

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 21		Review date: 10/04/2006		
IA/EA Project ID: 1046		GEF financing: 0.748244	at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name: Community Conservation and Compatible Enterprise Development in Pohnpei.		IA/EA own:		
Country: Federal States of Micronesia		Government:		
		Other*:		
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	1.452660	
Operational Program: 2, 3		<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	2.200904	N/A
IA: UNDP		<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved: 2000-2002: The Nature Conservancy (TNC) 2003-2005: Conservation Society of Pohnpei (CSP)		Work Program date		-
		CEO Endorsement		07/21/1999
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		05/08/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: <b>05/01/2003</b>	Actual: <b>10/01/2005</b>
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: <b>3 years</b>	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: <b>5 years, 5 months</b>	Difference between original and actual closing: <b>2 years, 5 months</b>
Author of TE:	Veikila Vuki	TE completion date: <b>11/30/2005</b>	TE submission date to GEF EO: <b>06/08/2006</b>	Difference between TE completion and submission date: <b>6 months</b>

\* 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

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	<b>S</b>	-	-	<b>S</b>

2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	-	-	MU
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	-	-	-	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

**Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?**

No because of the reasons explained in section 4.6.2, however the report provides a very good assessment of the project outcomes and relevant recommendations on what should be done to improve the project's sustainability.

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

No.

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

**3.1 Project Objectives**

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

The Project document describes that “the project is expected to have substantial global benefits through protecting Pohnpei’s biodiversity, and developing model community-based conservation strategies and methods which can be transferred to other FSM states and Pacific island countries”.

The TE shows there were no changes during implementation.

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

According to the Project Document, they were:

1. Engage local governments and all communities on Pohnpei in incorporating biodiversity conservation into natural resource planning and management by providing support to the development and implementation of Community Action Plans, and disseminating innovative methodologies to other FSM states and island nations
2. Control destructive kava cultivation in upland forests with the highest biodiversity through developing a “green” lowland kava industry and other environmentally compatible enterprises designed to reduce pressures on upland forests
3. Build the capacity of community-based organizations, Community Conservation Officers, and the Conservation Society of Pohnpei to help protect targeted upland forests and marine areas of high biodiversity value
4. Build a community-based conservation monitoring and enforcement program to improve community resource management and related decision-making
5. Support the development of state and local conservation laws, policies, and financing mechanisms that promote effective, long-term, community-based conservation of the island’s globally significant biodiversity.

The TE mentions that although there were no overall changes in the development objectives, the Mid-term evaluation recommended that the project should focus on establishing the Watershed Forest Reserve (WFR) as its key strategy for conserving the ecology of Pohnpei island. The specific priority programs the project should focus on were surveillance patrols, enforcement of infringements against WFR, forest restoration, and planned improved access to the WFR.

**3.2 Outcomes and Impacts**

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

The main outcomes achieved relevant to each development objectives were:

1. The project created a very successful model of engaging community participation, which, among other roles, was an essential part of the establishment of the Pohnpei Marine

Protected Areas Network.
2. There was an overall shift of 42% of farmers from the upland to the lowland, and the clearing of forests in the upland has been significantly reduced by 90%.
3. CSP took a leading role in being involved in the Micronesian region's conservation efforts through several partnerships that enhanced its technical capabilities and brought in required funding to support watershed conservation.
4. The project contributed effectively to help develop the roles of Community Conservation Officers (CCOs) and municipal government police officers in training in awareness and monitoring; greatly increasing community participation and support.
5. The project helped in the development of the Micronesian Conservation Trust to support conservation efforts in Pohnpei and the Micronesian Region.

