

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID	3254		
GEF Agency project ID	3820		
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-4		
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP		
Project name	Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel Across the Production Landscape		
Country/Countries	Seychelles		
Region	Africa		
Focal area	Biodiversity		
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	BD-2; BD-4		
Executing agencies involved	Ministry of Environment		
NGOs/CBOs involvement			
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	December 12, 2007		
Effectiveness date / project start	December 21, 2007		
Expected date of project completion (at start)	January 31, 2013		
Actual date of project completion	November 2014		
Project Financing			
	At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)	
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant	2	1.9	
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	2.9	18.5
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	2.5	2.6
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding	2	1.9	
Total Co-financing	5.1	21.1	
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	7.1	23	
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date	December 2014		
Author of TE	José Antonio Cabo Buján		
TER completion date	January 7, 2016		
TER prepared by	Laura Nissley		
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	S	S	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	--	ML	--	ML
M&E Design	--	S	--	MS
M&E Implementation	--	HS	--	S
Quality of Implementation	--	S	--	MS
Quality of Execution	--	S	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project were as follows: “The Seychelles is a repository of globally significant marine and terrestrial diversity. The importance of the terrestrial component of biodiversity is amplified by the fact that the rate of endemism is high. Some taxa are threatened or endangered, in particular the higher plants, birds, turtles, amphibians and invertebrates. The marine biodiversity is still largely unknown. The goal of the project is to secure the functional integrity of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems of the Seychelles. Much of the sensitive biodiversity in the Seychelles is already under some form of protection or maintenance but the main threats to biodiversity emanate from the production sectors and trade. The project is mainly designed to counter the threats to biodiversity from colonization by invasive alien species across the landscape. It attempts to address this threat through prevention and control of introduction and spread of IAS, which is linked with increasing trade, and the movement of persons and goods through the travel and tourism industries” (PD pg. 56).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was “Increased capacities to prevent and control the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species through trade, travel and transport across the production landscape” (PD pg. 33).

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

The 2010 PIR notes that the wording of Outcome 3 was changed from *Improved knowledge and learning capacities to control the introduction, establishment and spread of Invasive Alien Species* to *Improved knowledge and learning capacities for the management of Invasive Alien Species*. The 2010 PIR notes that the wording was changed during the Inception Workshop as the “previous wording was felt restrictive, and not inclusive of all aspects of IAS, e.g. mitigation, eradication, etc.” (section “adjustments,” row 18).

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 provides a rating of “relevant” for this aspect of project outcomes. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project aims to mainstream biodiversity management objectives into the activities of two production sectors in the Seychelles, tourism and artisanal fisheries. The project is therefore consistent with the GEF second Strategic Priority for the Biodiversity Focal Area, *Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Production Sectors and Landscapes* (PD pg. 2). The project also aims to establish a knowledge management network to inform the design of management controls on Invasive Alien Species (IAS), which contributes to GEF’s fourth Strategic Priority for the Biodiversity Focal Area, *Generation, Dissemination, and Uptake of Good Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues* (PD pg. 42).

The project is also consistent with the Seychelles’s national plans for environmental management and biodiversity conservation. In particular, the *Second Seychelles Environmental Management Plan 2000-2010* (EMPS), which coordinates and mainstreams development efforts across sectors, including IAS. In addition, the Seychelles is a signatory to the *Convention for Biological Diversity*, a multilateral environmental agreement promoting awareness and mainstreaming of IAS considerations in national and sector policies. Overall however, the Seychelles lacked a comprehensive policy on IAS and legal framework, both of which the project sought to address (TE, section 2.3, pgs. 1-2)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project largely achieved key expected outcomes of the project, including the approval of a new comprehensive biosecurity policy and the enactment of a new legal framework that complies with international standards. A biosecurity service was also established and functioning by the end of the project. A few project components were not fully realized by the end of the project, including the cost-recovery mechanism for the biosecurity system and the establishment of a national body to coordinate knowledge management and information sharing.

