

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2017

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2881	
GEF Agency project ID		CR-X1004	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	
Project name		Integrated Management of Marine and Coastal Resources in Puntarenas	
Country/Countries		Costa Rica	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP2 (Coastal, Marine, and freshwater ecosystems) BD-SP4-Policy, BD-SP5 -Markets	
Executing agencies involved		Lead Executing Agency: Fundacion MarViva Other Executing Partners: Ministry of Environment, Energy and Telecommunications, Sistema Nacional de Areas de Conservacion (MINAET-SINAC); National Coastguard Service (SNG) and Instituto Costarricense de Pesca y Acuicultura (INCOPESCA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Not mentioned	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		1/21/ 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		11/26/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		5/26/2015	
Actual date of project completion		Sept 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.28	0.28
	Co-financing	0.28	
GEF Project Grant		3.0	2.97
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	8.81	5.16
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.28	3.24
Total Co-financing		8.81	5.16
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		12.36	8.40
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		November 2016	
Author of TE		Jose Luis Alvarez R.	
TER completion date		3/16/2018	
TER prepared by		Selin Erdogan	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes		NR	NR	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		NR	NR	MU
M&E Design		HS	NR	MS
M&E Implementation		HS	NR	MS
Quality of Implementation		NR	NR	MS
Quality of Execution		NR	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project as stated in the PAD, was to strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of globally important marine and coastal biodiversity in the Province of Puntarenas in Costa Rica.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was “PD, pg. 4)

The project planned to achieve this objective through three project components:

- (i) Strengthening of the Regulatory Framework and Local Capacities: This component has three sub-components that respectively focus on the strengthening of key regulations and norms, the building of local capacity for integrated ecosystem management in the two MUMAs, and the design and implementation of sustainable financial mechanisms to assist in the funding of management activities for the two MUMAs. (PD, p. 4)
- (ii) Sustainable Resource Use by the Productive Sectors: This component focuses on rendering the productive activities within the two MUMAs, especially those of the tourism and artisanal fishing sectors, more sustainable. (PD, p. 4)
- (iii) Improvement and Systematization of Information for Decision Making: This component addresses the critical need for better information to guide decision making, including biological data on sustainable fisheries levels by species and carrying capacity for coastal development, socio-economic data on local communities’ well-being and development, and regulatory information to facilitate inter-institutional coordination and community participation. (PD, p. 5)

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

There were no changes in the Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives.

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
----------------------	-----------------------------

This Project is consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area’s Strategic Objective 2 (SO-2) “To Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors”, given its focus on integrating conservation and sustainability measures into marine areas whose resources are the basis for economically and socially important fishing and tourism sectors.

The Project contributes to both Strategic Programmes SP-4 and SP-5. SP-4, “Strengthening the Policy & Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity”, is supported through the Project’s strong focus on consolidating a regulatory framework for the planning and management of the MUMAs that will allow for the ecologically- sustainable use of coastal and marine resources by the key productive sectors in the areas, namely fisheries and tourism. With respect to SP-5, “Fostering Markets for Biodiversity Goods and Services”, the project aims to create two new PES schemes for coastal and marine resources and contribute to the development of a corresponding strategy at the national level (currently limited to land-based ecosystems).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE does not provide an overall rating for effectiveness but instead provided ratings for each sub-component. This TER rates effectiveness as moderately unsatisfactory, because some important results originally expected from the Project have not been achieved. The absence of a public policy on marine and coastal ecosystems, the historically recognized confrontations between the executing agencies, namely; Costa Rican Institute for Fisheries and Aquaculture (INCOPECA) and Sistema Nacional de Areas de Conservacion (SINAC/MINAE) at the political level, and the authorities not willing to identify fields of action, are the main reasons why some intermediate and final results set by the Project have not been achieved. However, the project generated important results, including knowledge related to the Golfo de Nicoya and Pacifico Sur Multiple-Use Marine Areas new facilities built for INCOPECA, SINAC, and SNG at Golfo de Nicoya, and the efforts made to generate specialized knowledge. MarViva - through the Multiple-Use Marine Areas (MUMAs) strengthening strategy – also has managed to keep participants interested in and aware of the importance of protecting the gulfs and their ecosystems.