#### 4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

<b>4.1 Outcomes</b>	
<b>A Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: HS</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain</b></li> </ul>	
<p>According to the Project brief, the Pohnpei Island is a globally important site for biodiversity with one of the highest levels of species diversity and endemism in the entire Pacific Island realm. In addition, Micronesia's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan support the protection of Pohnpei's biodiversity. Project outcomes were consistent with OP 2 &amp; 3 strategies related to planning and integration of biodiversity, identification and monitoring, institutional strengthening, and public education/awareness.</p>	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?</b></li> </ul>	
<p>According to the TE, the re-focus of the project on the institutionalizing arrangements for the WFR areas and the promotion of lowland agro-forestry have been very successful. The awareness outreach and the "Grow Low" campaign, particularly, had positive outcomes. It also mentions that the project has been very successful in assisting the island wide forest clearing monitoring and surveillances by the municipal government police officers and the CCOs. Finally, the project was also able to help in the development of the Micronesian Conservation Trust and was actively involved in the municipal and state governments in proposing and amending legislations and supporting policies that were relevant to PAs.</p> <p>On the other hand, information provided on the TE shows that not all outputs were completed. For example the WFR survey and demarcation of the area was not completed due to opposition of some community members, and no activities were implemented to improve access to the WFR.</p>	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?</b></li> </ul>	
<p>The TE states that funding from the national, state and local governments was not as forthcoming as initially anticipated, but that co-financing funds from NGOs and private foundations gave CSP the flexibility to supplement funds to support various activities.</p> <p>The Mid-term evaluation (mid 2002) proposed a 2-year extension that resulted in the Project executing agency being transferred from TNC to a local NGO, CSP, which was not involved in the project preparation or design. The project extension focused mainly on establishing effective management of the WFR, and it was not until January 2003 that the project was fully operational again.</p>	

#### Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

According to the TE, the project was able to establish Watershed Forest Reserves in 5 Municipalities. And even though the boundary survey, marking, and signage were not completed in all of them, the project worked very closely with Municipalities and other stakeholders to gain their support and develop Management Plans for them.

Finally, it also mentions that the watershed project success had great impact in the support for the newly established 11 Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in Pohnpei, the key factor being the awareness programs for the watershed. The strong capacity building component will most probably have a positive impact on the implementation of conservation activities in Pohnpei in the future.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
The TE identifies that although there is tangible support for the project from the local communities and the municipal and state governments, there are no systems in place to ensure direct regular and long-term support for the project post UNDP-GEF funding. So far the local governments have not made a commitment in kind or cash to show that it is serious in managing the WFR areas. In addition, it also assesses that there are some risks to the financial sustainability of the lowland farming practices, mentioning specifically that the slow growth of the lowland sakau makes it a less lucrative option for farmers.	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
There has been a constant array of projects in the area since 1983 which have focused on gaining the support of local communities for conservation. This project had significant community participation in the WFR planning, WFR management plans, CCO schemes, surveying, enforcements, monitoring and surveillance, so there appears to be no risk regarding this criteria. Nevertheless, the TE identifies that the lack of ownership by the municipal government was a weakness in the project preparation that was not resolved in the continuation of the project in 2003. It also observes that the project has not considered addressing the issue of encroachment into watershed areas by other municipalities.	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
According to the TE, the state is reluctant to deputize the CCOs trained by the project until they have received training in law enforcement because of liability reasons, but there is no mention on the TE about any future plans to do this. Also, there are no plans to ensure that the enforcement programs are linked to the joint surveillance patrols and then further linked to the court systems of both municipal and state governments. On the other hand, the TE mentions that discussions are currently underway to strengthen the partnership with academic institutions which will continue to provide science-based research information to support management.	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The TE concludes that 58% of the farmers have continued farming sakau in the uplands, and that it remains to see whether they will move lowland. It also mentions that the slow growth of the lowland sakau is still a great challenge to sakau farmers.	

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

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: ML	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<p><b>1. Production of a public good</b></p> <p>According to the TE, the CSP has disseminated lessons learned through the FSM Sustainable Development Council, the Micronesians in Island Conservation Learning Network and the Locally Managed Marine Areas Network. Also, the results of the “Grow Low Sakau” campaign were publicized through the awareness Programs such as the Green Road Show, Environmental Education Program and Youth to Youth.</p>
<p><b>2. Demonstration</b></p> <p>-</p>
<p><b>3. Replication</b></p> <p>The TE mentions that the Pohnpei model of engaging community participation has been fully recognized and adopted in other states such as Kosrae, Yap and Chuuk.</p>
<p><b>4. Scaling up</b></p> <p>-</p>

