

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2614	
GEF Agency project ID		3341	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Climate change adaptation, responding to coastline change and its human dimensions in West Africa through integrated coastal area management	
Country/Countries		Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, The Gambia, Senegal	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Strategic Priority for Adaptation	
Executing agencies involved		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNESCO/IOC • Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature, Direction de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature (Senegal) • Ministère du Développement Rural et de l'Environnement, Direction de l'Environnement (Mauritanie) • Ministerio dos Recursos Naturais, Direcção Geral do Ambiente (Guinea Bissau) • National Environment Agency (Gambia) • Ministry of Environment and Agriculture, Direction Générale de l'Environnement (Cape Verde) 	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGOs as implementer for activities at local level	
Private sector involvement		Consultancy firms as contractors for activities at local level	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		August 29, 2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 18, 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 17, 2012	
Actual date of project completion		September 30, 2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.7	0.7
	Co-financing	0.07	0.06
GEF Project Grant		3.3	3.27
Co-financing	IA own	0.1	0.1
	Government	6.18	N/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.81	N/A
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	1.63	N/A
Total GEF funding		4.0	3.97
Total Co-financing		9.79	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		13.79	N/A

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	November 2014
Author of TE	Badara Diagne
TER completion date	February 17, 2016
TER prepared by	Matteo Borzoni
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Watts

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	Likely	N/R	Moderately unlikely
M&E Design	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Satisfactory
M&E Implementation	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Moderately Satisfactory
Quality of Implementation	N/R	Marginally unsatisfactory	N/R	Moderately Unsatisfactory
Quality of Execution	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-		Moderately unsatisfactory

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The coastal and marine environment of Mauritania, Senegal, The Gambia, Guinea Bissau, and Cape Verde is a highly productive ecosystem of significant biological diversity that is under threat from climate change. Several assessments, based on country specific National Communications to the UNFCCC, the second assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as well as GEF-funded projects such as the African Process, have concluded that widespread coastal erosion and sedimentation due to climate change is one of the most devastating environmental problems faced by the region. Coastal erosion and sedimentation are strongly influenced by changes in climatic conditions.

The Global Environmental Objective is “to reduce vulnerability and to increase adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change in the focal areas in which the GEF work” (Project Document, p.22).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development objective of the project was “To develop and pilot a range of effective coping mechanisms for reducing the impact of climate change induced coastal erosion in vulnerable regions (Project Document, p.22).

The intervention logic also presented four expected outcomes which were formulated as follows:

- Pilot activities to increase the adaptive capacity and resilience of coastline ecosystems in regions vulnerable to climate change impacts implemented.

- Climate change and adaptation issues and coastal area management policies and programs integrated.
- Monitoring of coastal erosion and capacity building in coastal management and planning enhanced
- Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management increased

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

No

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates relevance as ‘Relevant’. This TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as Satisfactory.

Several assessments based on country specific National Communications to the UNFCCC, the second assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as well as GEF-funded projects such as the African Process, have concluded that widespread coastal erosion due to climate change is one of the most serious anticipated environmental problems facing the region. The project responds to the needs of the target countries and is in line with the regional, national and local application of policy considerations outlined in the UNFCCC and the CBD, as well as key elements of GEF’s strategic priority ‘Piloting an Operational Approach to Adaptation’ (SPA).

In addition, the nature of the selected sites and the type of human activities found there (estuary, urban area, RAMSAR site and open coast in an island area) makes the five target pilot areas highly representative of the local topographical situations that can be found along the West African coast, which are rich in biodiversity and exposed to climate risks. They are therefore well in line with the GEF SPA strategy.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory. This TER rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. This is because the indicators of the second outcome suggest that this outcome was not completely achieved.