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

- **Outcome 1:** Policy and regulatory framework for effective control of the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species in place:

Expected results under this outcome included (1) an overarching and comprehensive IAS policy developed, (2) national legislative framework dealing with IAS amended and brought in line with international standards, (3) cost-recovery system for "Biosecurity Service" is in place, and (4) national communication plan/public awareness strategy on IAS management developed and implemented. The first two results under this outcome were achieved. In 2012, a biosecurity policy focused on prevention was approved by the council of ministers. In 2014, the Plant and Animal Biosecurity Act was enacted, regulating the entry of animal and plant pests and diseases into the Seychelles and their movement internally. The law also provided for a Biosecurity Agency tasked with enforcement (TE, section 2.3, pgs. 2-4).

The third and fourth results under this outcome were less successful. In terms of the cost-recovery system, the project did not achieve its goal of recovering up to 30% of the Biosecurity Agency's costs. The fees and fines collected through the enforcement of the new law went into a general consolidated fund and did not necessarily feed back into the agency. Moreover, the budget for Plant and Animal Health Services shrank from \$480,000 to \$300,000. The final result, the national communication plan/public awareness strategy, was moderately successful. The TE notes that the project undertook awareness raising measures such as biosecurity posters, magazine articles, television and radio programs, documentaries, webpage, and events. A survey of 117 travelers to Seychelles revealed that most were aware of the impact of IAS. However, under one-fifth of those surveyed noted they had read the promotional materials and up to 20% admitted to bringing in restricted items (TE, section 2.3, pgs. 5-7)

- **Outcome 2:** Strengthened institutional capacity to prevent and control the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species:

Expected results under this outcome included (1) Biosecurity Service created, and (2) Biosecurity Service equipped and staffed with capacitated human resources. In 2009, Plant and Animal Health Services (PAHS) under the Seychelles Agricultural Agency, was established as the biosecurity agency. The TE notes that the project significantly contributed to developing the capacities of PAHS officials, as well as Customs and Civil Aviation Authority officials. A new biosecurity manual was developed, along with a corporate strategy. The project also secured two new x-ray screening machines and developed a new arrival declaration card with biosecurity questions. The TE does note some institutional gaps, including insufficient budget, staff, and facilities (TE, section 2.3, pgs. 8-12; 16).

- **Outcome 3:** Improved knowledge and learning capacities for the management of Invasive Alien Species:

Expected results under this outcome included (1) IAS baseline established, and (2) lessons learned and best practices on IAS eradication and control, and habitat restoration established

and disseminated. In 2009, a National IAS Baseline report was developed on the distribution, status, and impacts of numerous plant and animal species. A review of all documented control and eradication measures in the Seychelles was also produced. Five independent studies on IAS and control methods were financed. Progress was made to establish a National Invasive Alien Species Committee (NIASC) to coordinate knowledge management and information sharing, however it was not yet active by project end. The project funded the start-up of a web-based database, however it was also not active by the end of the project (TE, section 2.3, pgs. 12-14).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The project experienced delays during the first two years of implementation largely due to challenges setting up the project management unit and recruiting qualified staff and consultants. The TE notes that these delays affected the achievement of targets in the early years of the project (TE, section 2.2, pg. 5). Delays were also experienced later in the project when the project manager passed away, causing a significant slowdown in activities and expenditures (TE, section 2.4, pg. 20). As a result, the project received two no-cost extensions in order to achieve outcomes, shifting the expected completion date from 2012 to 2014. However, the TE found the project’s strategy to be cost-effective, noting that the “prevention of IAS is significantly more cost-efficient than engaging in eradication or control efforts after their introduction” (TE, section 2.4, pg. 29).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for sustainability, and this TER concurs based on an assessment of risks to financial resources and institutional frameworks and governance.

