

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review – Project ID 2474

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		02/02/2010
GEF Project ID:	2474		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	IMIS # GFL/2328-2732-4768	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.99	0.99
Project Name:	Promoting Ecosystem-based Approaches to Fisheries Conservation and Large Marine Ecosystems	IA/EA own:	0.74	0.80
Country:	Global	Government:		
		Other*:		
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.74	0.80
Operational Program:	OP 10 (Global Support Component)	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	1.73	1.79
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	UNESCO, World Council of Fisheries Societies (WCFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), American Fisheries Society (AFS), Princeton university, University of Rhode Island, University of British Colombia	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		May 2004
		Closing Date	Proposed: April 2007	Actual: June 2008
Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 35	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 49	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 14
Rajesh Koirala	Ines Angulo			
Author of TE:		TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 6
Lena Westlund		November 2008	May 2009	

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	MS	MS	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	ML	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	MU	MU	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MU
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why? Yes. The terminal evaluation report should be considered a good practice because it contains through discussion on project achievement, implementation and execution, weaknesses on monitoring and evaluation, and lessons learned.
2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.? The terminal evaluation has not reported such cases. No follow-up is required.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project appraisal document, the general objective of the project was to “support participation in the [4<sup>th</sup> World Fisheries] Congress [May 2004 in Vancouver, Canada] and its courses, workshops, and the follow-on networking of fisheries professionals from countries participating in the development and implementation of GEF/LME projects and other developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The project will serve to strengthen capacity for improving fisheries management at local, provincial and national levels through a holistic approach by facilitating sharing and applying usable knowledge and successful practices from the Congress and follow-on workshops and networking”.

As per the information provided in the terminal evaluation, there was no change in the general objective of the project.

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

- According to the project appraisal document, the project had five specific objectives as presented below:
1. “Train fisheries experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition in scientific, ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries management and fishery assessments that include food web and nutrient effects considerations in management decision-making”
  2. “Strengthen collaborative network and partnerships among fisheries scientists, managers, and policy makers from developed and developing countries through ECOPATH/ECOSIM workshops, Nutrient modeling workshops, and the May 04 Fisheries Congress and follow-on activities on fisheries management within the context of the ecosystem approach.”
  3. “Fill gaps in ecosystem carrying capacity for sustainable fisheries”
  4. “Forecast Nitrogen induced eutrophication”

No change in the project’s specific objectives has been noted in the terminal evaluation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

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

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

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

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

<b>a. Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
According to the project appraisal document and the terminal evaluation, the project outcomes are consistent with the GEF Operational Program 10 (Global Support Component) and International Water Strategic Priority 2 (Targeted Learning). The outcomes are also relevant to the GEF's initiative to incorporate Large Marine Ecosystems as important geographic units for introducing developing countries to innovative strategies for ecosystem-based management of marine resources.	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
According to the terminal evaluation, the project was not able to meet most of the indicators for strengthening scientific fisheries management capacity in developing countries. However, it successfully met indicators for modeling fisheries carrying capacity and nitrogen enrichment in the Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs). Based on the information provided in the terminal evaluation, performance of the project on each of its component is presented below: <b>Strengthening ecosystem-based approach to fisheries conservation and sustainability:</b> World Council of Fisheries Societies (WCFS)/ American Fisheries Society (AFS) held two meetings of 33 members in conjunction with the 4 <sup>th</sup> World Fisheries Congress, and established the Global Fisheries Ecosystem Management Network (GFEMN). The GFEMN currently has 107 members. WCFS/AFS also funded 33 participants to the Congress. WCFS/AFS organized four workshops, for Fisheries scientists, on microcomputer applications in fisheries science, stock assessment for data poor fisheries, decision analysis, and risk management. A total of 75 individuals participated in those workshops (target in the project document was to organize 13 workshops with at least 40 participants in each). To identify needs of developing countries regarding responsible fisheries management, WCFS/AFS sent questionnaires out to 90 members, but only 6 of them responded. An extensive database of ecosystem oriented fisheries management practices, and experts, was expected to be developed, but there is only a website containing contact details of 170 experts. According to the terminal evaluation report, it acts like "a mailing list" instead of database. <b>Filling the gaps in LME fisheries carrying capacity:</b> The Fisheries Centre of the University of British Columbia (FC/UBC) developed ecosystem models based on EwE, ecological software, for 63 of the world's 66 LMEs. FC/UBC also organized four workshops (total 102 participants) to better equip scientists in application of tools such as ECOPATH/ECOSIM for sustainable fisheries management. FC/UBC completed updating fisheries statistics of 64 LMEs from 1990 through 2000. Princeton University carried out a workshop (34 participants) on "Climate Change, Upwelling, Fisheries and Coastal Communities". University of Rhode Island conducted a training session on GIS, in which 11 representatives from 6 LMEs participated (in the project document, 25 experts from 13 developing countries were expected to be trained). One of the indicators of this component was that scientific tools developed by FC/UBC are successfully applied in developing countries, but no action except organizing workshops was undertaken in this regard. <b>Filling gaps in LME Nitrogen loadings forecasts for 64 LMEs:</b> Rutgers University developed nitrogen export models for each of the world's 64 LMEs. It also organized two workshops (total 16 participants) on application of the models.	
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
The project completion took one more year than it was initially planned. For some of the activities, level of achievement was low with respect to the budget expenditure. For example, according to the terminal evaluation, the entire allocated amount (in the project document) of US\$55,000 was spent for "survey of needs [of developing countries regarding sound fisheries management]: cost of survey and survey analysis." The project sent out questionnaires to 90 members. Among them only six responded, and no further action was taken to complete the survey.	