A summary of the project’s effectiveness, by component, is summarized below:

The project's first component - focused on strengthening of the Regulatory Framework and Local Capacities. The TE states that the indicator levels reached for this component reveal a high-performance level in terms of outputs, although intermediate and final results (effects and impact) of this component had deficits. The publication of the Executive Order to reform Multiple-Use Marine Areas, which was a key element to achieve other outputs, had not been achieved at the time of the evaluation. This has negatively affected the development of zoning proposals for the MUMAs. Business plans to ensure the financial sustainability of integral management activities in each MUMA as well as the pilot projects for Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) for the exploitation of marine resources were both formulated but not implemented due to financial risks. (TE, pg.22)

The second component; Sustainable Resource Use by the Productive Sectors has three sub-components: a) Sustainable Tourism, b) Artisanal Fisheries, and c) Alternative Livelihoods. Based on the reports provided by the project executing unit, has met almost at 100% the targets originally set for the outputs. At the time of the evaluation, 13 tourism operators had been certified and 8 were in the process of gathering evidence to obtain the certification; the target was 20 operators. A 300% increase in the number of hectares designated for responsible fishing is estimated to have been achieved - from 27,000 to 110,000 hectares. Seven new responsible fishing areas have been created with their relevant fishing management plans in place. The third sub-component related to economic alternatives reports a total of 13 community initiatives strengthened, of which 4 had already been operating in the Project's intervention area. The remaining 9 were led and managed through the Gulfs Project. Even if investments were appropriate and timely, at the time of the evaluation, some procedures related to concessions and permits were still pending, and, therefore, there was no evidences that those alternatives represent a replacement of income for families in the fishing business. (TE, pgs. 30-31)

Third component; Improvement and Systematization of Information for Decision Making: At the output level, three specific outputs have been established, namely: (i) All data for baseline indicators collected within 6 months of project start-up; (ii) Integrated information system for both MUMAs with adequate environmental, legal, institutional, and financial data, accessible on-line and sustainable operational arrangements for system clearly defined; (iii) Participatory monitoring program of the status of marine and coastal resources within the MUMAs is established and provides input to the integrated information system. The TE (pg. 37) could not possibly identify significant progress in terms of the expected results or effects as they are identified in the Results Framework. Except for one agreement executed between the Costa Rican Institute for Fisheries and Aquaculture (INCOPECA) and the National Coastguard Service (SNG), and incipient initiatives on the use of information shared by both institutions, there was no evidence pointing at the regular use of an integrated information system. The TE states that these institutions lacked enough technical staff specialized in data management and they were hardly interested in having additional information beyond their scope of activity.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE notes that at the time of evaluation, the first component on strengthening of the regulatory framework and local capacities had used 11.38 % of the project resources allocated to paying consulting contracts. It was the component with the least cost and, although the outputs and effects originally sought were not achieved by the time the Project ended, the Project completed a total of 20 large activities/outputs that were found to be consistent with a concept of sustainable development as expressed in the Project. Aspects critical to the component like the Multiple-Use Marine Areas (MUMA) zoning process (that would contribute to improving the de facto protection of existing conservation and marine protected areas), as well as the analysis of the institutions involved in the MUMAs, the development and implementation of sustainable financial mechanisms, and the allocation of two facilitators to the MUMA marine commissions consumed the largest proportion of the resources used in this component. (TE, pg.25)

The evaluation mission conducted within the scope of TE to assess sustainable resource use by the productive sectors identified the completion of 22 large activities supported by 18 consulting assignments. By the end of the Project, no activities were pending execution based on the work plan for the final year. There have been no significant delays in the service procurement processes carried out by the project executing unit, except for the process of identification, selection and final materialization of the productive projects executed under sub-component of Alternative Livelihoods which did suffer delays. (TE, pg.34)

TE indicates that activities in relation to “improvement and systematization of information for decision making” has consumed resources which were allocated to paying 15 professional service contracts (consulting services), which represents 19.84% of the total funds allocated to consulting contracts. The numbers are representative of “high levels of expenditure in consulting services and weaknesses in terms of the articulation between the different institutions in the use and management of integrated information systems”. (TE, Executive Summary)

Despite the resources allocated on the information systems aspect of the project, the TE could not identify significant progress in terms of the expected results or effects just like they are identified in the Results Framework. This was attributed to the institutions lacking interest and enough technical staff specialized in data management. Considering this and the delays in the Alternative Livelihood aspect of the second project component, this TER rates efficiency as “Moderately Satisfactory”

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

The TE rates the four dimensions of risks to project sustainability: financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental sustainability. The ratings do not include an explanation or the rationales for these assignments. This TER assesses the sustainability rating as Moderately Unlikely

