

### GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
				Review date:	11/2/05
GEF ID:	223		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)	
Project Name:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago	GEF financing:	\$4.970	\$3.23 (as of June 2003)	
Country:	Yemen	Co-financing:	\$8.013	\$8.23	
Operational Program:	2	Total Project Cost:	\$12.983	\$11.46	
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	Government of the Republic of Yemen and UNOPS	Work Program date		October 1996	
		CEO Endorsement			
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		May 1997	
		Closing Date	Proposed: May 2002	Actual: May 2003	
Prepared by: Josh Brann	Reviewed by: A. Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 5 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 6 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 year	
Author of TE:	Mark Infield; Ibrahim Sharaf Al Deen	TE completion date: August 2003	TE submission date to GEF OME: 6/21/05	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 22 months	

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME 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). GEFME 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. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	N/A		U/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	HS		S
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	MS		MS
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS		S
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A		MS (4.2)

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No. Why? There are a number of issues that are not discussed in a comprehensive manner. See ratings of TE at end.

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

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

Not specifically identified outside of Global Development Objective below.

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

The biodiversity of the Socotra archipelago conserved through community-based resource management and implantation of a zoning plan which will integrate biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives in a holistic manner.

Immediate objective: A zoning system based on community resource management, integrating biodiversity conservation, environmental management and development objectives, implemented.

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

- Socotran and national awareness of environmental and conservation issues raised.
- Human and institutional resources for biodiversity conservation and management strengthened.
- Zoning plan for Socotra developed.
- Selected initiatives to reduce pressure on natural resources developed.
- Project implementation capacity developed.
- Zoning plan implemented.
- Socotra Conservation Fund established.
- Socotra Conservation and Development Program Coordination Unit established.

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

#### 4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Rating: S

##### A Relevance

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The project outcomes are very much in line with focal area and operational program strategies. The project focused on both protected areas as well as the broader landscape through its development of a zoning plan for the archipelago. The main question is the long-term sustainability of project outcomes, but this is addressed later under sustainability.

##### B Effectiveness

- **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)?**

According to the TE, "The evaluation team found that the large majority of activities referred to in project documents had been implemented, most to a high degree of completion and with a high level of technical competence. The evaluation team also noted that many activities were undertaken in response to recommendations made in the mid-term evaluation report." The TE does not go into a lot more detail than this, pointing out that the project progress reports provide further detailed information. Overall the TE gives a rating of highly satisfactory to the "Implementation of activities."

##### C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

- **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**

<b>projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems?</b>
<p>The TE does not provide very much information in this area, and in fact states that “The evaluation team is not able to comment on the cost effectiveness of the ... projects.” According to the TE this is because the evaluation did not permit a sufficiently detailed examination of budget structures, cost of individual activities, or analysis of expenditure in relation to budgets. Given this lack of information it is difficult to say much beyond this, other than the fact that the project appears to have been conducted along the lines of internationally accepted standards for project costs, and in line with what was planned at the beginning of the project. The average rate of disbursement (\$/year) is within the range of the GEF average for biodiversity projects. There were some administrative difficulties with the management of the project, which according to the TE, “Several project partners suggested that [the administrative complications] led to an unnecessary and cost-inefficient ‘second tier’ of project management. They felt this resulted in a weakening in the original project format that focused strongly on Socotra itself and was considered to be an important strength of [phase 1].” The TE rates “Management, cooperation and operational issues” as “satisfactory” which is optimistic given the difficulties described by the TE. Ultimately these difficulties may not have had a large impact on the achievement of project objectives, but the “satisfactory” rating of this aspect of the project is not justified based on the information presented in the TE.</p>

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

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: 2</b>
<p>“Further investment is required to achieve long-term sustainability without which many of the achievements will be lost. As such the situation is not dissimilar to that three years ago when the mid-term evaluation was carried out. If investment stops, not only will many of the achievements made to date erode, but unique biodiversity, the primary interest of the project and a central concern of GEF, may well be lost in the future.”</p> <p>“The economic future of Socotra provides the strongest mechanism to ensure future flows of benefits for conservation. The generation of revenue will flow not only to communities but also to local government, central government institutions such as the EPA, community groups such as the protected area groups and the eco-tourism association, all enhancing sustainability of project outputs. However, these benefit flows remain in the future.”</p> <p>“The eco-tourism industry requires considerable development before it can provide financial flows to support development on Socotra and funding for protected areas and conservation institutions.”</p>	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: 5</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The project has a strong political network on and off the island, as witnessed by the effective resistance to the Qalansia road and increasing reference to the EPA for environmental vetting of investment and development proposals. In addition the establishment of the Socotra Conservation Fund links local and international lobbies for conservation.”</li> <li>• “The identification of sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism as the engines of economic growth on Socotra represents ‘mainstreaming’ of conservation on Socotra at the highest level.”</li> </ul>	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: 5</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Institutional capacity for conservation on Socotra, which was effectively non-existent prior to the first GEF project has been significantly strengthened. The EPA is now probably the strongest government institution on Socotra. It has a trained and motivated staff, first class facilities, and links to regional and international conservation bodies.”</li> </ul> <p>“Further institutional development is essential if communities and local government are to resist outside pressures that could result in unsustainable and environmentally damaging economic development.”</p>	
<b>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
N/A	
<b>E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<p>The TE does not discuss examples of replication in areas other than within the archipelago, and in this regard states that the project has not reached the point of replicating approaches. In the section on</p>	