##### 4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

The project has developed practical tools that could be applied for sound management of individual LMEs or for global analyses and studies. The terminal evaluation cites NOAA stating that the project outputs have contributed to "the GEF IW portfolio, the proposed UN Global Marine Assessment, and the Assessment of Assessment process, and the Transboundary International Waters Assessment." According to the terminal evaluation current LME projects are starting to use EwE as their main ecosystem modeling framework. The Project has made the AFS more open to and interested in developing country members. This could lead to increased exchange of knowledge and experience between scientists in developing and developed countries.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
As stated in the terminal evaluation, the continuity of project outcomes depends on continuous source of external funding such as from the GEF.	
<b>b. Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The terminal evaluation mentions that the general acceptance and support for ecosystem-based fisheries management is high within the academic world, but it is yet to be achieved among policy makers and fisheries managers.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
A large number of GEF/LME projects and NOAA as a technical coordination unit have strong institutional structures. The project partners who executed components of this project also have dedicated institutions to continue similar research.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
There appears to have no environmental risk.	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>a.. Production of a public good</b>
Based on this project work, two technical reports, on the EwE modeling of 63 LMEs and on the Nitrogen export modeling, were published. The project finding/experience was incorporated in the UNEP Large Marine Ecosystems Report – A perspective on changing conditions in LMEs of the World’s Regional Seas (UNEP Regional Seas Studies and Reports No 182). Participation of scientists on trainings and workshops related to ecosystem based fisheries assessment and management enhanced their skills and knowledge.
<b>b.. Demonstration</b>
No examples of replication were included in the TE.
<b>c.. Replication</b>
No examples of replication were included in the TE.
<b>d.. Scaling up</b>
No examples of scaling up were included in the TE.

#### 4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
According to the terminal evaluation, actual co-financing (US\$809,000) was US \$69,000 higher than it was proposed in the project document. Compared with the expected co-financing in the project document, WCFS/AFS contributed US\$ 110,000 more, FC/UBC the same US\$100,000, NOAA provided US\$ 40,000 less, and IOC-UNESCO 10,000 less. The reason of this discrepancy is not mentioned in the available documents for this review. Based on the information in the terminal evaluation, co-financing was essential for the activities carried out by the project.
<b>b. Delays.</b> If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
As mentioned in the terminal evaluation, there were delays both at the beginning and the completion of the project. At the beginning, delay occurred due to IOC/UNESCO’s administrative procedure to transfer funds to project partners. To compensate it, the project completion was extended, at no additional budget, for a year. These delays had no effect on the project’s outcome and sustainability.
<b>c. Country Ownership.</b> Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.
As stated in the terminal evaluation, no country played a role to affect project outcomes and sustainability. The ownership was mainly considered with project partners rather with countries while designing and structuring the project. Because of research oriented nature of the project, experts in the particular field were given priority.