- **Financial resources sustainability. Unlikely** The mechanisms proposed to cover the costs associated with the management of the Multiple-Use Marine Areas (MUMAs) with resources from sustainable financial mechanisms required modifications and the approval of their rules which according to the TE was not done during the project period. An indicator for Component 1-Two pilot projects for Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) for the exploitation of marine resources under execution- has also been on hold due to financial risks. (TE, pg.22)
- **Sociopolitical sustainability. Moderately Unlikely** As mentioned in the TE; “when it comes to the development and promotion of economic alternatives, Component 2 evidences weaknesses which are inherent to the local organizations, which threaten the sustainability of the Project and render the groups entrusted with the generation and management of productive alternatives highly vulnerable.” (TE Executive Summary). The TE also states (pg.36) that “the process for identifying and selecting the beneficiary groups of alternative projects should be coupled with a strategy for supporting those projects and rendering them sustainable. It is assumed that public institutions will continue to support those groups with training, technical assistance, and funds, but the design of the Gulfs Project did not contemplate a strategy to guarantee local governance sustainability. There is no evidence that commitments have been assumed by those institutions in this regard. “
- **Institutional framework and governance. Moderately Likely** The strategy utilized under Component 1 as well as the relevant tasks achieved on the preparation and search for governance conditions has been to strengthen the MUMAs. The TE states that “All the activities carried out are consistent with the work plans, and, as a non-expected result, the Gulfs Project has risen awareness on the management of marine areas and got this issue on the agenda of SINAC - which has traditionally not focused on this issue.”
- **Environmental sustainability. Unable to Assess** The TE does not explicitly address environmental risks to the project’s sustainability

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?

According to the TE, at the time of project completion only around 58% of the co-financing committed at the project approval has been realized. The TE does not provide an explanation as to why the co-financing was lower than expected.

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 project has shown slow progress with respect to planned activities for the first year. As of June 30th, 2012, the project had disbursed only 31.1 % (\$183,886) of the funding projected for the fiscal year 2011-2012. Based on the risk analysis in PIR 2012; delays in main project activities were attributed to difficulties by the executing unit in the timely preparation of terms of reference. The report indicated that more coordination was needed, compared to the beginning of the project, in the actions related to the preparation of terms of reference and to procurement processes among the executing unit, IDB, and SINAC.

At the end of the project, a 5-months additional extension of the project closing date was granted to September 26, 2016 in order to complete the project’s requirements such as the financial audit, final evaluation, etc. (PIR 2016)

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 Project Executing Unit (PEU) included governmental agencies along with the lead executing agency (NGO). As stated in TE pg.6 “The direct beneficiary is the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC), which is under the scope of authority of the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE), and Fundacion MarViva executed the project through a Project Executing Unit (PEU). In addition, co-financing and technical experience has been provided by entities such as the Costa Rican Institute for Fisheries and Aquaculture (INCOPECA), the Costa Rican Institute of Tourism (ICT), the National Coastguard Service (SNG), the Costa Rican Water and Sanitation Institute (AYA), and the Institute for Social Assistance (IMAS)”

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: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E design as highly satisfactory, noting that “M&E was adequately budgeted for at the project planning stage”, This TER rates M&E Design as moderately satisfactory, since the political aspect of the project and relevant risks were undermined in the design phase.

The Project Results Matrix, part of the Project Document approved by IDB, was reviewed and analyzed at a risks workshop held at the beginning of the Project with the institutions involved, the PEU and IDB. (TE, pg.15) The TE notes that, “the excessive optimism in certain assumptions implicit in the original design was not identified as a risk, especially those related to the political support from the Costa Rican government institutions, which negatively affected the results expected to be obtained by the Project right from its start”

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

The TE rates M&E execution as Highly Satisfactory. However, this, TER rates M&E implementation as Moderately Satisfactory, due to lack of precision of indicators in the results matrix and issues related to the reporting and monitoring of some project achievements.

