

### GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	9/8/05
GEF ID:	346		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Control of Exotic Aquatic Weeds in Rivers and Coastal Lagoons to Enhance and Restore Biodiversity	GEF financing:	3.000000	3.000000
Country:	Cote d'Ivoire	Co-financing:	1.900000	2.110
Operational Program:	OP 2	Total Project Cost:	\$4.900000	\$5,110
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Center Ivorian Anti-Pollution	Work Program date		12/01/1992
		CEO Endorsement		
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Dec 1995
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
			Dec 1999	Aug 2004
Prepared by: Neeraj Kumar Negi	Reviewed by: Claudio Volonte	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 4 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 8 years and 9 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 4 years and 9 months
Author of TE:	Francis Lauginie, Assitou Dinga, Peter Newenschwander	TE completion date: July 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: July 2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: One year

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	<b>S</b>			MS
2.2 Project outcomes	<b>S</b>			MS
2.3 Project	<b>N/A</b>			MU

sustainability				
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	<b>N/A</b>			MS
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>		MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

No

The narrative of TE explains that since project area was in accessible to the evaluators, the TE was prepared based on the desktop and online review of the project. The TE, however, does not explain why the project area was inaccessible.

While exposition on project impacts and sustainability is satisfactory, it is clearly not adequate on M&E issues. Further, important issues such as financial details of the project have not been addressed. Similarly, the discussion on M&E systems is also inadequate.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the Project document the project objectives were to:

- Reduce the main species of water weeds through biological control;
- Monitor the spread of the infestation;
- Lay the foundation for integrated watershed management to tackle the problem of excessive increase in water nutrification;
- Survey and monitor the status of biodiversity; and,
- Strengthen the coordination between similar African projects and disseminate the project results to other countries confronted with similar problems.

The TE does not provide us any information on whether there have been any changes in the global environmental objectives during the course of the project. However, TE has assessed the performance of the project based on achievements of the above described objectives. Also, according to the PIRs of the project there has been no change in the objectives.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According the PIR 2004, the development objective of the project is improve and/or to restore the aquatic biodiversity in Côte d'Ivoire by reducing the populations of water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*), water lettuce (*Pistia stratiotes*) and water fern (*Salvinia molesta*).

The TE does not explicitly spell out the development objectives of the project. Furthermore, it provides no information on whether there have been any changes in the development objectives.

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

The consultants involved in writing the TE were not able to visit the project sites due to inaccessibility of the area. A member of the evaluation team did reside in Cote d'Ivoire and some of the people associated with the project implementation were met. This said, the TE is primarily based on the desk review of the implementation reports of the project and other information that was available online.

**According to the TE, project has achieved the following outcomes and impacts:**

1. **Reduction in main invading aquatic weed populations by biological control:** Exotic natural enemies of the invading weeds were released and successfully established on 90% of the invaded zones.
2. **To monitor the spread of infestation:** information on this objective was not available in the documents reviewed for terminal evaluation.
3. **Lay the foundation for integrated watershed management to tackle the problem of excessive increase in water nitrification:** According to TE, it was too ambitious for the project to pursue this goal. Even if the national situation was normal this objective would have been difficult to accomplish without appropriate institutional measures<sup>1</sup>. Unsurprisingly, there was little progress made in achieving this objective.
4. **Survey and monitor the status of biodiversity:** According to TE, the project has been maintaining an inventory of the biodiversity status of the project area. The amount of attention given to various biological groups is, however, unbalanced. While inventory on zooplankton, algae and other microphytes is adequate, information on Ichtyofauna, benthic macrofauna, entomofauna and fauna of 'floating rafts' needs to be more comprehensive.
5. **To strengthen the coordination of control projects in Africa and dissemination of the results:** The TE opines that while information dissemination activities were carried out as per the plan, the objective to strengthen coordination of control projects in Africa was clearly too ambitious. The TE claims that no measure taken to achieve greater coordination among the control projects in Africa was quoted or referred to in the reports reviewed.

#### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1 Outcomes and impacts

**Rating: MS**

##### A Relevance

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

According to the TE, the outcomes of the project were consistent with the objective of biodiversity conservation (OP2). The activities such as biological control of the infestation by the water weeds, maintaining data of the organisms in the water body and establishing monitoring systems to generate information on the level of weed infestation in the water body, that were taken up under the project are consistent with the goals of the operational program.

**S**

##### B Effectiveness

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

According to the TE, the project has achieved good results in reducing the main species of water weeds through biological control, maintaining an inventory of the species and their occurrence in the water body, and monitoring the level of weeds in the water body. However, it has not been effective in laying foundation for integrated watershed management to address the problem of eutrophication and also in strengthening the coordination of the control projects in Africa. This, TE opines, is more due to these objectives being overambitious and less due to any failing on part of the project team.

**MS**

##### C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and**

<sup>1</sup> The TE does not clarify what this national situation was other than mentioning that in 2002 there was a change of guard in the concerned ministry. The TE could probably be referring to the political turmoil facing Cote d'Ivoire over the last couple of years.