The projects achievements under its originally planned outcomes are detailed below:

For Outcome 1 (Pilot activities to increase the adaptive capacity and resilience of coastline ecosystems in regions vulnerable to climate change impacts implemented) the project planned five pilot interventions (one per country). Two of them can be considered successful. They include the stabilization of 40 hectares of coastal dunes in Mauritania, awareness raising campaigns and promotion of ecotourism, and the demarcation of a wetland complex in The Gambia. In Cape Verde various outputs were delivered. They are supposed to contribute to the achievement of the development objective however the outputs in Cape Verde were not those originally planned (i.e. rehabilitation of plant cover on dune areas and development integrated river and coastal management plans). Outputs finally delivered in Cape Verde included the planting of 474 fruit trees, the construction of a dyke to reduce sediment movement, an inventory of local biodiversity through a GIS system, awareness raising campaigns to improve understanding of climate change issues and to protect turtles and migratory birds, and the development of alternative income generating activities that were expected to reduce pressure on natural resources. In Senegal and in Guinea Bissau the pilot initiatives are considered a failure. In Senegal it was planned to reforest 10 km of coastal line. Here the failure rate of replanting operations was quite high (64.2%). Moreover the achieved target (1.6 km of replanted coastal belt) was well below the planned target (TE, p. 20). According to the TE this was also due to the fact that the local population was not sufficiently informed about the activities of the project, local authorities (Ngallou PCR and Fimela sub-prefecture) were not involved in the implementation process, and with the project office established far away in Dakar, activity planning and coordination was inadequate. In Guinea Bissau 10,000 seedlings should have been planted but not a single seedling was planted.

For Outcome 2 (Climate change and adaptation issues and coastal area management policies and programs integrated) in Mauritania studies were carried out to improve the adaptation component of the Banc d'Arguin National Park (PNBA) management plan but it is not clear whether the results of the studies have been actually integrated in the management plans. Various trainings were delivered in Senegal so that climate change issues could be addressed in the Palmarin local development plan, but again it is not clear whether this actually occurred. Also the project envisaged that adaptation and coastal climate change concerns would have influenced national policies in at least two countries. Both in Mauritania and in Senegal changes were introduced in the coastline laws but these laws had not yet been passed when the TE was conducted.

Four Outcome 3 (Monitoring of coastal erosion and capacity building in coastal management and planning enhanced) the project was supposed to improve capacities of institutions to develop and implement adaptation strategies and to disseminate lessons and best practices and information products. The project delivered various trainings but the information products and training material was

not replicated as expected. Moreover, the consultancy firm in charge of coastal monitoring never delivered the study on coastal monitoring (TE, p.19).

For outcome 4 (Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management increased) the project intended to establish a network of stakeholders for adaptation to coastal erosion and to develop a website on the same topic. The website was actually developed with 20417 hits up to the end of June 2011. It was then reorganized with a new database management system. In addition, an inter-State partnership network was developed among beneficiary countries through RACCAO (Réseau pour l'Adaptation aux Changements Climatiques en Afrique de l'Ouest), along with a network of local populations involved in development initiatives and a network of parliamentarians.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory, while this TER rates efficiency as moderately unsatisfactory because of the failure to mobilize expected co-financing along with a delayed start-up.

The project failed to mobilize the projected parallel financing included in the project document, as well as additional funds. Some countries (Mauritania, The Gambia) allocated funds to the national UNDP program as initially indicated and UNESCO also contributed to the regional activities through its voluntary contribution. Nevertheless, delays in the UNDP country offices in making annual budgets available considerably affected project inception and implementation of the project. Another important cause of delays was the excessively long process of drafting and approving annual work plans from national teams (TE, p.4). Delays also affected the quality of results. One of the reasons why the replanting failure rate was so high in Senegal was due to the fact that replanting activities were delayed during the first year and only started at the end of the cold season (TE, p.20).

Moreover in Guinea Bissau the GEF project budget was exceeded by more than 57,000 USD (TE, p. 28). This also suggests a low supervision capacity of UNDP because in Guinea Bissau a Direct Execution Arrangement (DEX) process was applied, which required that all expenses were authorized by UNDP.