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

<b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MS</b>
The project appraisal document included a provision that the project team and the steering committee would be responsible for overall monitoring and evaluation of the project. But a detail plan about how it would be implemented was not formulated during the project design. It was expected to be done after the project approval. Indicators to measure the project performance were identified, but not all of them were SMART.	
<b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MU</b>
According to the terminal evaluation, there was no systematic, formal implementation of M&E plan. The PSC meetings took place irregularly and more frequently than initially planned, but the meetings appeared to have no clear role in reviewing project performance and providing feedback. The project document stated that a more specific plan would be developed later, but it never happened. Fund initially assigned for M&E activities was reallocated to other activities, except for the terminal evaluation. No progress reports of the first year of the project and only partial reports of the second year were available. The terminal evaluation cites three reasons for the lack of proper implementation of M&E: GEF's minimum M&E requirement came into effect only after the project was approved; EA lacked specific management unit responsible for the project, and project components were carried out by the partners on contract basis; and lack of continuity of a key staff responsible for this project in both IOC/UNESCO and UNEP.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Initially US \$ 44,500 was allocated to M&E, but later it was revised down to US\$25,500.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Only terminal evaluation was formally implemented. For this sufficient and timely funding was provided.	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? The documents available for this review, including PIRs, give no indication that the project monitoring system provided real time feedback.	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. No. As stated in the terminal evaluation, there was no formal implementation of the M&E system, and there is no evidence of M&E system contributing to enhance project performance.	

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

<b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MU</b>
<b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU</b>
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.
The project appraisal document contains a general objective, four specific objectives, five outcomes and four components. Although outcomes are well articulated, it is not clear which outcomes is intended to achieve which objective. There is much overlap, and as stated in the terminal evaluation, “hierarchy” between the outcomes and the objectives is missing. Indicators to assess the achievement of project objectives are clearly formulated, but not all of them are SMART. According to the terminal evaluation, UNEP reviewed operational aspects of the executing agency to make sure performance was acceptable. But as mentioned in the terminal evaluation UNEP experienced difficulties to supervise the project consistently due to staff turnover. This caused negative effect on project monitoring and consequently on project implementation. It participated in most PSC meetings; submitted financial reports and other progress reports, compiling information from the executing agencies, to the GEF. The terminal evaluation mentions that it would have been more effective if the project design, indicators and M&E plan had been revised.

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

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The executing agency was IOC/UNESCO, but the project components were carried out by other partners under contractual agreement. According to the terminal evaluation, IOC/UNESCO did not have any project specific management unit. According to the terminal evaluation those partners had limited familiarity with the normal procedures of donor funded development projects such as monitoring & evaluation, log frame and process indicators. Because of this, partners performed activities as specified in their contracts with IOC/UNESCO, but without necessarily viewing those activities in the overall picture of the project goals. There was no separate audit of the project; it was included within the overall IOC/UNESCO audit system. Financial reports were submitted to UNEP timely and regularly. However, the quarterly reports that were to be provided to the PSC, as per the provision in the Project Document, were not submitted. According to the terminal evaluation, some other reports that were submitted failed to draw attention to the lack of progress towards attaining objectives. The project suffered from a lack of continuity with regard to staff both in IOC/UNESCO and UNEP, causing negative effect on project monitoring. According to PIR 2006, 2007 and 2008, the project had low or negligible risk.

**5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

Lessons learned from this project, as presented in the terminal evaluation, are summarized as follow:

1. Even if a project consists of relatively independent components, implementing agency should ensure the presence of an overall project coordinator with clear management responsibilities, work plans, and systematic M&E.
2. If executing partners are not familiar with international development procedures, such as the planning and reporting requirements, the implementing agency should provide sufficient information or training at the beginning to make them acquaint with prevailing requirements.
3. To enhance the application of project's scientific results in management decision, decision-makers at the country and the field level should be involved in project design and their needs be addressed in project activities. Also, opportunities like training should be given for scientists, politicians, managers and others.
4. Publication of reports and their wide dissemination of the project result and its application is important to gain more attention of stakeholders and public.

**b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

Following are the recommendations provided in the terminal evaluation:

1. Two technical reports to be published by the Project (*Models of the World's large Marine Ecosystems* and *Filling gaps in LME Nitrogen Loadings Forecast for 64 LMEs*) are published in English, in French and possibly in Spanish.
2. A workshop could be organized, in conjunction with the annual IOC-UNEP-IUCN-NOAA Consultative Meeting on LMEs, to make project partners familiar with the achievements, assess performance and formulate future plans. The next project that could come out of the meeting should emphasize on bridging the science-management gap and consultations with GEF/LME projects with regard to their needs and desires.

<sup>1</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

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

**6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.**

NA

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The report presented a comprehensive assessment of the project performance against the objectives, and outcomes specified in the project document.</p>	S
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> The report is consistent, evidence is complete/convincing, and ratings are well substantiated.</p>	S
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The sustainability issues were discussed thoroughly.</p>	
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Lessons learned presented in the report are fully supported by the evidence.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Actual project costs (total and per activity) is included in the report, but co-financing per activity is not presented and the role of co-financing is discussed briefly.</p>	MS
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The report thoroughly discusses the M&amp;E issues.</p>	S

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

NA