<p><b>implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems?</b></p>
<p>The information provided in the TE on outcomes of the project vis-à-vis costs and inputs is very scant. However, since the period of project implementation was extended by 57 months it is bound to have affected the cost effectiveness of the project.</p>
<p><b>Unable to assess</b></p>

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

<p><b>A Financial resources</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: MU</b></p>
<p>According to the TE, a long term commitment from the government is required to adequately address the problem of water weed infestation. In July 23, 2003, the government of Cote d'Ivoire committed to transform this project to a national program; to search for resources to pursue its implementation; to reinforce the national implementation agency, its team, and the national operators; and, to seek international technical support. Despite this commitment, the past record on financial management and planning raises questions about the financial sustainability of the project. According to TE, during the implementation of the project, there was a 200 million CFA Franc (FCFA) annual budget. However, for 2004 – out of 232 million (FCFA) requested by the project - only 69.5 were granted. Financing for insect rearing, even though it was of high priority, was is not planned for 2004. TE suggests that prevalence of such issues may not be the best way to guarantee the sustainability of the project.</p>	
<p><b>B Socio political</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: MU</b></p>
<p>The TE narrative refers to political constraints as the major reason for the delay in implementation of the project. It further suggests that non inclusion of the local population, who could play an important role in controlling eutrophication, so far could have played a major role in preventing the project from 'laying' the foundation for integrated water resource management. Despite these experiences, according to the TE, the government has committed to transform this project to a national program and to search for resources to pursue its implementation. However, it is not clear whether this commitment will hold given the unstable political condition in Cote d'Ivoire.</p>	
<p><b>C Institutional framework and governance</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: MU</b></p>
<p>The narrative of the TE suggests that so far the institutional framework for the project has been inadequate. While it does not provide direct evidence to show how institutional framework was inadequate, it does point out some failings that could be a result of inadequacy of institutional framework and governance.</p> <p>The TE points out that the steering committee of the project been slow and there also has been little progress in the legal environment in terms of enactment of an appropriate water code. Furthermore, the present team, which the TE considers competent, is breaking – the project execution team and the key persons in partner organisation are leaving the project as a result of completion of the first phase. Unless special efforts are made to retain them, this team will break away. The project too has limited autonomy from the Ivorian Antipollution Center in scheduling activities and managing staff or budget. All these factors have implications for the project sustainability.</p>	
<p><b>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: L</b></p>
<p>The TE does not report any adverse ecological consequences of the project. In contrast, it suggests that the project has been instrumental in restoring the local ecology of the water body.</p>	
<p><b>E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: Unable to access</b></p>
<p>The TE has discussed the government's commitment to convert the project into a national program and look for resources for its implementation. However, the TE does not provide any indication of the extent to which it believes that the government will be able to meet its commitment.</p>	

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

<p><b>A. Effective M&amp;E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&amp;E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating: MS</b></span></p>
<p>According to TE, the GEF did not require logical frameworks when the project was being designed and a logical framework was developed during the stage of project execution at the request of the Minister of Environment, Water and Forests of Cote d'Ivoire. According to TE, the nature of results indicators included in the log-frame – the indicators included in the log-frame focus more on physical progress and less on indicators of impact – makes it difficult to assess the true impact of the project. The TE further claims that some of the assumptions mentioned in the log-frame are not exogenous to the project but are a consequence of the functioning of the project. For example, assumptions such as the inventories are representative and the sites selected in the country are appropriate, are endogenous to the project.</p> <p>The TE seems to be overall satisfied with the quality of information being gathered and managed by the project for assessing the status of the biodiversity within the project area. The TE opined that some of the information that has been collected is worthy of finding place in a good journal.</p>
<p><b>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating: Unable to assess</b></span></p>
<p>There is no discussion on this issue in the TE.</p>
<p><b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b></p>
<p>According to the TE, although the M&amp;E system of the project has been effective in gathering valuable information on the biodiversity of the project area, the M&amp;E system itself may not be ideal due to inappropriate design of the log-frame – i.e. due to wrong formulation of the indicators and errors in specifying the project assumptions.</p>

### 4.4 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p><b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b></p>
<p>The TE mentions following lessons can be learned from the project experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning should be as realistic as possible and should account for the possible delays;</li> <li>• Adequacy of the means for meet the recurrent post project costs vis-à-vis the means for the short (project) period.</li> <li>• Specification of objectively verifiable indicators to correctly assess the level of achievement of planned results.</li> <li>• The steering organs of the project may be very slow due to involvement of many ministries and organizations, groups of researchers with different expertise and political constraints.</li> <li>• It is important that the commitment of the beneficiary country to finance the follow up phase is demonstrated in a formal manner during grant negotiation and must be a contractual point for releasing funds.</li> </ul>

**4.5 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

<b>4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>
In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.
N/A

<b>4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The TE does contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievements. It provides a relatively detailed exposition on the level of achievement of each of the project objectives.</p>	S
<p><b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> The TE is internally consistent on most instances. However, it does leave some of the important questions unanswered. For example, while it mentions that the government has committed to convert this project into national program it fails to comment on the possibility of it actually happening, given the political uncertainty in the country.</p>	MS
<p><b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> Other than not addressing the catalytic effect of the project, the TE has adequately assessed the issue of project sustainability. The financial, socio-political, and institutional aspects of project sustainability were well covered.</p>	S
<p><b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The lessons learned have been supported by the evidence. Each of the lessons specified was supported by the evidence. The lessons learned, and the evidence cited in its support, are comprehensive as they cover important dimensions such as financial sustainability, project administration, M&amp;E design, etc.</p>	S
<p><b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The report does discuss some of the financial issues related to the project but it does not report the actual project costs.</p>	U
<p><b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The TE does present some information on the M&amp;E systems such as formulation of the indicators and on the assumptions, but it has not looked into all the aspects that could be important in determining whether the M&amp;E system was robust. For example, it has not specified how the information collected by the M&amp;E system has been used.</p>	MU

<b>4.6 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.</b>	<b>Yes: X</b>	<b>No:</b>
<p>Explain: A technical assessment of the project impacts and results would be recommended (when the project area becomes accessible), especially in light of the fact that the TE team could not visit the field and also to verify the project outcome claims in the long term. If this project effectively reduced the amount of invasive species, it may be interesting for future projects dealing with the same problems.</p>		
<p>Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No such issue has been mentioned.</p>		

**4.7 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