The TE also reports that in Senegal mobilization procedures were slow and inefficient, as was activity implementation. Moreover, expenses were recorded well beyond the date at which project accounts were supposed to be closed, with amounts still being expended in May 2014 (TE, p.33).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates sustainability as Likely while this TER rates sustainability as moderately unlikely. This is because of the political instability in some the participating countries and also the livelihood pressures that pose risks to the sustenance of the results (i.e. Senegal and Guinea Bissau).

The TE rates financial sustainability as Likely. This TER is unable to assess financial sustainability. This is because neither the TE nor other accompanying documents provide any useful information to assess financial sustainability.

The TE rates socio-cultural sustainability as likely. This TER also rates Socio-cultural sustainability as likely. The project raised awareness about the need to preserve and sustainably manage local ecosystems and about protecting coastal areas from the proliferation of wastes. Training programs were organized for various stakeholders alongside commemorative events and debate sessions on important environmental issues such as fire outbreaks and turtle protection. In addition in Senegal (where main problems were caused by an inadequate ownership at local level, see below) authorities are perfectly aware of threats to the ecosystem in the pilot area (TE, p. 20).

The TE rates sustainability of the institutional framework and governance as likely, while this TER rates this criterion as moderately unlikely. The implementation structure was very complex. Moreover, political instability is also an issue in Guinea Bissau and in Mauritania. In most cases (except the case of Mauritania) implementing local adaptation activities was made more difficult because the sites were located far away from the capital city. This was further compounded by the fact that several decision-making bodies were involved in the implementation. In these conditions monitoring of the effects of the project will certainly be more difficult once project funds are over.

The TE rates environmental sustainability as likely. This TER rates environmental sustainability as moderately unlikely. This is because in two of the four areas for pilot interventions the project does not seem to have addressed main threats. The target area in Senegal is experiencing a gradual diminution to natural resources that serve as a basis for most income generating activities. Here the project was supposed to promote reforestation but replanting failure rate was high (64.2%). Moreover, of the 10 km of coastal belt for the replanting target only 1.6 km have been actually replanted (TE, page. 20). Moreover, the absence of alternative income generating in the pilot area of Guinea Bissau will probably aggravate pressures on the already fragile ecosystem (TE, p.35).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project failed to mobilize co-financing from the partner government. The majority of co-financing was supposed to be in kind. As a consequence the project was unable to mobilize all human resources required. Human resources allocated to the project mainly consisted in central government staff, to the detriment of local experts, who could have better monitored activities in the field and promoted ownership among villagers (TE, p. 34)

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The actual duration of the project was four years, which coincided with its planned duration. However, during the first steering committee it was decided to amend the duration of the project to three years (the reasons for this decision are not reported in the PIRs or in the TE). Following delays in the implementation of activities the projected closure was postponed twice for six months each time, thus making the total project four years again.

Delays were due to difficulties faced by the national teams in developing the annual work plans (AWPs) and due to slow disbursements from UNDP once annual work plans had been submitted (TE, p. 31 and p. 32). One of the effects of these delays was that the seedlings were planted in a risky period in Senegal and this contributed to the mentioned high failure rate (among other causes like insufficient watering from villagers).

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TER does not include an analysis of country ownership at national level. However, in the last two steering committee meetings members approved the design of a possible second phase (TE, p 26). This may represent an index for good ownership at national level.

One instance where ownership was very low was in the pilot area in Senegal. Here local authorities were not involved in the implementation and local population was not sufficiently informed about the activities of the project (TE, p. 20).