According to the TE, The project prepared a total of 9 half-yearly progress reports over the Project's implementation period based on the results matrix. It's stated (on TE, pg.14) that “From the start of the Project until the second half of 2012, the progress reports prepared by the PEU contain an account of the progress and achievements made, as well as the difficulties faced, during the implementation of the Project. In the first half of 2013, the form of the reports changed and were structured based on the outcomes and indicators of each component. While this tool constitutes a results-based planning and management effort, it is still incipient, as it reveals ambiguities in both the way the indicators are formulated, and the ability to monitor their evolution over time.” The TE compared the indicators to the information included in the project reports and reached the following conclusions: (TE, pg. 15)

- The accounts on the progress of an indicator over time do not always refer to the same units of analysis. The reason for this is the ambiguity or lack of precision of the indicators included in the Project Results Matrix.
- There is confusion between the activities necessary to achieve a target and the reporting on the level of achievement of such target.
- The half-yearly reporting system does not allow getting the full picture of the indicators monitoring throughout the project life-cycle. The targets achieved in each report often disappear in the following one.

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 Satisfactory
--	--

The project implementing agency was the IDB. The TE does not provide a rating for IDB’s project implementation performance, however it concludes that the implementation of the project was complex due to its scope, impacts and execution mechanisms, and because it had a small Executing Unit made up by two people (a coordinator and an administrative assistant). A rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** is therefore found appropriate for quality of project implementation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

The project executing agency was Fundacion MarViva. According to the TE, “the Project had highly acceptable performance levels regarding the completion of activities, and it involved considerable efforts and expenses. The Project executed 100% of the resources planned. Each dollar spent on management enabled mobilizing 7 dollars in investments.” The technical expertise provided by MarViva has been found critical.

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 TE does not cite any specific environmental changes that occurred by the end of the project.

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 TE reports that a total of 13 community initiatives were strengthened, of which 4 had already been operating in the Project's intervention area. The remaining 9 are reportedly led and managed through the Gulfs Project. TE notes that “Even if investments were appropriate and timely, and (at the time this evaluation was conducted) the Project had concluded different works involving infrastructure and equipment, some procedures related to concessions and permits were still pending, and, therefore, there are no evidences that those alternatives represent a process of replacement of sources of income for families in the fishing business.” (TE, pg. 31)

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

A 300% increase in number of hectares for responsible fishing is estimated to have been achieved - from 27,000 to 110,000 hectares designated as responsible fishing areas.

b) Governance

Component 1 “Strengthening of the regulatory framework and local capacities” has facilitated preparation and search for governance conditions, despite lack of political support from the Government's institutional authorities (TE, Exec Summary)

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 cite any unintended impacts that occurred by the end of the project.

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.

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 TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. 43-44):

1. The approval of regulations such as laws, executive orders and institutional agreements, is beyond the control of the Project, and threatens the fulfillment of the indicators in connection with such approvals. It should be recognized that those are ambitious objectives that promote the strengthening of the

regulatory framework for MUMA management and, although the institutions involved made a great effort, it was not enough to get all the proposals submitted to their directors approved and signed.

2. The execution mechanisms established in the project document were conceived to keep procurement processes under control, but there should have been a balance between control and implementation in order to streamline the decision-making process.

3. The associations benefited by the Project seem to be initially organized and to have common interests - a situation which changed in some of them with the implementation of new productive projects and additional commitments and responsibilities related to the development of the initiatives. Differences have been detected among the members of the associations, and sub-groups have emerged. The lack of defined roles for the members of the associations causes disorder and hinders everyday decision making; the leaders of the associations take advantage of this and almost fully assume the administration of the projects, relegating the productive matters to the rest of the members.

4. It is critical to have a detailed knowledge of the organizational and operational aspects of the local associations that use the coastal and marine resources. The experience with the implementation of the productive projects shows that the associations that were supported and whose existing initiatives were improved by the Project are willing to assume new commitments and take on new tasks as part of their daily activities, which ensures the sustainability of the Project activities.

5. To increase the success in participatory processes related to fishermen and mollusk extractors, the activities should be carried out during the closed season, and those related to tourism operators should take place during the tourist low season.

6. At the technical level, the institutions involved evidenced great interest in the development of governance initiatives and proposals for managing the Multiple-Use Marine Areas; in spite of this, the results of the Project do not extend to the political arena as fast as necessary to get the relevant approvals. This situation limits the achievements and impacts of the Project.

7. The implementation of the Project was complex due to its scope, impacts and execution mechanisms, and because it had a small Executing Unit made up by two people (a coordinator and an administrative assistant). In future projects, at least 4 professionals with complementary profiles should be considered to integrate the PEU. The technical expertise provided by MarViva has been critical.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations, (pgs. 45-48).

- The resources available to a project need to be more concentrated, rather than scattered. It is advisable that future interventions should not have such an extensive coverage. Promoting pilot initiatives on alternative income management providing great local support and technical expertise on community development is critical to avoid ambiguity in the socio-productive initiatives and other local roles related to the protection and responsible management of resources.

