN (DR National Office of Planning); CEBSE, Grupo Jaragua, and other NGOs.	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary Executing Agencies	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		February 1994	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 1997	
Actual date of project completion		Project completion date is N/A. Project closure date is November 2001 (Trustee dataset)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.0	2.96
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi-/bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.0	2.96
Total Co-financing		0	0
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.0	2.96
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		August 1998	
TE submission date			
Author of TE			
TER completion date		June 2014	
TER prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the GEOs of the project were to preserve Dominican coastal biodiversity and ecosystems by facilitating their sustainable management and use. The Dominican coastal zone provides critical winter habitat for hundreds of migratory species and harbors several threatened species, including whales, sea turtles, crocodiles, manatees, black coral, and numerous bird, reptile, invertebrates and vascular plant species (PD, pg 3). These resources face a number of threats, principally stemming from intense competition for coastal zone resources, changing land use, demographic pressures, poorly planned tourism development, and a lack of communication between scientific research and land-use planning (PD, pg 4).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objectives, as stated in the PD, are to preserve the Dominican coastal biodiversity and ecosystems by facilitating their non-destructive economic use. This will be achieved by the development of a multi-sectoral model of integrated coastal zone management with participation of all stakeholders. The model will be developed for three pilot areas – Jaragua, Samana, and Los Haitises– with the intention of adapting it subsequently to the rest of Dominican coastal zones pending evaluation of the results (PD, pg 21).

To achieve the long-term goal of the project, the project has the following five immediate objectives and associated outputs:

1. *Strengthen the capacity of governmental, non-governmental, university, and private sector organizations to manage the coastal zone by providing structure and improving human and technical capabilities for conserving biodiversity while pursuing economic development.* Outputs under this objective are:
 - a. Improved operating procedures in environmental organizations with strategic plans in operation
 - b. Enhance technical capacity of participating institutions
 - c. Increased expertise of specialists in participating institutions and increased numbers of environmentally trained personnel

- d. Establishment of permanent bases of operation in the coastal zone for appropriate institutions
 - e. Creation of private sector partnership to promote independent financing of training, public education, and environmentally sensitive economic ventures
2. *Establish a research program in-country to support coastal zone management, sustainable resource development, biodiversity conservation, and continuous long-term environmental monitoring* – this objective includes establishment of a GIS system to be shared among university, NGOs, government agencies, and local communities to serve as a basis for conservation planning and management decisions.
 3. *Establish a coastal zone management policy for the Dominican Republic, initially establishing regional management plans in selected areas as model projects for extension of regional planning to the remainder of the coastal zone.* Outputs under this objective are:
 - a. Establishment of regional management plans with significant community input in the Jaragua Region and in the proposed Biosphere Reserve in the Samana Bay Region
 - b. Establishment of a coastal zone management policy.
 4. *In collaboration with community organizations, establish appropriate mechanisms of improving public awareness of biodiversity, its relationship to human welfare, and its significance as a basis for sustained economic activity*
 5. *Develop and implement effective mechanisms for the participation of local communities in conservation, planning, and action*

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

Yes. While there were no changes to the Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives noted in the TE, the scope of activities appears to have been downscaled. Project management appears to have structured and planned work around those objectives that were seen by the management team as feasible, dropping those objectives (notably development and implementation of coastal management plans) that were seen as not feasible. There is no mention in the TE as to what UNDP's role in shaping and supervising project implementation was, and whether UNDP approved changes in project activities.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project is relevant to both the Dominican Republic and the GEF. For the Dominican Republic, alignment is seen between the project’s long-term goal of sustainable management of coastal resources and the Government of the Dominican Republic’s 1992-1996 Country Program that seeks to ensure that development and land-use occur in a sustainable manner (PD, pg 6). In addition, the country has established a system of protected areas covering nearly 12% of the national territory. However, this system of protected areas lacks a comprehensive assessment of biodiversity and a comprehensive management policy – two issues which this project seeks to address. For the GEF, the project is consistent with Operational Program 2, which seeks to conserve globally-significant biodiversity in Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems. As stated above, the Dominican coastal zone targeted by this project provides critical winter habitat for hundreds of migratory species and harbors several threatened species, including whales, sea turtles, crocodiles, manatees, black coral, and numerous bird, reptile, invertebrates and vascular plant species (PD, pg 3). These resources face a number of threats, principally stemming from intense competition for coastal zone resources, changing land use, demographic pressures, poorly planned tourism development, and a lack of communication between scientific research and land-use planning (PD, pg 4).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	-------------------------------

While the project was able to make some progress in developing technical capabilities of partners, undertaking biological monitoring, and in implementing a public awareness-raising campaign, it failed at developing and establishing a coastal zone management policy in piloted regions and the larger Dominican Republic that would have potentially led to real changes on the ground. Project objectives to develop and implement policy were not feasible given that the project was implemented largely without the participation of governmental institutions, and project executing agents had no authority to develop and implement coastal management plans in either the piloted sites or for the DR itself. As stated in the TE, the project’s theory of change rests on the assumption that effective resource management is science driven. However, as the project experience has shown, “the governance process itself is both the major problem and the major opportunity and the ‘science-driven management’ hypothesis has been revised or rejected” (TE, pg 9).

