

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		340	
GEF Agency project ID		UNDP: 810, World Bank: 63717	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP, UNEP, World Bank	
Project name		Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden	
Country/Countries		Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Sudan, Yemen	
Region		Africa, Asia	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF OP-9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area	
Executing agencies involved		Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea & Gulf of Aden (PERSGA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		n/a	
Private sector involvement		n/a	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 10, 1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 21, 1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 2003	
Actual date of project completion		June 30, 2005	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	340,000	247,589
	Co-financing	270,000	270,000
GEF Project Grant		19,000,000	7,922,452
Co-financing	IA/EA own	4,600,000	0
	Government	2,000,000	2,000,000
	Other*	11,000,000	1,305,000
Total GEF funding		19,340,000	8,170,041
Total Co-financing		17,870,000	3,575,000
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		37,210,000	11,745,041
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		April 2004	
TE submission date		April 2004	
Author of TE		Meriwether Wilson, Lucien Chabason, & Tarek Genena	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Antonio del Monaco	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		John Soussan	
Revised TER (2014) completion date			
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	3.5 out of 4 (HS)	n/a	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	2.95 out of 4 (S)	n/a	U
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	n/a	U
M&E Implementation	n/a	2.78 out of 4 (S)	n/a	MU
Quality of Implementation	n/a	3.52 out of 4 (HS)	n/a	MU
Quality of Execution	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective is to "improve coastal and marine environments of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden," which "contain some of the world's most important coastal and marine environments and resources" (Project Appraisal Document, page 6). The marine region's varied topography gives rise to a high level of biodiversity with many unique species. Although it "is still one of the least disturbed seas relative to other enclosed international water bodies," the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden suffer from a wide range of transboundary environmental threats, including overexploitation of fisheries, habitat destruction from coastal development, and pollution from maritime transport. This project would "safeguard the coastal and marine environments of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden and ensure sustainable use of its resources" (TE, page iv).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objectives are as follows, listed by component and sub-component:

1. Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation
 - a. Strengthening the institutional capacity of the PERSGA secretariat (Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea & Gulf of Aden)
 - b. Enhancing regional cooperation
 - c. Developing a sustainable financing and resource mobilization strategy
2. Reduction of Navigation Risks and Maritime Pollution
 - a. Navigation working group
 - b. Implementation of international conventions
 - c. Port state control
 - d. Hydrographic surveys
 - e. Routing measures
 - f. Navigation aids
 - g. Contingency plans
 - h. Marine Emergency Mutual Aid Center and oil pollution response facilities
 - i. Port rules, Global Maritime Distress and Safety System, accident and incident investigations

3. Sustainable Use and Management of Living Marine Resources
 - a. Promote capacity building for sustainable management of living marine resources
 - b. Develop a sustainable management strategy for transboundary stocks and invertebrates
 - c. Establish the legal and policy framework for conservation and sustainable management of living marine resources
4. Habitat and Biodiversity Conservation
 - a. Promote capacity building for sustainable management of habitats and biodiversity at the regional and national levels across the RSGA area
 - b. Develop regional conservation action plans for key species, e.g. seabirds and marine turtles
 - c. Develop regional conservation action plans for key habitats, e.g. coral reefs, mangroves and seagrass
 - d. Assist in the establishment of legal and policy framework for conservation of habitats and biodiversity
5. Development of a Regional Network of Marine Protected Areas
 - a. Establishment of a regional network of experts specialized in MPA planning and management
 - b. Increased human capacity in MPA management through regional training and exchange programs
 - c. Effective implementation of a network of representative MPAs.
 - d. Completion of site-specific management plans, supported by detailed habitat, biodiversity and resource use surveys, and public consultation
 - e. Commitment from the respective Governments
 - f. Establishment of a process of regular regional review meetings with exchange of data, information and management expertise
6. Support for Integrated Coastal Zone Management
 - a. Regional networking
 - b. Regional training and exchange program
 - c. Geographic information systems
 - d. Model Integrated Coastal Zone Management plans
7. Enhancement of Public Awareness and Participation
 - a. Capacity building for PAP regional network members
 - b. Raising PERSGA profile at the regional and international level
 - c. Raising awareness of PERSGA SAP in the general public and decision makers
 - d. Development of environmental education
8. Monitoring and Evaluation of Program Impacts

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

The midterm evaluation recommended a few changes that were adopted by the project: demonstration activities were added “to ensure concrete delivery of project funds for ‘on the ground’ actions, to

engender a sense of ‘country ownership’ and to address in a limited way the root causes of marine environmental issues” (PIR 2005, page 13). A regional environmental monitoring program was also established. The PIR reports that this did not change the global environmental or development objectives, nor was the log frame altered to reflect the changes made.