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE rates M&E design at entry as Satisfactory. The TER agrees with that rating. A monitoring and evaluation plan was developed. It included baseline studies, APRs and RIPs, steering committee meetings, annual evaluations by the project team, a mid-term evaluation and a final external evaluation. The M&E plan did not have an accompanying budget. The logical framework was well structured and presented SMART indicators.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates M&E implementation as Satisfactory while this TER revises the rating to moderately satisfactory. This is because the great majority of the indicators presented in the logical framework were not actually monitored. More specifically the PIRs used just six indicators out of more than 20 indicators included in the logical framework. Moreover, national annual reports did not include all final required information which made it difficult to aggregate results at regional levels (2012 RIP).

The PIRs have been developed every year and the few used indicators have been measured regularly. The mid-term evaluation was properly conducted and the analysis presented is of good quality, however the recommendations proposed were not perceived as actionable by the management.

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--	-----------------------------------

The TE rates project implementation as Marginal Unsatisfactory. This TER agrees with the rating noting weaknesses in UNDP’s supervision and facilitation support.

The TE states (p. 32) that country offices experienced enormous difficulties in accessing funds once the annual work plans and the activity reports had been submitted. These problems were at the origin of the two six-month extensions. Moreover the project in Guinea Bissau was implemented under a Direct Executing Arrangement (DEX) process, which requires that all activities and expenses have to be authorized by UNDP. On one side this provoked cumbersome procedures that hindered a smooth implementation in the country (TE, p. 32). On the other side this system did not guarantee a proper supervision. In fact expenses in the Guinea Bissau exceeded the planned budget of almost 57,000 USD.

A major management issue was the split of the total budget into six parts managed by five different national country offices and the Regional Office of UNESCO in Dakar. This arrangement created a *de facto* national implementation situation of five projects coordinated with great difficulties at the Regional level, with no direct managerial authority at national and local level (2012 RIP). The last available PIR also mentions great difficulties in obtaining necessary information from the five countries. As an example of coordination problem that this *de facto* situation provoked it is here mentioned that the last PIR was unable to indicate cumulative total expenditures (including co-financing).

Finally the program coordinator resigned in September 2011 while the new project coordinator was recruited six months after (2012 PIR).

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

The TE rate quality of execution as moderately satisfactory. This TER confirms this rating.

Each national team was headed by a national coordinator who reported to a national Project Director. The national project teams were therefore under the direct policy supervision of the respective national ministries.

The quality of project execution clearly varies according to the country. In Cape Verde, Mauritania and the Gambia the project was executed in a satisfactory way since targets were achieved, expenses were well managed and communication with the regional office was positive. In Guinea Bissau and in Senegal the execution was problematic. In Senegal the most important achievements were well below planned target (1.6km of replanted coastal belt against 10 km a target of 10 km). In Guinea Bissau the project failed to ensure proper implementation of contracts with various scientific and technical partners. These included the Water and Forestry department (DGFF/MADR), IBAP and GPC (for the analysis of flora and fauna) and the Senegalese consultancy firm TROPIS (for monitoring coastal erosion). For this last case the TE reports that payments to the company were not made.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The Project provoked important positive environmental changes. In Cape Verde these included the construction of a dyke to reduce sediment movements, planting of fruit species, and the protection of birds and turtles through awareness raising campaigns. In the Gambia a wetland complex was demarcated and an area of 80 meters of abandoned quarry sands was converted into a refuge for birds and coastal animals. In Mauritania 40 hectares of coastal dunes were stabilized by planting 35,000 seedlings. In Guinea Bissau environmental changes were positive but less important than planned. Here 10,000 seedlings should have been planted but no planting took place, because the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) did not comply with the contract. Instead of planting seedlings, campaigns were organized to clean beaches. This was certainly important but the environmental benefits were much lower than in the case of the original planting of seedlings. In Senegal more than eight hectares of mangrove forest were reforested. In addition, 1.7 km of coastal belt was replanted. This was significant but the environmental benefits would have been much higher if the original 10 km target were achieved.

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

The project promoted some income generating activities. These included a rabbit rearing in Cape Verde, and beekeeping and oyster farming in Senegal. In addition, a millet thresher was installed in the Senegalese target area to reduce women's workload.

