

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review – Project ID 2722

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 2722		Review date: 02/12/2010		
IA/EA Project ID:		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)	
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	0.99	0.99
Project Name:	Fostering a Global Dialogue on Oceans, Coasts, and SIDS, and on Freshwater-Coastal-Marine Interlinkages	IA/EA own:	0.17	0.17
Country:	Global (105 countries participated)	Government:	-	-
		Other*:	0.95	1.91
	International Waters	Total Cofinancing	1.12	2.08
Operational Program:	10	Total Project Cost:	2.11	3.07
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	IOC/UNESCO, International Coast and Ocean Organization (ICO), NEPAD/COSMAR, IOCARIBE, PEMSEA, SOPAC, EPOMEX/SEMARNAT/CCA, WON	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		October 2005
		Closing Date	Proposed: September 2007	Actual: June 2008
Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 24	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 32	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 8
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
Yves Henocque		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	S	S	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	S	S	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	--	MU	“US”	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S-HS	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. The terminal evaluation report thoroughly examines the project achievement, strengths and weaknesses, lessons learned, and provides useful recommendations. The project experience documented in the report could be valuable while designing similar projects in future.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such case is reported in the terminal evaluation and PIRs.

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 global environmental objective of the project was “to foster a global South-to-South and South-to-North dialogue, through the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, on the implementation of the activities aimed towards the achievement of JPOI [Johannesburg Plan of Implementation] targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands, with a special focus on SIDS [Small Island Developing States] and the inter-linkages between freshwater and the coastal and marine environment.”

Based on the information presented in the terminal evaluation, there was no change in the global environmental objective during implementation.

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)?)

As stated in the project appraisal document, the development objectives of the project were:

1. “Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues;”
2. “Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA);”
3. “Establish multi-sectoral dialogues, involving experts from developing countries, countries with economies in transition, and GEF LME projects in the policy analyses, public outreach and cross-learning between LME experiences and coastal and ocean management experiences;”
4. “Raise the awareness of and promote national ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to large marine ecosystems as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS;”
5. “Improve interlinkages between freshwater, coastal and oceans issues by developing a relationship between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum and associated institutions.”

No change in the development objectives of this project has been noted in the documents available for this review.

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)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
According to the project appraisal document, the project is consistent with the GEF Operational Program 10 (international water), more particularly with its Global Technical Support component. The project was also relevant to the GEF IW Strategic Priority 2, which intends to expand global coverage of foundational capacity building.	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: S
Based on the information provided in the terminal evaluation, the project performance exceeded project document’s target in some cases such as organization of the 4 th global conference, but in other cases, for example appointment of regional representatives of the Global Forum and completing the ten year strategic plan, the project achievement could not materialize as envisioned in the project document. The Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands mobilized ocean leaders from 93 countries representing governments, nongovernmental organizations, UN agencies, industry and academia to advance the global oceans	

agenda of the World Summit on Sustainable Development. To strengthen organizational set up, 12 working groups were formed work under the Forum. The project document intended to have completed the 10-year strategic plan (2006-2016) of the Forum, approved by Global Forum Steering Committees, but only the draft was completed. The Forum and the Global Water Partnership worked jointly on pilot projects in the Mediterranean and Caribbean regions, and also formulated the Global Water Partnership network in SE Asia.

UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) organized the 3rd Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts and Islands, in Paris, in which 400 representatives from 78 countries including 38 ministers participated (the project document aimed at not less than 500 participants, including 30 ministers). Based on discussion in the conference, it published a proceeding related to the attainment of major Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) and Millennium Development Goals (MDG) as regards coasts and oceans. Beyond the expectation of the project document, the Forum organized the 4th Global Conference, on Oceans, Coasts and Islands in Vietnam which involved 439 participants from 62 countries. Working under the Global Forum, 12 multinational groups, involving 254 ocean experts from 68 countries, prepared 12 policy briefs on issues related to coasts, oceans and islands (the project document intended at least 10 policy reviews). In conjunction with the 4th Global Conference, the Forum held technical training workshops on public participation and payments for ecosystem services through the establishment of an online resource centre. In 2005, The Ocean Policy Summit was organized in Lisbon which proved to be an important platform to promote global oceans agenda. At the summit experience was shared about the 20 National Ocean Policies, and a book was published based on the work presented at the summit by those countries.

Regarding Policy analyses, the implementation of the 2005 Mauritius Strategy, including the capacity development needs, was assessed for four Small Island Developing States (SIDS), as well as regional gap analysis for four regions (Project document targeted each category of work for three regions). However, as planned in the project document, capacity building need assessments did not lead to specific self-financed capacity building activities at country level. Under the Government of Brazil's leadership, eight Portuguese-speaking Nations agreed on a Framework of Cooperation on the Environment (an extra outcome not indicated in the Project document).