4. GEF EO 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 conforms to GEF Operational Program 9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area. It focuses on “better use of land and water resource management practices on an area wide basis” and takes “preventative measures to address threats” by strengthening institutions, creating region-wide protected areas, supporting coastal zone management, and many other measures (GEF Operational Program Number 9, page 2).

This project will contribute to the implementation of the Jeddah Convention, and all of the countries involved in the project are parties to the Convention. The governments have also participated in the development of the Strategic Action Program for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, reflecting country priorities. For some of the countries involved, the project is also consistent with Country Assistance Strategy goals. Each Country Assistance Strategy is developed by the World Bank in consultation with country stakeholders, laying out a framework for World Bank projects to achieve the country’s stated goals. Egypt, Jordan, and Yemen had Country Assistance Strategies prepared before the start of the project. The project was consistent with the Strategies’ objectives of “supporting sustainable development, sound management of natural resources, strengthening of local institutions and development of human resources” (Project Appraisal Document, page 5). Djibouti and Sudan did not have Country Assistance Strategies prepared.

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

The project is highly complex and project outcomes are reported under each component. The project design did not have a log frame and targets for indicators are not presented in the TE, making it difficult to judge whether the project met its objectives. Project effectiveness is rated Moderately Satisfactory to

recognize the achievements made in capacity building, building national and regional networks, setting up monitoring systems, improving maritime safety, and strengthening the region's protected area network. However, the TE mentions several project activities that were incomplete or never begun, indicated below.

1. Institutional Strengthening to Facilitate Regional Cooperation

The project conducted dozens of workshops and training sessions for PERSGA, obtained office equipment, installed a GIS system, and developed administrative and financial systems. A library was collected and a website created, allowing PERSGA to serve "as a knowledge and information base...for regional use" (TE, page 10). Some outreach materials (a regular newsletter, a documentary film, posters, etc.) were created, but the TE reports that outreach between PERSGA and national and international partners was weak and should be a high priority for PERSGA.

Regional Working Groups were created that were meant to "support coordination and implementation of the national components of the SAP, and respective incorporation into national policies and investment programs," but this was not fully achieved due to the overambitious project design and the lack of decision makers in the working groups (TE, page 11). A roster of experts and consulting firms was prepared, as was a review of all environment-related legislation in the region. At the time of writing of the TE, two regional protocols, a "protocol concerning the conservation of biological diversity and the establishment of protected areas" and a "protocol the protection of the marine environment from land-based sources of pollution in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden" were currently being developed (TE, page 12). A third protocol on fishery maintenance was envisioned in project design but was not developed.

Although several documents have been prepared to plan the sustainability of PERSGA and the work on the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, no funds or instruments have been secured. Requests for assistance from the World Bank and others were in progress at the time at the time of writing of the TE.

2. Reduction of Navigation Risks and Maritime Pollution

Each country involved in the project ratified one or more international maritime conventions during the project. Training for maritime authority representatives was conducted, and Egypt, Jordan, Yemen, and Sudan started to control ships in their harbors, but no regional memorandum of understanding for port state control was developed.

A hydrographic survey was conducted, a new chart of the southern Red Sea was published for the Government of Yemen, and certain risky areas were surveyed for the first time. New routing measures were prepared based on the aforementioned survey. "Further plans aiming at separating the maritime traffic routes" were being prepared at the time of writing of the TE (TE, page 18). Requirements for improving navigation aids were reviewed with stakeholders, and a new lighthouse was planned for establishment in Yemen.

Two workshops were arranged on contingency planning, with a Regional Action Plan approved by PERSGA. National contingency plans were operational in three of the five countries, and the TE expected

contingency plans to be developed in all of the project countries by 2005. A Marine Emergency Mutual Aid Center was established in Hurghada and a host agreement was signed in Cairo between PERSGA and Egypt. International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code was translated into Arabic and disseminated to ports. Global Maritime Distress and Safety System stations were installed in the northern part of the Red Sea, the definition of maritime boundaries between states progressed, and a workshop was devoted to marine accidents and investigations.