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

activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The capacities of national government staff and beneficiary at grassroots level were improved in different ways. Awareness raising sessions were carried out with the village residents in the five countries in order to improve their knowledge about climate change.

At a regional level about 110 persons (including people from target groups from the five beneficiary countries) were trained during six training workshops with topics covering mangrove restoration techniques, climate change in coastal areas, dune reforestation, *sandwatch*, mapping of coastal areas, and integrated coastal area management. Participants came from either NGOs, or universities.

b) Governance

The project contributed to improving the governance of coastal adaptation in the target region in different ways.

In Mauritania studies were carried out to improve the adaptation component of the Banc d'Arguin National Park (PNBA) management plan. An additional study was developed and focused on promoting the integration of climate change and adaptation issues in the PNBA management plan. In addition, a consultative workshop was organized on the integration of climate change adaptation into a government coastline ordinance.

In Senegal the project contributed to drafting a law on the coastline through a series of workshops aimed at exchanging legal and institutional information and covering the understanding and enforcement of existing legislation governing the environment and urban and national planning.

However, at the time when the TE was drafted the bills promoted by the project in Senegal and in Mauritania had not yet passed by the by the governments of these two countries.

In Cape Verde an advisory council on integrated coastal management was set up, including local stakeholders, NGOs, international representatives and the police.

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

The TE does not report any unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental

benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE reports that the *Sandwatch* concept for teachers and schoolchildren was replicated in the five countries. The TE does not add any further information about the replication process. The replication of the *Sandwatch* component seems more an activity promoted (and funded) by the project than an initiative of national partners.

During the last two meetings of the steering committee members approved the design of a possible second phase of the project covering the 2012-2016 period.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The most important lessons of the TE are the following:

- Political instability affects the implementation of activities. This was evident in Mauritania (with respect to the award of co-financing and capital funds expected from the Mauritanian Government) and in Guinea Bissau (for measuring shifting sediments and coastline changes)
- Flexibility on institutional and financial aspects facilitates and promote co-financing from other international institutions (such as the IDRC and UNESCO-COI).
- Direct execution arrangements (DEX) of UNDP did not promote institutional anchoring and efficiency. Project implementation would probably have been smoother if DEX arrangements were accompanied by a project facilitation structure (in the country) aimed at providing technical and administrative support.
- Post electoral periods should be avoided for launching local level community project activities because local bodies tend to experience functional problems that may affect the implementation of the project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The key recommendations of the TE are:

- Oceanographic and climate data collection mechanisms should be strengthened all along the West African coastal area.
- Measurements of changes in underground waters should be included in a second phase of the project along with the promotion of renewal energy use.
- Country teams should be obliged to report scientific, technical and financial information to the regional project coordination unit.

- Disaster management approaches should be integrated into adaptation programs.
- A team of professional translators of all the official languages used in the target countries should be set up within the project regional coordinating team.
- The regional coordinating unit should be strengthened for monitoring project's activities at country level also by integrating organizations such as UNOPS.
- Integrate research components to strengthen the scientific basis of the project, especially with respect to the analysis and use of oceanic and climate parameters.
- Set up a collection system of relevant parameters to improve the analysis of climate data along with additional tide gauges with dense coverage of the area.
- Simplify administrative and financial procedures regarding the elaboration and approval of the activity plan from UNDP.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE includes a good assessment of the relevant outcomes and objectives. The analysis of impacts is more confused and incomplete.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The ratings of the TE are all positive however the way they were assigned is not clear since many important short-coming were stressed.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The analysis of potential sustainability is weak since it does not include relevant information. Exit strategy considerations are completely missing.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are not clearly formulated. Moreover they do not include an analysis of the context and of key issue that generated the lesson.	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Total project costs have been included for the GEF component but not for the other cash components. Moreover, project costs per activity are not included. Data on actual co-financing are missing	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	An analysis of the M&E is missing	U
Overall TE Rating		MU

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