For public outreach, the Forum published two newsletters and posted a global directory of nongovernmental organizations on its website. It also organized nine side events on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands during major ocean meetings such as the UN Informal Consultative Process (ICP). Collaborating with the Stakeholder Forum, the Global Forum published six issues of *Outreach* to support UNEP's Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA).

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: S

The project completion was delayed by eight months. According to the terminal evaluation, the project activities were carried out at low managerial cost through a part-time Secretariat and involving many volunteer experts. To disseminate information and knowledge sharing, the project used up-to-date communication means such as You Tube, and an online resource centre.

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

According to the terminal evaluation the project made "significant inputs" into UN processes, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. By applying the lessons learned from the Global Forum, the Global Island Partnership is now a recognized programme of the CBD Island Biodiversity Work Programme. Also, the recent UN Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group used the outcomes and policy papers of the Global Conference, on issues related to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction. At the national level, diverse actors like government officials, ministers, international organisations, the private sectors, and civil society organisations are now better prepared to contribute to national level policy development, as they have actively participated in the conferences. Activities carried out by the Freshwater to Oceans Working group of this project provided the basis for further partnership with the GPA, especially in preparing a global report on advancing the WSSD targets on coastal ecosystem management.

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.

a. Financial resources	Rating: ML
According to the terminal evaluation, the Global Forum is capable of generating funding as it did from international/multi-lateral, government and non-government organizations during the project implementation. However, international financing organizations such as GEF need to ensure adequacy of funding to maintain the project gains.	
b. Socio political	Rating: L
According to the terminal evaluation the Global Forum generated significant awareness within global, regional and national stakeholders. As a result governmental organizations, academic and research institutions and INGOs are interested in the project activities.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
According to the terminal evaluation, Global Forum's ten year strategic plan preparation is incomplete, and clear strategy to collaborate with multiple stakeholders at local level is lacking. However, the Global Forum is an established institution capable of continuing the project activities.	
d. Environmental	Rating: L
Based on the information presented in the terminal evaluation, there is no environmental risk.	

4.3 Catalytic role

a.. Production of a public good
The agenda of the project, coastal ecosystem management, brought many countries to a common platform, leading to collaboration in other common issues. For example, according to the Annual Project Performance Report, South-to-South cooperation agreement among eight Portuguese speaking Nations has covered the areas of Biodiversity, Combating Desertification, Ecotourism, Environmental Education, Waste Management, Integrated Water Resources Management, Climate Change, and Renewable Energies, including a specific program of collaboration between Brazil and Cape Verde. This demonstrates unity of purpose to actively cooperate on critical issues at global, regional and national level. Some other significant public goods produced by this project are policy reviews, information package, and a book on <i>Integrated Regional and National Ocean Policies</i> , establishment of an online resource centre to share knowledge and experience on ecosystem-based ocean management.
b.. Demonstration
No demonstration activities were implemented.
c.. Replication
According to the terminal evaluation, lessons learned and policy changes as a result of the Global Forum have been replicated by other organizations, for example, the Coral Triangle Initiative of OSPAR.
d.. Scaling up
According to the Annual Project Performance Report, the project activities, mainly policy analysis and the 2005 Summit, led to policy decisions in Mexico and Japan: Mexico Policy on Integrated Ocean and Coastal Management (2006) and Japan Basic Act on Ocean Policy (2007).

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

a. Co-financing. 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, 94% of the co-financing envisioned in the project document was materialized during implementation. Moreover, US\$1.03 million co-financing, cash and in-kind support including facilities, staff time and travel, came from new sources not included in the project document. Twenty eight international, government and non-government organisations co-financed the project in the form of cash and in kind support particularly for three activities: for 2005 The Ocean Policy Summit, the 3 rd Global Oceans Conference in 2006, the 4 th Global Oceans Conference in Hanoi in 2008. The terminal evaluation states that the co-financing was essential to successfully organize those events and ultimately to achieve the project outcomes.
b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
There was eight month delay in completion of the project. According to the terminal evaluation three main reasons caused the overall delay of the project completion. First, the implementing agency released the first disbursement after six months of the project approval by the GEF. Second, the project document lacked clear plans and time schedules for some outcomes. Third, because of the inherent heterogeneity at the regional level, problems were encountered related to regional capacity assessment. However, the delay had no negative effect in the project's outcome and sustainability.

c. 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.
Based on the information presented in the terminal evaluation, countries played limited role to influence project outcomes and sustainability. Ministries of Portugal, Canada, Italy, Belgium, Singapore, and Korea provided co-financing. Ministers and other representatives from 70 countries participated in the global summit.