replication the TE also discusses dissemination of information and knowledge transfer, which is the first step towards replication. There is also a discussion on some aspects of the capacity built and it is not clear how this relates to replication. Overall it seems as though there have not been examples of replication as yet, but the TE states that “the model being developed will be replicated in the many other proposed protected areas on the island.”

#### 4.3 Assessment of the project’s monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

**A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project’s M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.? Rating: 4**

The TE discusses the two levels of M&E – M&E of project implementation and M&E of project results. The project addressed both levels, though not to a fully satisfactory level.

At the level of project implementation, the TE reports that “Project implementation monitoring has been strong and consistent throughout the course of the implementation of the three projects. All donors interviewed here highly satisfied with the level and quality of reporting provided to them.”

The TE does provide a caveat however: “Internal evaluation of UNDP GEF projects is through Tripartite Review Meetings. These meetings provide the highest level of project steering available to GEF, UNDP and GOY. The minutes of Tripartite meetings held do not, however, indicate that sufficient evaluation and guidance of project implementation was undertaken. The Tripartite Meetings seemed to have been used as little more than a brief reporting opportunity. There is little evidence that substantive issues of implementation were discussed, progress towards project goals evaluated, or substantive issues resolved.”

Regarding M&E of project results, according to the TE, “The lack of or weakness of indicators developed for [phase 1] was discussed in the mid-term evaluation. Clear indicators for [phase 2] implementation were developed and were tracked closely in project reports. Indicators of impact, however, were not clearly defined.”

The TE does not discuss the environmental baseline, or whether there was monitoring and evaluation at the impact level at the end of the project.

**B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management? Rating: 5**

There is no specific discussion of adaptive management in the TE, but the TE does mention several times changes that were made as a result of the mid-term evaluation (see discussion on project indicators above).

**Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? NO**

#### 4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

**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?**

The lessons presented in the lessons learned section of the TE are somewhat limited, although the few lessons mentioned are substantive:

“[The problem of strong technical staff with weak management skills] can be avoided by providing training in management skills and by developing closer management relations with government partners. ... building capacity in management will contribute significantly to the sustainability of

project achievements.”

“The large parallel structure developed by the project presents a problem for sustainability which is not sustainably by Government. .... Hiring in expert staff enhances short term performance, which in the conservation sector is often important, but compromises sustainability. Executing project activities through existing government structures and relying on slow incremental building of capacity compromises the speed of achievement and often the quality of project outputs, but enhances sustainability. The contradictions between the natural interest of government institutions and staff in direct implementation, and the inevitable concern of donors for quality short-term outcomes must be recognized and balanced.”

“The linking of economic development on Socotra directly to conservation and protected area establishment through development of sustainable fisheries and eco-tourism industries presents a valuable model for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation. However, that it is the lack of development alternatives on Socotra that has made this possible.”

“Agreed changes in policy and practice must be viewed as an integral component of government’s participation. The UNDP Country Office should also play an important role in supporting governments to make the necessary changes.”

**4.5 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.

**4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings**

In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

<b>4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	5
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> The TE is not entirely internally consistent – see above discussion in cost-effectiveness section.	4
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The TE does devote one and a half pages to the issue of sustainability, and the general assessment is good, although overall the concept is not systematically broken down into different aspects of sustainability. The TE spends a lot of time discussing what needs to happen, but provides little information on what is actually going to, or is expected to, happen.	5
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The lessons learned are not comprehensive. For an \$8 million project with many complexities there are only 5 paragraphs on lessons learned, which do not seem to be structured in a logical way.	4
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b>	3

The TE includes a table showing planned and actual co-financing and total disbursement, but not broken down by project activity.	
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? The TE discusses the two important levels of M&E (project implementation, and project results), but the discussion is not comprehensive, and important information on the M&E of project results (discussion of baseline?) is not provided.	3

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

Yes:	No: X
------	-------

Explain:  
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No.

**4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**  
GEF online database.