Progress is detailed further along each of the five immediate objectives:

1. *Strengthen the capacity of governmental, non-governmental, university, and private sector organizations to manage the coastal zone by providing structure and improving human and technical capabilities for conserving biodiversity while pursuing economic development.* Under this objective, stakeholders participating in the project (not clear from TE what organizations comprise this group) have been strengthened through workshops and seminars, research activities, and a small-scale grants program. Five projects (not clear from TE what these projects

were) were carried out that were designed to promote sustainable forms of resource use, build the capacity of community-level organizations, and promote awareness of conservation issues. Activities under this objective that call for the creation of private sector partnerships to promote “green investments” did not go forward for reasons not stated in the TE (TE, pg 11).

2. *Establish a research program in-country to support coastal zone management, sustainable resource development, biodiversity conservation, and continuous long-term environmental monitoring* Establish a coastal zone management policy for the Dominican Republic, initially establishing regional management plans in selected areas as model projects for extension of regional planning to the remainder of the coastal zone. TE states that under this objective, a major program of interdisciplinary research has been carried out in all of the pilot areas (4 pilot areas – one was added during implementation). A GIS information system was set up in the National University, and is reportedly accessible “to all interested parties” (TE, pg 22). However, the goal of establishing a research program that is linked to coastal zone management was not achieved since, as of yet, there is no coastal zone management program in the DR (TE, pg 13).
3. *Establish a coastal zone management policy for the Dominican Republic, initially establishing regional management plans in selected areas as model projects for extension of regional planning to the remainder of the coastal zone.* As stated in the TE, the project failed to achieve this objective for the simple reason that “the NGOs selected to implement this GEF project do not have the authority to promulgate regional management plans let alone a national policy for the Dominican coastal zone” (TE, pg 13). TE states that sets of recommendations on a diversity of topics have been put forward at each of the four demonstration sites. TE also states that “with the exception of Los Haitises these tend to be lists of problems and proposed actions that lack strategic focus” (TE, pg 14).
4. *In collaboration with community organizations, establish appropriate mechanisms of improving public awareness of biodiversity, its relationship to human welfare, and its significance as a basis for sustained economic activity-* TE provides a short list of activities that were pursued under this objective, and include over 50 workshops and courses, training for school teachers, school education modules seen by around 800 school children, and production of pamphlets. However, there is no assessment on the effectiveness of these efforts in improving environmental awareness in targeted communities, or the degree to which these efforts have led to any changes in support for conservation and sustainable use of coastal resources.
5. *Develop and implement effective mechanisms for the participation of local communities in conservation, planning, and action.* While the activities under this objective were broadly stated and somewhat unclear, TE finds that several activities undertaken under this objective have been successful in building capacity and confidence among several user groups in each of the four demonstration sites. Projects listed include training workshops for tourism guides, production of sweets in Los Haites and fish artisanal products in Samana. As with other project activities, the lack of baselines, indicators and targets limits the ability to assess the effectiveness of these efforts.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for project efficiency and is inconsistent in its discussion of aspects of project efficiency. Nevertheless, evidence presented in the TE suggests that the project experienced moderate shortcomings with respect to implementation which impacted the ability of the project to achieve all of its stated objectives. TE states that only after project implementation had begun and a Project Coordinator had been retained, it was “discovered” that UNOPS procedures require an international solicitation process for all subcontracts exceeding \$50,000, which included all of the work to be contracted under this project (TE, pg 6). However, the intent of the PD was that subcontracts would be executed by Dominican NGOs to better strengthen local capacity and ownership (TE, pg 6). To address this issue, the project made ONAPLAN – the Dominican National Office for Planning – the executing agency, and adopted a “short list” solicitation process modeled on the World Bank’s. This led to a protracted series of negotiations over detailed work plans for each subcontractor that consumed the better part of a year. During this time, a fourth pilot area was added to the project. Execution of project activities was compressed into a two-year period (TE, pg 31 – although project’s financial closure was much later in 2001) and it does not appear that an extension was sought. Project management appears to have structured and planned work around those objectives that were seen by the management team as feasible, dropping those objectives (notably development and implementation of coastal management plans) that were seen as not feasible. There is no mention in the TE as to what UNDP’s role in shaping and supervising project implementation was, and whether UNDP approved changes in project activities. At the same time, TE states in the executive summary that the project has been administrated with “outstanding skill and efficiency” and successfully adapted to a rapidly changing institutional landscape (TE, pg 2).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to Assess
---------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for sustainability of project outcomes, nor discuss sustainability sufficiently to provide a rating in this TER.