3. Sustainable Use and Management of Living Marine Resources

Two training centers were established as ongoing partnerships with universities. A “regional reference collection center” was established at a university in Jeddah, which will continue to support training and the collection center, although “funds are needed to secure additional materials and environmental education outreach needed” (TE, page 21). Seven workshops were held on data methods, developing a fisheries database, stock assessment, ornamental fisheries, and environmentally friendly aquaculture.

A geo-referenced database was created on living marine resources in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, a baseline document on the status of living marine resources was published, and a species identification guide was created and distributed. A study was conducted on shark finning and trawling. A monitoring program was developed in three countries, a regional management plan for invertebrates was prepared, and national management plans for trawling were developed by three countries. A study was conducted on ornamental fishing and guidelines for aquaculture were developed.

4. Habitat and Biodiversity Conservation

115 specialists were trained, 4 specialist networks were developed, standard survey method guidelines were established and disseminated in training workshops, and 16 surveys were conducted to serve as the basis for monitoring efforts. Regional action plans for the conservation of seabirds, turtles, coral reefs, and mangroves were either finalized or published. No regional action plan was prepared for seagrass due to a lack of time and funding. Turtle kits for tracking were distributed and several status reports on species and habitats were published.

5. Development of a Regional Network of Marine Protected Areas

45 managers were trained in marine protected areas with multiple workshops and exchanges. A regional master plan was published and used as a template for site-specific master plans for four marine protected areas. Survey and field equipment were delivered to 3 countries. Two sites were declared as protected areas in the Sudan and one site was declared in Djibouti.

6. Support for Integrated Coastal Zone Management

A regional seminar was held on integrated coastal zone management and planning, and training on multiple topics was executed. A draft handbook on coastal zone management was prepared, and an integrated information management system was developed. Three model management activities were being implemented at the time of writing of the TE. Evaluation reports were prepared by three countries based on their experiences with integrated coastal zone management.

7. Enhancement of Public Awareness and Participation

Five national centers for public awareness were established. Training on public awareness was conducted and a training kit was produced. A “Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Day” was celebrated in four countries. A regional media network was established, posters were published, and a PERSGA newsletter was upgraded. For environmental education, more than 350 teachers were trained and 150 environmental school clubs were established, involving thousands of students. The Ministry of Education in some of the countries created an environmental education unit within the ministry. A microgrants program supported the funding of 17 community participation projects in 7 countries to promote environmental awareness.

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

The final PIR indicates that most of the cofinancing listed in the project document did not emerge during implementation, so the project had fewer resources to work with than planned. However, no financial information was presented in the TE, so it is impossible to say how the project was able to cope and whether the incomplete activities were a result of the lack of cofinancing.

The project was extended by a year and a half on a no-cost basis. The fact that several activities noted above were incomplete by the time of writing of the TE would indicate that project efficiency was not as high as planned. The TE mentions several times that a 5-year span was not enough time to complete all intended outputs, so perhaps the project design was overambitious. The 2000 PIR writes that delays in project start-up were caused by a low level of technical capacity in the region that was unanticipated by the project design. There were also delays in hiring, including one resignation.

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

Financial: **Unlikely**; the TE reports that “no ongoing financing or new financing was rallied during this 5 year process in spite of various efforts to do so. The Red Sea Environment Fund that was envisaged from the start has not yet transpired” (TE, page 47). Furthermore, money is lacking even for the initiatives that were begun during the project; for example, the regional action plan for maritime contingency planning lacked \$1,800,000 needed for its implementation and the regional reference collection center required funds for additional materials (TE, page 18). Thus there are high risks to financial sustainability; there is no evidence that financing for project activities will continue.

Sociopolitical: **Moderately unlikely**; the project was endorsed at the ministerial level, but the newness of PERSGA raised concerns in the 2000 PIR that national governments did not yet accept its role and were reluctant to take advice. The TE also expresses concern about the weakness of outreach efforts toward national and international partners by PERSGA (TE, page 11). This would indicate a moderate lack of country ownership in PERSGA’s efforts. On the other hand, some of the participating countries’ Ministries of Education created an environmental education unit within the ministry, so success for the

education sub-component is likely. Another positive signal is that each country one or more international maritime conventions during the project. Many regional action plans were created, but it is unclear whether they were accepted by national governments. Also, the TE notes that in several instances, guidance on various topics was created, but not implemented (TE, 23). There are no apparent incentives for implementation to begin, or for the monitoring systems that were established to continue running. Hence the sociopolitical risks are significant due to the lack of incentives or evidence of adoption by governments for most of the project components.

