

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3271	
GEF Agency project ID		P104225	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Regional Activities of the Strategic Partnership for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in the Large Marine Ecosystems of Sub-Saharan Africa, Tranche 1 ¹	
Country/Countries		Regional	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Operational Program 8- Waterbody-based Operational Program	
Executing agencies involved		African Union, United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization (FAO) & World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		WWF as executing agency	
Private sector involvement		None mentioned	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 16, 2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 9 th , 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 1, 2010	
Actual date of project completion		February 29 th , 2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1	.648
Co-financing	IA own	.225	NA
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	.105	NA
Total GEF funding		1.0	0.648
Total Co-financing		0.33	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.33	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 6 th , 2013	
Author of TE		Beula Selvadurai & John Virdin	
TER completion date		2/2/2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	

¹ This is one project under the umbrella "Strategic Partnership for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in the Large Marine Ecosystems of Sub-Saharan Africa (2093)

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)
--

Caroline Laroche

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

*TE is final PIR

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of this project is “to reverse the depletion of fisheries in the Large Marine Ecosystems (LME)s of Sub-Saharan Africa, and to assist the individual coastal countries bordering these Large Marine Ecosystems to meet the fisheries and poverty reduction targets set by the (World Summit on Sustainable Development) WSSD targets.” (Project 2093 GEF Partnership Brief 09/29/05 p.9) This project supports the global environmental objectives of parent project 2093, SP-SFIF: Strategic Partnership for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in the Large Marine Ecosystems, which shares the same Global Environmental Objective.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objectives of this project were to:

- 1) “Strengthen regional coordination in order to ensure complementarity among country-level and regional projects, particularly in respect to management of trans-boundary resources”
- 2) “Promote learning and information exchange at the regional level to ensure that the lessons from successes and failures of country and Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) level investments are adequately disseminated and can provide examples that will align Governments and stakeholders around a common understanding of the fisheries reforms necessary to meet the (World Summit on Sustainable Development) WSSD targets”
- 3) “Encourage long-term and sustainable financial support in the (Sub-Saharan Africa) SSA countries for the necessary governance (i.e. policy, legal, and institutional) reforms and sector adjustments to manage their fisheries sustainably in a way that ensures a distribution of benefits that will contribute to poverty reduction and food security”
- 4) “Assist individual coastal countries to build the capacity to participate in the ongoing GEF-led Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) projects and regional fisheries bodies (RFBs) as well as collaborate through these initiatives to implement management measure for the marine ecosystems and the trans-boundary fisheries resources and/or fishing fleets that would be more appropriate at the sub-regional scale (e.g. sub regional monitoring, control and surveillance

systems, management of fishing capacity, sub-regional research initiatives, networks of marine protected areas (MPAs), etc.” (revised project proposal 4-19-07 p.4)

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

There were no changes to Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation.

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 relevant to the GEF under Operational Program 8, Waterbody-Based operational program, as well as GEF-4 targets under International Waters Strategic Objectives IW#1: Catalyze implementation of agreed reforms and on-the ground stress reduction investments to address transboundary water concerns and IW #2: Expand foundational capacity-building to a limited number of new transboundary systems through integrated approaches and foster replication through targeted learning for the international waters portfolio.

The project is relevant to the region as it is part of a larger GEF-led sub-regional Large Marine Ecosystems project and helps the countries meet their obligations as members of Regional Fisheries Bodies.