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?

Project was designed without any co-financing, and no co-financing is reported to have materialized during implementation.

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?

TE states that after project implementation had begun and a Project Coordinator had been retained, it was "discovered" that UNOPS procedures require an international solicitation process for all subcontracts exceeding \$50,000, which included all of the work to be contracted under this project (TE, pg 6). However, the intent of the PD was that subcontracts would be executed by Dominican NGOs to better strengthen local capacity and ownership (TE, pg 6). To address this issue, the project made ONAPLAN – the Dominican National Office for Planning – the executing agency, and adopted a "short list" solicitation process modeled on the World Bank's. This led to a protracted series of negotiations over detailed work plans for each subcontractor that consumed the better part of a year. During this time, a fourth pilot area was added to the project. Execution of project activities was compressed into a two-year period (TE, pg 31 – although project's financial closure was much later in 2001) and it does not appear that an extension was sought. While it is likely that the shortened time for implementation of project activities limited to some degree the extent to which project activities were completed, the failure of the project to achieve some key objectives, notably the development and implementation of coastal management plans, is more likely due to critical weaknesses in project design rather than any delays in project implementation.

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:

Country ownership is evident in some areas, but not so much in others. TE states that the "character and ownership of the project is clearly Dominican," noting that the project was executed by a Dominican agency, ONAPLAN, and administered by a Dominican national (TE, pg 35). However, there is little evidence in the TE to suggest that the Government of the DR engaged in the project in a substantive way – certainly not to the extent needed to develop and implement coastal management plans. TE finds that the failure to incorporate the active participation of governmental institutions responsible for coastal management in the DR – both at the pilot sites and throughout the DR – is a key weakness of project design (TE, pg 9). In addition, TE notes that the project was implemented at a time of "major institutional change" regarding environmental policy in the DR, with many institutions experiencing high staff turnover (TE, pg 33). All this is to say that this project does not appear to have been a priority for the Government of DR, and to the extent to which outcomes and sustainability are dependent upon policy changes that require participation and support from Government actors, this has diminished both the extent of outcome achievements and prospects for sustainability.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately

Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

Project design had a wholly inadequate M&E system at entry. Project lacked baselines, indicators and targets. No implementation timetable was provided for project activities except to organize activities into 3 phases – each 1 year long – but having little clear connection to the activities later described in the PD. PD does not establish who is responsible for conducting M&E or how M&E should feed into adaptive management. PD simply states that the project will be subject to tripartite review by representatives of the Government, UNDP, and the multi-agency commission at least once every 12 months (TE, pg 30). Project budget does not specifically allocate any resources to M&E.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

While the design of M&E at entry was unsatisfactory (see above), there is little evidence in the TE to suggest that M&E was improved upon in any way during implementation, or that monitoring even took place as prescribed. TE states that only one of the tripartite reviews, from 1996, was available at the time of terminal evaluation (1998), at that this report “provided few insights on the accomplishments of the project. More recent reviews were not available to us” (TE, pg 10). TE does state that the project contains “many excellent examples of adaptive management,” (TE pg 35), although the degree to which this occurred, and was based on any inputs from M&E systems is unclear. All in all, evidence provided in the TE suggests that M&E implementation was unsatisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--	-------------------------------

While the TE does not assess the quality of project implementation by UNDP, critical weaknesses in the project’s design, as well as failure to design and establish an effective M&E system, imply that quality of project implementation by UNDP was unsatisfactory. Weaknesses in project design that should have been identified and addressed prior to project implementation include: (1) lack of any institutional framework that would allow for the achievement of the project’s principle objective of developing and establishing coastal management plans at pilot sites, and subsequently throughout the DR; (2) failure to identify compliance requirements of UNOPS that were in conflict with the stated aims of the PD - that is, to have the project be executed by local NGOs; (3) failure to design the project with an adequate M&E system. As stated in the TE, the project was premised on a theory of change that proved to be false. That is, that effective resource management is science driven. As the project experience has shown, “the governance process itself is both the major problem and the major opportunity and the ‘science-driven management’ hypothesis has been revised or rejected” (TE, pg 9).