Institutional: **Moderately likely**; institutional and staff capacities were increased during the project and information and databases were provided to PERSGA and other stakeholders. The geographic surveys and baseline monitoring reports will prove useful for future operations, if they are used. Training centers were created, but it is unknown whether they will continue after project closure. The PERSGA secretariat's office was effectively established by the project, but it is possible that the end of GEF support could reduce PERSGA staff or capabilities. The treaties that were newly signed by the project countries and the new protected area sites are another positive signal for sustainability.

Environmental: **Not applicable**

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?

Unable to assess; there was no financial information in the TE. The final PIR indicates that actual co-financing was much lower than planned, but does not account for the discrepancy or the purpose of the money that did emerge.

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 was extended twice according to the final PIR, albeit on a no-cost basis. The TE states that the project's lifespan was too short to achieve the intended targets. In particular, the component on integrated coastal zone management and the demonstration projects required further work after the original closing date of 2003.

Some components, such as integrated coastal zone management, were started late, which according to the TE led to incompleteness of project activities. The 2000 PIR indicates that the lead specialist of the integrated coastal zone management component was not able to cope and resigned, leading to the need for a new specialist. The 2000 PIR also states that the project design overestimated the level of technical capacity in the region, so more time and resources had to be devoted to training PERSGA and the component working groups than anticipated. It is not clear whether these delays were the cause of the incompleteness of certain project activities.

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 2000 PIR reports that PERSGA, as a recently established regional organization, was not yet accepted in its role and mandate by the member governments. In addition, “countries tend to be defensive when policy or even operational advice comes from a regional entity” (PIR 2000, page 5). This is indicative of a lack of country ownership in PERSGA’s efforts at the project’s beginning. It is unknown whether this situation was ameliorated, although the TE’s concern about the weakness of PERSGA’s outreach efforts may signal a continuing problem with relationships between PERSGA and member states. As noted in the Sustainability section, there is no evidence presented that countries would adopt the project’s activities after completion, thus hindering sustainability.

Two positive signals for country ownership are that some of the participating countries’ Ministries of Education created an environmental education unit within the ministry, and that in each country one or more international maritime conventions were signed during the project. This raised the likelihood of the sustainability of environmental education and of the subjects of the treaties.

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: Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-------------------------------

No log frame was prepared in project design, and the project document does not contain a plan for monitoring and evaluation. A matrix was prepared during implementation, but the TE states that it did not match the outcomes and objectives in the project document.

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

The TE reports that a log frame matrix was created during project implementation, but there were discrepancies between it and the project document. In addition, the log frame was revised several times, which some project staff felt was a positive change and others felt made tracking less clear and more difficult (TE, page 41). The TE reports a successful maturation from process indicators to stress reduction indicators. In addition, the recommendations of the midterm evaluation were taken into account, which led to the creation of the demonstration projects. Other than the midterm evaluation, it

is unclear whether regular monitoring took place or led to project changes; the TE states that “utilization of the M&E tools was compromised,” which “caused some components to lag behind in achievements and time schedule, as well as difficulty in seeing overall needs” (TE, page 46). A regional monitoring system was put into place but its sustainability after project closure is in doubt. M&E implementation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory due to the frequent changes, discrepancies, and lack of evidence for a functioning monitoring system.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

Regarding project design, the lack of a log frame was a serious deficiency that contributed to the project’s problematic M&E structure and inability to complete certain tasks. Project design also overestimated the capacity of PERSGA, leading to start-up delays. Finally, the design did not adequately take project sustainability into account and there was no apparent exit strategy.

The TE does not comment on the quality of supervision or the interactions between UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank, the three project implementers. The moderately unsatisfactory rating therefore reflects the deficiencies in project design.

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

The TE rates project execution as “flexible and responsive” and that the partnerships with institutional stakeholders were effective (TE, page 46). However, it also says that more participation and consultation with national stakeholders would have improved the project’s outcomes. The TE hints at conflicts between PERSGA and national governments; it states that “there is an inherent difficulty in this type of regional project where sometimes sustainable regional benefits are outweighed by specific national interests,” but does not explain further or give examples of the difficulties experienced in the project’s execution (TE, page 46). Project execution is rated moderately satisfactory for the achievements described in the Effectiveness section, tempered by the incompleteness and delay of some project

activities as well as the apparent difficulties in harmonization and communication with national governments.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

Unable to assess. Information on species and habitats in the Red Sea was collected, but only once to establish a baseline for the regional monitoring system.