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

<p><b>A. In retrospection, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Rating: MS</b></p>
<p>The revised project framework and action plan from the mid-term evaluation identified relevant indicators and an M&amp;E activities to keep track of the project's achievements. The TE describes that forest monitoring was conducted on a quarterly basis by a monitoring team consisting of municipality community members, CSP staff and municipality police officers. The TE provides no information on M&amp;E activities during the period were TNC was implementing the project (before the mid-term evaluation). And with regards to the initiatives to encourage alternative income generation activities (to shift cultivation away from the uplands), the TE mentions that there is not enough data available to determine their impact on shifting the focus from sakau farming.</p>
<p><b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Rating: S</b></p>
<p>The project monitoring and supervisions were undertaken through reports being sent by the Terrestrial Project Manager and the CSP's Director to the UNDP Supervisor, and accepted by the Tri-Partite review meetings which were well attended by different stakeholders. Most importantly, the Mid-term evaluation was instrumental in re-focusing the project to its original design.</p> <p>According to the TE, the only weakness in the M&amp;E system was that there was a lack of technical reporting to document the technical research aspects of the Project that could have guided its implementation.</p>
<p><b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Rating: S</b></p>
<p>According to the Project Brief, almost 25% of the project funds would be used for “developing an effective community-based enforcement and monitoring program island wide”. The TE provides no information of lack of funding for M&amp;E activities.</p>
<p><b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b></p> <p>Yes. The TE concludes that the project was successful in engaging different stakeholders in M&amp;E activities. For example the technical monitoring was executed jointly with the state governments Department of Land and Natural Resources and Division of Forestry, and was also enhanced through technical collaborations with Universities and Colleges.</p> <p>Also the project brief describes that there were some previous projects related to monitoring in</p>

the area supported, among others, by TNC and the Pohnpei Council for a Sustainable Future. The project was able to build on those experiences.

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

#### What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?

From the information provided in the TE, the reviewer finds the following interesting lessons:

- Enforcement programs must be linked to the court systems of both municipal and state governments because it is not effective to have an enforcement program that will not go to court to be tested.
- When implementing a Volunteer program (such as in the case of the Community Conservation Officers), it is very important to have the state or local government to officially recognize their work. Having the government support (both institutionally and economically) is a high priority to assure the long-term sustainability of their activities.
- Collaborative efforts and partnerships with research and academic institutions are a good way of securing funding to strengthen the research component of projects and can also pave the way for building capacity of project staff members.

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

#### 4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.

No additional information was available to the reviewer.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p><b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>            Yes. A detailed evaluation and comments of the achievement of outcomes is presented. The TE is less comprehensive when assessing the shortcoming of project activities that were conducted during the first half of the implementation period (when TNC was the main partner).</p>	S (5)
<p><b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b>            The TE is consistent and includes a detailed list of project outcomes in relation to each expected outcome. However, it does not provide any ratings.</p>	MS(4)
<p><b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b>            Although this issue is not assessed on its own, it is sufficiently addressed during the evaluation of project outcomes and achievements. It also includes very comprehensive recommendations to improve project’s sustainability.</p>	HS (6)
<p><b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>            The list of lessons included at the end of the TE is not very comprehensive. For example it mentions that “lessons learned in promoting community awareness</p>	MU (3)

and on developing local partnerships greatly influenced the community support..." but gives no description of the lessons themselves.	
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The breakdown of the co-financing funds and how they were specifically used were not available to the authors of the TE. The TE only presents annual expenditures and budgets for the different allocations and programs from 2003 to 2005.	<b>U (2)</b>
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> Assessment of the project's M&E system was made in a complete way.	<b>S (5)</b>

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

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

Explain: Many of the project outputs were planned to be replicated in other watersheds around Pohnpei (for example the Enipein Watershed Study, the "Grow Low" campaign, the project's model of engaging community participation, etc). So it would be valuable to see if these initiatives take ground and their environmental impacts several years down the road.

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

Project brief, PIR 2004