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

TE does not provide a rating on quality of project execution, and the narrative presented in the TE is somewhat inconsistent regarding project execution. TE states in the executive summary that the project has been administrated with “outstanding skill and efficiency” and successfully adapted to a rapidly changing institutional landscape (TE, pg 2). These changes include changes that were occurring in the DR with respect to the governmental policy and institutions responsible for natural resource management, and many of these institutions were experiencing high staff turnover at the time of project implementation (TE, pg 33). At the same time, project management appears to have structured and planned work around those objectives that were seen by the management team as feasible, dropping those objectives (notably development and implementation of coastal management plans) that were seen as not feasible. While these changes could be seen as a form of adaptive management, there is little to suggest that the project restructured itself in a way so as to maximize the use of project funding. Many activities, such as the collection of biological monitoring data, or community-development activities, seem to have been undertaken as an end to itself, with little linkage to one another (TE, pg 30) or contribution to a long-term objective. The project failed to establish an effective M&E system, and it is not clear whether annual project reviews even took place, as only one of three expected reports was available to the terminal evaluation team, and this report “provided few insights on the accomplishments of the project” (TE, pg 10).

8. Lessons and recommendations

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

TE provides the following lessons:

- The five step “road map, as described by GESAMP, for developing effective coastal management regimes, oversimplifies complex situations in which individual project must play out. For

example, it is important to recognize that in some cases the formal approval and funding of an integrated management plan...may be neither feasible nor desirable. In the DR, for example, the disarray of government institutions at the national level with responsibilities for resource management would, in the past, have made such formalities difficult to achieve and potentially meaningless.

- Far too many resource management initiatives fail to progress into a period of effective implementation at significant scales. They tend to become caught up in repeated cycles of data gathering, analysis and planning that contribute little to forward progress. This leads to frustration and disillusionment among those involved.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE “strongly recommends” a phase 2 GEF project building upon efforts in this project. TE recommendations for a phase 2 GEF project include:

- The principle focus of a Phase 2 effort should be the four pilot sites where the priority should be to produce living models of successful participatory management in a diversity of settings.
- During a Phase 2 GEF project, it will be essential to design institutional frameworks for management at the four sites and at the national level.
- The developments of the last two years require including governmental institutions as full partners in a Phase 2 effort.
- Baselines and monitoring schemes should be adjusted so that the short-term impacts of selected human activities can be evaluated. For example, in the Samana region, it would be very useful to document the impacts of the rapid increase in trawling on both bottom communities and fisheries landings.
- We recommend that future training activities feature techniques of strategic planning and options for the design of management plans that will be effective as the basis for a future management process.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	TE does provide some assessment of achievements under each of the five short-term objectives given in the PD. However, TE provides insufficient detail on the kinds of activities undertaken, the quality of these activities, and how they may have contributed to desired project outcomes. TE provides a separate chapter on “capacity assessment” - using a manual provided by UNDP - that gives little insight into project performance and implementation experiences.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE is internally inconsistent, incomplete in several regards, and does not provide ratings (except narrative assessment of project outcomes and execution). Inconsistencies include the overall assessment of project implementation – “administered with outstanding skill and efficiency” – while noting near total lack of project monitoring and extensive delays in first year of project. Many important aspects of project implementation, such as M&E, supervision by UNDP, and execution arrangements are barely touched upon.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability of project outcomes is not assessed sufficiently. TE does mention some prospects for subsequent projects that may address similar issues and objectives, and does not that funding for protected areas management is currently wholly inadequate in the DR. However, no attempt is made to incorporate these factors into a well-considered assessment of project sustainability.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons provided in the TE focus primarily upon whether or not the evaluative tool developed by UNDP for assessing coastal management processes is relevant to the work of evaluating this project. There is nothing of value regarding the project’s experiences vis a vis attempting to develop a management plan, or improve environmental awareness, or experiences at the pilot sites. A lost opportunity.	HU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE does not provide any information on project costs.	HU
Assess the quality of the report’s evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not discuss project M&E except to note absence of required reporting, and failure of project design to include any effective M&E plan (TE notes lack of baselines, indicators and targets and that their absence limits the extent to which project achievements can be assessed).	U
Overall TE Rating		U

Overall TE rating = (0.3 * (2+2)) + (0.1 * (2+1+1+2)) = 1.2 + 0.6 = 1.8 = U

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