Financial Resources

This TER rates the sustainability of financial resources as **Moderately Likely**. At the time of the evaluation, the budget of the biosecurity agency (Plant and Animal Health Services) was rated by officials as insufficient to carry out its responsibilities. However, the TE does note potential sources of funding, including a new performance-based budgeting approach being piloted with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Industry. In addition, the newly approved Seychelles National Agriculture Investment Program (2015-2020) includes a program on biosecurity and a dedicated budget for preventing damages to local production from pests. UNDP is also supporting another project, Biofin, which promotes mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into budgets (TE, section 2.5. pgs. 1-3).

Sociopolitical

The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess sociopolitical sustainability.

Institutional Framework and Governance

This TER rates the sustainability of the institutional framework and governance as **Moderately Likely**. As a result of the project, the institutions and governing frameworks for biosecurity in the Seychelles have been significantly strengthened. The TE does note that a greater degree of cooperation is needed between relevant government institutions in order to enforce biosecurity services. In addition, there is room for further development of coordination and advisory bodies, such as the National Invasive Alien Species Committee (NIASC) (TE, section 2.5, pg. 4).

Environmental

The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess environmental sustainability. The TE does note that project outcomes would be at risk if invasive species populations increased, however it does not provide any indication of how likely this is to occur (TE, section 2.5, pg. 5). Moreover, the Management Response to the TE notes that the particular invasive species cited by the TE, *Acanthaster planci*, is highly unlikely to be transported as it dies quickly out of water (pg.6).

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 TE estimates that actual co-financing (\$21.1 million) was significantly higher than expected co-financing (\$5.1 million). However, both the Midterm Review (2012) and the TE note that co-financing information was vague and unreliable. The project management unit had difficulty getting co-financing information data from some of the project partners and lacked an effective system for tracking what data they did collect (Midterm Review pg. 10; TE, section 2.4., pg. 27). The TE does not directly address the effect of the significant increase in co-financing on the outcomes of the project.

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 experienced significant delays at start-up and during implementation which resulted in an extension of the completion date from 2012 to 2014. The initial set-up of the project management structures took longer than expected. In addition, the project had difficulty navigating the government's rules for the approval of job placements and replacements of civil servants, affecting recruitment of project staff. Lastly, the project manager passed away in 2013, which significantly slowed down project

activities. However, with the no-cost extensions, the project was able to largely achieve its expected outcomes.

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:

Country ownership over the project appears to have been significant. The government contributed over \$18 million in co-financing for the project, and Project Management Unit was housed under the Ministry of the Environment. The government was a key partner in developing and approving the biosecurity policy; enacting the Plant and Animal Biosecurity Act; and establishing the Biosecurity Agency.

However, the TE did find that the Project Coordination Unit was generally perceived to be “external” by government partners. Additionally, representatives from the Ministry of Environment were often absent from project steering committee meetings. The TE surmises this was because the biosecurity agency was housed under the Ministry of Natural Resources (formerly the Ministry of Agriculture), causing tensions between the two ministries which had divergent views on how the project should be implemented (TE, section 2.2, pg. 2).

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 provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The results framework outlined in the project design was sound and logical, and the product of an extensive problem analysis and stakeholder analysis. The results framework was complete and included baseline values, midterm and end of project targets, data sources, and associated risks and assumptions. However, the midterm review rightly notes that the majority of the indicators were not SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely) and tended to be worded more like results statements than indicators (i.e. new overarching and comprehensive policy on IAS implemented) (Midterm Review, pg. 31). The TE also noted two outcome-level indicators that were particularly

problematic as they did not capture changes that could be specifically attributed to the project (TE, section 2.2, pg. 4).¹