- It is recommended that decision-makers and those responsible for managing the economic resources should re-assess the role of the civil society organizations (NGOs and academics) when it comes to the research, training and technical assistance necessary for integrated ecosystem management. A greater involvement of these players and better acceptance by the institutions involved is critical to exert political influence on the Government.
- It is recommended that technical work models and systems be adopted under a results-based management approach. The strategic and work plans of the MUMAs, as well as the community planning, should translate in a results-based culture that seeks changes in the institutional and social fabric, rather than the mere execution of activities or control of expenses.
- SINAC and the Vice-Ministry of Waters, Seas, Wetlands and Coasts should continue following up on the MUMA Executive Order in order to get it approved and published.
- The institutions represented at the MUMA Commissions should keep supporting the officers that use those Commissions as a space for discussion that promotes the analysis and coordination of joint actions related to the management of marine and coastal resources.
- The institutions that make up the Steering Committee should advance the proposals for agreements and regulations on specific uses generated and submitted by the Project to the relevant institutions.
- SINAC and the Vice-Ministry for Waters, Seas, Wetlands and Coasts should take the necessary steps for the Guide for Cetacean Monitoring and the Protocol for Marine Spatial Planning (both of which have a national scope) to be made official.
- The Marine Spatial Planning Proposals for the Golfo de Nicoya and Pacifico Sur MUMAs submitted by the Project to SINAC and the Vice-Ministry of Waters, Seas, Wetlands and Coasts need to be promoted by such institutions in order for them to be made official. They represent a joint effort where the parties involved agreed with the proposals. The proposals getting an official status will evidence a real commitment on the part of the Government.
- The institutions should use the updated MUMA Master Plans as an input and include proposed actions in their annual work plans to strengthen the management of marine and coastal and resources.
- SINAC and the Vice-Ministry for Water, Seas, Wetlands and Coasts should work in cooperation with MarViva, which is using own resources to promote the Bill for the Creation of the National Fund for Payment for Marine Ecosystem Services (FONASEMAR), so that the proposed financial mechanisms submitted to such institutions get implemented in the medium term.
- The Costa Rican Institute of Tourism (ICT) should continue promoting the certification of marine and coastal tourism operators. It should take advantage of the fact that 37 tourism operators participated in the training sessions. The efforts of the ICT should initially focus on the 9 tourism operators that completed the whole training but failed to prepare and submit their files for evaluation.
- INCOPECSA should continue implementing the Fishing Management Plans in the Responsible Fishing Areas (RFAs). To that end, the cooperation agreement between INCOPECSA and the organizations of the RFAs demarcated by the Project should get signed. The Project submitted said agreement to INCOPECSA and it is in the process of being signed.

- INCOPECA should follow up on the productive initiatives related to fishing and aquaculture developed by the Project.
- SINAC and INCOPECA should, as soon as possible, sign the agreement that regulates the use permit for the premises built by the Project in Cipanci. This will allow INCOPECA to occupy the premises, just as the National Coastguard System does.
- SINAC should take advantage of the agreements in place with Mision Tiburon and the organizations that conduct research on cetaceans to ensure the sustainability of the monitoring programs conducted by the Project.
- INCOPECA should adopt in its relevant office the Community-Based Fishing Monitoring program in order to continue with the initiatives developed by the Project and the fishermen groups in the MUMAs.
- In order to strengthen the ownership of the local productive projects, SINAC should transfer such projects to the beneficiary groups and consider donating the equipment used to monitor the MUMA coastal and marine resources (cetaceans, sharks and fish). It is recommended that the equipment be donated to the groups that participate in the monitoring.

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 report's assessment of outcomes and impacts at the component level was adequate, though lacks a comprehensive overall assessment	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report provides a summary ratings table at component level but has not been substantiated, lacking explanation for each of the ratings. Rationale behind several ratings seems missing in the overall text and although most of the ratings seemed correct, ratings on M&E performance seems inflated	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides information on sustainability of Component 1, however information on the other components and the overall project performance is scattered throughout the text and not clearly laid out. More information could have been provided on environmental sustainability	UA
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project includes actual total project costs including actual co-financing used. Actual GEF resources has been broken down at the component level, however that representation is missing for the co-financing	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE provides information on the M&E mechanisms, however more clarity and explanation are needed to distinguish between M&E design and implementation	MU
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).

No additional sources were used.