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

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): MS
The M&E plan had a clear distribution of responsibilities for M&E monitoring project progresses, but it lacked specific plan and baseline information. According to the project document, the Steering Committee (SC) would regularly meet to review progress. The project staff would develop, before the first PIR, the M&E plan for conducting the quarterly, annual, and terminal evaluations, including indicators to evaluate project's success. According to the terminal evaluation no such M&E plan was developed after the project started. It was stated in the project document that the executing agency would prepare quarterly progress reports, and UNEP would be responsible to carry out the final evaluation of the project.	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): MU
According to the terminal evaluation, there was no formal implementation of M&E, due to the absence of specific M&E plan and poor quality of the logical framework. The project monitoring and evaluation was conducted through two project steering committee meetings (the second one was questionable as it took place just for formality), three progress reports (September 2005 – June 2007), the PIR 2007, the PIR 2008 and the Global Forum Report of Activities (2005-2008). According to the PIR 2007 and 2008, the project compiled the opinion about the usefulness of the project activities, of government and non government ocean leaders, who participated in the multi-stakeholder meetings. The PIR 2008 also notes that detailed information on process indicators was collected throughout the project period and reported in the Project Logical Framework reporting in June 2008. Earlier reporting might have allowed time for improvement.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?	The project document included US\$80,000 for M&E, and for the level of activities intended, it should be sufficient.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?	Unable to assess
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?	Based on the terminal evaluation, it can be inferred that project monitoring system did not provide real time feedback to improve project performance.
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

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
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 document contained a few weaknesses. There was no clear connection among objectives, components and activities, and some objectives were duplication of others. The specific plan for the project M&E was lacking. The selection of the executing agency was appropriate as the EA effectively and efficiently launched the project. Based on the information presented in the PIR 2007, and PIR 2008, the IA's Task Manager periodically supervised the project performance and risk factor. Although no specific recommendations were noted, the level of achievement presented in the PIRs would have facilitated to identify areas requiring more focus to achieve the targets. The terminal evaluation provides limited information on further role played by the implementing agency.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) S

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.

Two organizations co-executed the project. UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) received the total GEF financing and contracted the Global Forum’s International Coast and Ocean Organization (ICO) for the implementation of specific activities under all four project components. A project steering committee was set up, and two meetings were held during the project. According to the terminal evaluation the second meeting was questionable because it took place at the very end of the project as there was “not much to negotiate”, and participants were only six members compared to 13 at the first meeting. According to PIR 2008, both external and internal risks were either low or negligible. The project abided by all the reporting requirements (financial, substantive, auditing, co-financing reports) specified in the project document. Both executing agencies IOC and ICO did proper financial management by following the UN Rules and Regulations. The contracts arrangement and internal reports were dealt with smoothly between the executing agencies. But according to the terminal evaluation “progress reports to the Implementing Agency did not always respect the 6-month requested periodicity”. The terminal evaluation admits that the role played by EAs, specially the Global Forum Secretariat, was crucial for the successful completion of the project.

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

As mentioned in the terminal evaluation following are the lessons learned from this project:

1. There should be clear linkages between project objectives, components, and activities, and “multi-folded objectives” are to be avoided.
2. Stakeholder analysis and their involvement plan need to be prepared to adequately address their differing motivation and expectations.
3. Global projects like this should develop “a strategy map” considering similarities and differences of developing countries, countries in transition, and developed countries, so that region specific needs are addressed.
4. The project duration should be sufficiently allocated to ensure the achievement of the “necessary key results”.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Terminal evaluation recommends :

1. To maintain the outputs and impacts of the project, the Global Forum should extensively report to the partner organizations and steering committee members about their participation and ownership, thematic classification of working groups, and their role to optimize functioning of the Forum.
2. Similar to that of a steering committee members’ proposal to create a Regional Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands for the Channel and the North Sea, the Global Forum should formalize the regional leads within already present entities in the respective regions.
3. Although there is a good probability that the Global Forum would receive more financial support from national institutions, as an immediate step, international financing organizations, particularly, UNEP/DGEF should continue to work with the Global Forum to develop and promote its programs.
4. The Global Forum should “further revise and finalize” the draft 10-year strategic plan, including a plan of what and how would be implemented taking into considerations the region specific needs and priorities.
5. To foster a multi-stakeholder, global South-to-South and South-to-North dialogue, the Global Forum should address global issues of ocean governance in a continuum with exclusive economic zone management, regional collaboration (regional seas and large marine ecosystems), and oceanographic issues that transcend national boundary.

¹ 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.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The report comprehensively assesses the achievement of the project against objectives, relevant outcomes and impacts.</p>	S
<p>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? The report contains a few cases of inconsistency. The evidence is complete and the IA ratings have been substantiated.</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? It properly assesses the project sustainability.</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons learned are supported by evidence, and are comprehensive.</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report does not include project cost (total and per activity), but it includes actual co-financing total and per donating agency. Per activity project cost is also missing.</p>	MS
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? Many aspects of the project M&E are not discussed in the report.</p>	MU

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

NA