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.

Unable to assess. There is no information available on socioeconomic change.

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

Capacity-building was a major part of the project. PERSGA's capacity was enhanced through training sessions, new office equipment, administrative systems, a website, a library, and a GIS system. PERSGA prepared a roster of experts and consulting firms as well as a review of the region's environmental legislation, so they have contacts if their own capacities are still limited. Training for maritime authority representatives was conducted, and new hydrographic surveys and charts will be used to improve navigational safety. Two workshops were arranged on contingency planning, and a Marine Emergency Mutual Aid Center was established. International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code was translated into Arabic and disseminated to ports. Global Maritime Distress and Safety System stations were installed in the northern part of the Red Sea, and a workshop was devoted to marine accidents and investigations. A regional seminar was held on integrated coastal zone

management and planning, and training on multiple topics was executed. A draft handbook on coastal zone management was prepared, and an integrated information management system was developed.

For environmental monitoring and operations, seven workshops were held on data methods, developing a fisheries database, stock assessment, ornamental fisheries, and environmentally friendly aquaculture. A geo-referenced database was created on living marine resources in the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, a baseline document on the status of living marine resources was published, and a species identification guide was created and distributed. A study was conducted on shark finning, trawling, and ornamental fishing. 115 specialists were trained, 4 specialist networks were developed, standard survey method guidelines were established and disseminated in training workshops, and 16 surveys were conducted to serve as the basis for monitoring efforts. Turtle kits for tracking were distributed and several status reports on species and habitats were published. 45 managers were trained in marine protected areas with multiple workshops and exchanges. Survey and field equipment were delivered to 3 countries.

b) Governance

Governance impacts were also positive. The new hydrographic surveys mentioned above were used to create new routing measures to improve shipping safety. A regional protocol on conservation of biodiversity and a regional protocol on protection from pollution were in the midst of development. Each country involved in the project ratified one or more international maritime conventions during the project, and Egypt, Jordan, Yemen, and Sudan started to control ships in their harbors. A Regional Action Plan was approved by PERSGA on contingency planning. National contingency plans were operational in three of the five countries, and the TE expected contingency plans to be developed in all of the project countries by 2005. Regional management and action plans were created for the conservation of invertebrates, seabirds, turtles, coral reefs, and mangroves. National management plans for trawling were developed by three countries, and guidelines for aquaculture were developed. Lastly, a regional master plan was published and used as a template for site-specific master plans for four marine protected areas.

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 TE reports that several regional and national initiatives have “evolved or emerged from the project process” (TE, page 48). Four of the initiatives mentioned are: Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities, Regional Action Plan for Marine Contingency Planning, Regional Environmental Monitoring Program for the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, and Demonstration Projects. These activities expand on the project’s components.

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 notes the importance of building on international partnerships and of diversifying those partnerships.

The TE also concludes that a phased approach with simpler components and less ambitious goals would have more realistically anticipated the project’s issues, for example the long start-up time and lack of an exit plan.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The terminal evaluation makes a case for clarity in vision to strengthen sustainability. It recommends that the GEF should have a rigorous process for the phasing out of projects and sustainability should be embedded in project design.

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 EO 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?	Project outcomes are described, but the targets are left out so there is no basis for comparison of actual outputs to the intended outputs. Explanations for delays and incomplete activities are left out. The sentences are often worded vaguely so that it is difficult to distinguish concrete accomplishments.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The project's outputs and outcomes are not compared to the targets set in the log frame, so it is impossible to tell if the project met its targets. It also made it difficult to understand why the TE would rate a component as satisfactory or less than satisfactory. Ratings are provided but do not conform to the current GEF IEO rating scale. Many of the same outcomes are written about repeatedly, but under different components, which was confusing.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section is vague and lacks concrete evidence, although information presented in other sections allowed for a sustainability assessment to be made in this review. The tone appears inappropriately upbeat compared to the actual evidence presented.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned were lacking. Recommendations overwhelmingly focused on PERSGA's future rather than the GEF or future GEF projects.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not contain any financial accounting.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	M&E description was adequate, but like the rest of the TE the description lacked detail and was not entirely clear. There is no evidence presented that would indicate a functioning monitoring system.	MS
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 information was used.