The M&E plan on the other hand was appropriate for the project and outlined relevant M&E activities, responsible parties, associated costs, and timeframe for execution. The M&E plan also included provisions for a project inception workshop during which staff would review the results framework, set targets for the first year, establish roles and responsibilities, and become familiar with UNDP-GEF M&E requirements. A budget of \$136,000 was allocated for M&E activities (excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses. (PD pgs. 101-107).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The Midterm Review concluded that project monitoring was regularly undertaken by the project team (pg. 47). A review of the PIRs confirms that the project had a functioning M&E system where data was regularly collected and analyzed. The TE also notes that project reports were complete and project performance ratings were based on data (TE, section 2.2, pg. 5). The TE did find that insufficient data was collected for three indicators measuring IAS expenditure, threatened species status change, and awareness on biosecurity (TE pg. 9). Additionally, the midterm review was postponed due to the delays in project implementation noted above. There is evidence however that the project did accept some of the recommendations provided at midterm and adapt the project strategy accordingly (TE, section 2.2, pg. 5). The 2011 PIRs also notes that UNDP organized a training for the Project Coordination Unit on results-based management (pg. 29).

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.

¹ The two indicators which the TE identified as weak were (1) amount spent from non-government sector on IAS control, and (2) management and traveling public, tourism operators, importers and shipping agent aware of risks of IAS and need for biosecurity.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for “implementing agency execution,” which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation. As noted above, the project design was logically sound although the indicators provided for measuring performance were weak. The UNDP Country Office was located in Mauritius and the Program Manager regularly traveled to the Seychelles to monitor project implementation (2011 PIR, pg. 4). The 2010 PIR does note however staffing issues at the UNDP/GEF Program Coordination Unit contributed to project slow down at key times. For half of the 2010 reporting period, the project was managed by consultants as neither the Project Coordination Unit nor the UNDP/GEF Program Coordination Unit had a manager on staff (“IPRating” section, row 18).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Marginally Satisfactory** for “executing agency execution.” This TER, which uses a different scale, assigns a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project execution. Project execution was managed by the Project Coordination Unit housed under the Ministry of Environment. A Project Steering Committee, composed of key project stakeholders, met on a quarterly basis to advise the project. As noted above, the project did experience delays and staffing issues throughout the life of the project which affected the timely delivery of outcomes. However, some of these factors were outside of the control of the executing agency, such as the unexpected passing of the project manager. The Program Coordination Unit did try to implement measures to mitigate these challenges as well, such as hiring a part-time Biosecurity Advisor to perform management tasks (TE, section 2.4, pg. 20). The TE does also note that the project did not have any significant shortcomings related to the disbursement of funds or procurement processes (TE pg. 11).

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 analysis provided in the TE suggests that the status of terrestrial organisms threatened by alien species in the Seychelles improved under the project (2009-2014) as compared to before the project (1996-2008). However, the TE is careful to note that the analysis does not take into consideration uncertainties involved in the threatened status and the relative importance of IAS as a threat (TE, section 2.3, pgs. 16-18).

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 does not cite any socioeconomic changes that occurred by the end of the project.

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 TE notes that the project played a significant role in strengthening the technical and institutional capacities of the Biosecurity Agency. In particular, training has contributed to improved inspection of passenger and trader goods. In addition, an emergency response plan and operational manuals have been developed and are in use, strengthening the capacity of the Biosecurity Agency to assess the risks posed by traded commodities and determine the appropriate emergency response to the introduction of new IAS (TE, section 2.3, pg. 15).

b) Governance

The TE notes that the project has contributed toward strengthening the institutions and governing frameworks for biosecurity in the Seychelles. In 2012, a biosecurity policy focused on prevention was approved by the council of ministers. In 2014, the Plant and Animal Biosecurity Act was enacted, regulating the entry of animal and plant pests and diseases into the Seychelles and their movement internally. The project contributed toward establishing a Biosecurity Agency for enforcing and coordinating IAS control activities (TE, section 2.3, pgs. 2-4).

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.

An unintended impact of the project was the ascension of the Seychelles into the World Trade Organization. As mentioned above, project activities facilitated the enactment of the Plant and Animal Biosecurity Act in 2014. Aligning the legal framework with internationally recognized standards – the International Plant Protection Convention and World Organization for Animal Health guidelines—strengthened Seychelles’s negotiating position in the membership process (TE pg. 9; section 2.3, pg. 4)

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 does not cite any initiatives that have been mainstreamed, replicated, or scaled up by project end.