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

The TE rated both progress toward achieving grant objectives and progress with implementation of Grant Financed activities as satisfactory, which this TER downgrades to Moderately Satisfactory, as two of the project’s four main components were only partially achieved. The MSP helped the African Union (AU) to develop capacity to advocate for fisheries governance reforms through participation in the first Conference of African Ministers of Fisheries and Aquaculture (CAMFA), and to establish a permanent Fisheries Unit within the AU. A common fisheries policy for the AU was not completed during the project, although the process was begun, and scheduled to continue through AU financing (TE p.4)

Achievements under the projects components are as follows:

Establishment of a core group of fisheries specialists in Africa: The TE implementation rating for this component was satisfactory. According to the TE, this has been completed, and a draft network has been prepared. (TE p.3)

Support to AU for development of fisheries policy: The TE implementation rating for this component was moderately satisfactory. A common fisheries policy for the AU was not completed during the project, although the process was begun and is scheduled to continue through AU financing. A concept note for a common Africa fisheries policy was prepared. (TE p.3)

Support for national fisheries policies and sector strategies in 2 to 3 countries as pilots: The TE implementation rating for this component was satisfactory. The project’s planned output was to prepare new fisheries policies in at least 2 or 3 countries as case studies. By the end of the project, the AU had helped several countries identify key fisheries policy reforms as a basis for future investment, including Cameroon, Comoros, Gabon, Mozambique and Seychelles. (TE p.3)

Coordinating lessons learned from GEF, World Bank and other donor investments in fisheries in Africa: The TE implementation rating for this component was moderately satisfactory. The AU produced a description of lessons learned from the strategic partnership to date. (TE p.4) The 2010 PIR noted that several communication materials and briefs had been prepared, but awareness-raising activities were delayed due to the change in communications specialist. (PIR 2010) The 2011 PIR notes that progress had improved with the new communications specialist, and that the organization had been working regularly with the African Union to produce and circulate communications products on the importance of fisheries in Africa and efforts of the Partnership initiative, including newsletters, a website and various brochures and pamphlets. (PIR 2011 p.2)

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: UA
-----------------------	------------

There is not enough information on project efficiency to assess. Efficiency is rated as satisfactory in the terminal evaluation but no supporting information is provided. (TE p.6) In the PIRs there are some limited mentions of problems with efficiency. For example in the 2009 PIR, overall progress is rated as moderately unsatisfactory, and it is noted that WWF has had difficulty as the communications specialist recruited had resigned and moved, and the vacancy remained opened. It notes that “the organization has not made sufficient progress in completing recruitment and implementing the grant.” (PIR 2009 p.2) By the 2010 PIR the position had been filled and WWF had begun to make progress in implementing the grant, but it remained behind schedule. (PIR 2010 p.3)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: UA
---------------------------	------------

There is insufficient information provided in the TE and project documents to rate project sustainability. This being said, there is some positive evidence of sustainability, chiefly that the AU has established permanent staff in fisheries for the first time as a result of this grant, and that the GEF has approved a follow on grant. (TE p.5)

Financial Resources: Likely The TE notes that a follow-on grant of US\$2.5 million from the GEF was awarded (TE p.5) making financial sustainability likely. Additionally the grant “has contributed to leveraging over \$300,000 in new resources from the African Union for fisheries”, also a positive sign for financial sustainability.

Sociopolitical: There is not sufficient evidence to rate sociopolitical sustainability.

Institutional framework and governance: Likely As a result of this project, AU established permanent staff in fisheries, making it likely that both capacity within the AU and efforts in this area will continue. (TE p.5)

Environmental: There is not sufficient evidence to rate environmental 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?

No information on co-financing is provided. The TE mentions that the grant contributed to leveraging over \$300,000 in resources from the African Union for fisheries, however it is unclear whether this is co-financing, or funds committed for follow on activities.

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 TE mentions a delayed start. Additionally, although the project was completed two years later than expected, there is no or explanation of the extension in the TE, PIRs, or other project documents.

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:

No information on country ownership is given in the TE or other project documents, thus this TER is unable to assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability.

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 Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE does not assign a rating for M&E design at entry, although it assigns a rating of “Satisfactory” to Monitoring and Evaluation as a whole. This TER assigns a rating of MU, due to the lack of discussion of monitoring responsibilities, and the few indicators given which are specific to the project.

The project document states that this project will contribute to the larger results and results indicators included in the overall results framework for the parent project, and as such provides only three process indicators specific to this project:

- “Awareness of recent developments and proven approaches to management for sustainable fisheries, of the status of global fisheries, and of the dialogue between developing and developed countries and distant water fishing interests on sharing benefits promoted in at least 75% of all Sub-Saharan African countries.
- Examples of support for sector strategy design and development of tactical programs to implement the sector strategy documented and distributed to all sub-Saharan countries.
- Examples of programs to effectively provide more remunerative alternative employment to fishermen (including creation of vocational training, education, micro-credit programs and the introduction of social security programs) documented and distributed to all sub-Saharan countries.” (Strategic Partnership Regional MSP Brief, p.11)

The Monitoring and Evaluation budget provided in the project document is 75,000\$. The project document states that the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) will conduct an independent evaluation monitor the success of the strategic partnership (p.15)

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

Not enough information is provided to assess M&E Implementation. The TE rates Monitoring and Evaluation as Satisfactory, but provides no discussion to support this rating.

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: UA
--	------------

Project management (by the implementing agency) was rated as moderately unsatisfactory in the 2009 PIR, and rated as Satisfactory in the final TE. However, as no discussion was given, this TER is unable to assess quality of project implementation.

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

There is no discussion of the performance of the project's executing agencies, African Union, United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization (FAO) & World Wildlife Fund (WWF), in the TE. A critical issue noted in the 2009 PIR was slow recruitment of the Coordinator/Fisheries advisor for the partnership at the AU, which had hindered implementation. (PIR 2009 p.2)

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.

There was no evidence of environmental change by project end.

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.

There is no evidence of socioeconomic change by project end.

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 network of fisheries specialists in the African Union has been established and is undertaking supervision and learning exchanges with ongoing projects and governments. (TE p.3)

The grant has supported work of the AU with NEPAD in hosting the first Conference of African Ministers of Fisheries and Aquaculture (CAMFA) in 2010, and supported a number of regional fisheries consultations with stakeholder to identify areas for fisheries policy reform. (TE p.2)

b) Governance

This grant led to the establishment of a fisheries unit in the AU's Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (IBAR) office, and the recruitment of at least one Fisheries Officer with AU financing.

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.

No unintended impacts were reported.

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 project contributed to mainstreaming fisheries issues into the African Union, with the establishment of a fisheries unit in the AU. The project has helped countries including Cameroon, Comoros, Gabon, Mozambique and Seychelles identify fisheries policy reforms as a basis for future investment. (TE p.3)

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.

Strengthening the capacity of the AU as well as other regional partners to support healthier fisheries that can help reduce poverty is a good investment. In this project, the AU was able to help elevate fisheries in the policy dialogue, particularly in the context of food security, and is increasingly drawing lessons from specific Bank investments in fisheries that can be replicated elsewhere. In terms of communicating results and encouraging replication and wider policy uptake throughout the region, investing in AU capacity and other regional partners is a valuable use of resources. (TE p.5)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

There is a wealth of new efforts on the ground in Africa to reform the way fisheries are governed and managed, and important lessons to be learned, as well as successes to be replicated. The need also

exists for continued local expertise in fisheries governance that can help draw out lessons and disseminate them widely. (TE p.6)

The World Bank's Africa Fisheries Program is growing and is a key piece of the Bank's support to the continent's food security and coastal poverty reduction. Efforts to elevate the results of the project to a regional dialogue and communicate success are essential to the wider portfolio. The World Bank is well placed to support efforts to rebuild Africa's fisheries. (TE p.6)

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?	Relevant outputs and outcomes are discussed, but discussion is very brief with little support provided.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent but ratings are not well substantiated. The whole TE is only 7 pages long.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Compelling evidence of financial and institutional sustainability is provided, but no evidence of socioeconomic or environmental sustainability is given.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are not comprehensive. Only one is given, although it is supported by the evidence presented.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No discussion of co-financing is provided.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	No discussion of the project's M&E system is provided	HU
Overall TE Rating		U

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

The Project document for this project's parent project 2093, 10-07-05, was consulted.