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 states the following lessons learned (pgs. 13-14):

- Project LFA indicators and its monitoring are critical to establish progress towards development objectives and therefore constitute the primary tool for adaptive management. Hence, at design and inception, it is necessary to rigorously test all indicators against SMART quality standards, particularly specificity, i.e. to establish if any factor other than the project can cause changes of the indicator variable.
- Awareness strategies should have clearly defined objectives and target groups, as well as measuring mechanisms, i.e. the indicators and the methods to collect information e.g. surveys, as well as be provided with sufficient budget to cover the costs of monitoring. Failing to do that denies stakeholders the possibility of learning what strategies are most cost-effective for what awareness objectives. Strategic, specific investment in awareness, would likely yield better results than general, diluted messages.
- As recruitments constraints are nothing new in SIDS context, contingency plans to avoid halts in project delivery could be developed by designating deputy project managers, pre-identification of experts, and signature of memoranda of understanding with implementing partners.

However, it must be noted that the PCU and the UNDP did in fact implement all the measures mentioned above, including signing agreements with both the Department of Environment and the Seychelles Agricultural Agency and interim covering vacant positions by reassigning tasks of the remaining staff.

- Accounting of expenditure should be consistent with budgeting. Mechanism to ensure this are, at project design, double check budget accounts and budget notes, and, during implementation coordinate expenditure accounting between UNDP and project implementation unit and keep documentation on “expenditure notes” to enable to track down project costs to activities.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE states the following recommendations (pgs. 12-13):

- Current confusion among some key stakeholders, particularly institutional actors on their roles and responsibilities under the Biosecurity Act, including membership, roles and functions of the National Biosecurity Committee should be immediately addressed through awareness and communication measures.
- The Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Environment, with the support of the PCU should seek funding to further training and studies for staff from the biosecurity agency. This can not only be an important factor in bringing in critically needed skills and know how, but can also serve to motivate and increase visibility and prestige of the biosecurity agency.
- Efforts should be made to disseminate the knowledge products generated by the project, with active engagement of the PCU, the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Environment. Key results in this endeavor would be finalizing the installation of the IAS database, promoting the activation of the National Invasive Alien Species Subcommittee (of the NBC) and incorporating the project’s research results in the communication actions of government and non-government actors.
- Support must be given to a more needs-based allocation of budgets for biosecurity service functions, involving a better coordination among the agencies and departments involved and making use of the new budget allocation mechanism, i.e. performance-based budget allocation and mid-term expenditure framework. Also, fees and fines included in the Biosecurity Act should be reviewed to more accurately reflect the costs incurred by the biosecurity service. The potential economic impacts of violation of the Biosecurity Act may reach enormous proportions, e.g. in the case of introduction of agricultural pests or accidental introduction of rats or parasites to outer islands. Hence, strict enforcement of a system of fines correlated with the damage cost is unrealistic and it could be even counterproductive if investments are scared away. Hence, the possibility of setting aside a fund or a liability insurance for agricultural, trade and tourism operators should be studied.

- Include species with high risks of “invasiveness” such as *Acanthaster planci* in the list of regulated IAS to be included as one of the administrative provisions of the Biosecurity Act. This will likely prompt relevant government agencies to provide the necessary support to include monitoring and treatment of these species in management protocols.

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 is comprehensive. The information is presented in a systematic way, congruent with the project design.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. The evidence provided is convincing, however the evaluator could have included more indicator data in their analysis. This may have been available in an annex that this TER did not have access to.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section had some information gaps, particularly regarding sociopolitical and environmental risks. In addition, the management response to the TE challenges some of the report's assertions (i.e. likelihood of a specific invasive species being transported).	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations are comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides actual project costs and actual co-financing used. However, the exact figures vary by a small degree (most likely inconsistencies in rounding).	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides an extensive assessment of the M&E design, however more information could have been provided on implementation.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

Midterm Review (2012) and Management Response to TE (2015)