

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

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3519	
GEF Agency project ID		4055	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Reducing and Preventing Land-Based Pollution in the Rio de la Plata/Maritime Front through the Implementation of the FrePlata Strategic Action Program	
Country/Countries		Argentina and Uruguay	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-2; SP-2	
Executing agencies involved		National Secretary of Environment and Sustainable Development (Argentina); Ministry of Housing, Territory and Environment (Uruguay)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Vida Silvestre Argentina	
Private sector involvement		Uruguayan Association of Technicians Chemical Industries and the National Cooperative of Milk Producers	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		August 25, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		November 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.15	.15
	Co-financing	.4	Not given
GEF Project Grant		2.85	2.85
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	15.02	1.56
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3	3
Total Co-financing		15.42	1.56
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		18.42	4.56
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 2015	
Author of TE		Fernando Amestoy	
TER completion date		March 1, 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	MU	MS	--	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML <sup>1</sup>	--	MU
M&E Design		S	--	MS
M&E Implementation		S	--	MU
Quality of Implementation		S	--	MU
Quality of Execution		MU	--	U
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The CEO Request for Endorsement document does not explicitly state the Global Environmental Objectives of the project,<sup>2</sup> however the overall goal of the project was to have “safe water for population health, recreational use and aquatic biota development” (pg. 21). The Project Document notes that the Río de la Plata and its Maritime Front (RPMF) contains globally significant biodiversity which is affected by degradation due to economic activities in the coastal areas of both Argentina and Uruguay (pg. 9).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is to “To advance toward sustainability of the uses and resources of the Rio de la Plata/Maritime Front through the implementation of the Strategic Action Program (SAP) with regard to reduction and prevention of land-based pollution” (Project Document pg. 21).

The expected outcomes of the project included:

- Outcome 1: Implementation of institutional reforms and strengthening at bi-national and national levels as proposed in the SAP to address priority transboundary environmental problems
- Outcome 2: Enhanced capacities and tools to prevent and mitigate pollution promote greater collaboration between public and private sectors, especially at provincial and municipal levels
- Outcome 3: A suite of pilot activities that contribute in a measurable way to the reduction of priority pollutants are implemented, and

<sup>1</sup> The TE provides a rating of “3” for project sustainability, defined as “somewhat likely/moderate risks.” This rating corresponds to the GEF scale of Moderately Likely.

<sup>2</sup> The CEO Request for Endorsement Document will be referred to as the Project Document in this TER.

- Outcome 4: Monitoring/evaluation (M&E) Program and Integrated Information System established to support decision taking and management of the RPFM

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

The objectives and outcomes of the project were not changed during implementation, however there was an informal agreement to move away from the regional component of the project. The regional project was therefore implemented as two separate national projects each focused on its own coastal zone (TE pg. 15).

## 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: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project relevance, which this TER adjusts to **Satisfactory**. This project was a continuation of the UNDP-GEF FREPLATA project implemented in the Río de la Plata and Maritime Front (RPFM) transboundary area from 1999 to 2008. The FREPLATA project generated a transboundary diagnostic; designed a joint Strategic Action Program (SAP) and complementary National Programs of Action (NPAs); and formed a binational network of municipalities. The follow-up project was designed to address the institutional weaknesses post-FREPLATA and promote cross-sector collaboration (TE pg. 6). The project outcomes were consistent with both Argentina and Uruguay's national environmental recovery and management priorities. The Government of Argentina has invested heavily in the restoration of the most polluted basins, such as the Matanza-Riachuelo and the Buenos Aires Metropolitan coastal area. The Government of Uruguay has approved key environmental legislation and policies, such as the Framework Law on Environmental Protection, and the Regional Decentralization Plan, which strives to improve institutional and inter-jurisdictional cooperation on environmental issues (Project Document pg. 11).

The project outcomes were also consistent with the GEF-4 International Waters Focal Area, specifically Strategic Objective 2, *to catalyze transboundary action addressing water concerns*. Additionally, the project contributed to Strategic Program 2, *reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion*

*from land-based pollution of coastal waters in Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) consistent with the Global Program of Action (GPA) (Project Document pg. 11).*

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
-------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The actual outcomes were significantly lower than expected, and the project objective was not achieved. Coordination between the two countries was weak, resulting in the implementation of two separate national projects and the postponement of the transboundary water components. Moderate progress was achieved in strengthening national institutions dedicated to the reduction and prevention of land-based pollution.

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

- **Outcome 1: Implementation of institutional reforms and strengthening bi-national and national level, as proposed in the SAP, to address priority trans-boundary environmental problems.** <sup>[SEP]</sup>

Under this outcome, it was expected that two permanent National Inter-Sectoral Committees (NICs) would be established in Uruguay and Argentina, as well as a Bi-National Technical Advisory Group. Additionally, it was expected that national and bi-national frameworks for implementing the joint Strategic Action Program (SAP) would be developed and operational, and financial sustainability mechanisms would be implemented. Finally, it was expected that links would be established with other freshwater and coastal-marine initiatives. By project end, there was some progress in strengthening institutions at the national level, including increased awareness of water use and wetland protection (2014 PIR pg. 10). However, regional efforts were unsuccessful. The Bi-National Technical Advisory Group did not materialize, legal frameworks for implementing the SAP were not developed, and financial mechanisms were not established (TE pg. 31). The 2014 PIR also noted that cooperation with other environmental initiatives was fragmented and insufficient (pg. 9).

- **Outcome 2: Skills and tools to prevent and mitigate pollution promote greater collaboration between the public and private sectors, especially (provincial and municipal) locally.** <sup>[SEP]</sup>

Under this outcome, it was expected that at the municipal level, capacity for routine monitoring, identification of hotspots, and policy development would be strengthened. It was also expected that capacity for engaging the private sector in pollution reduction and mitigation initiatives would increase, and a demonstrative Public-Private Partnership (PPP) project would emerge. Finally, it was expected that that RIIGLO, the Local Governments Information Exchange Network in Argentina, and other coastal marine networks, would generate a system-wide monitoring system for water quality control. By project end, RIIGLO and DINAMA (Environmental National Direction in Uruguay) had established standards for monitoring pollution sources locally, and

municipal governments increased their capacity for monitoring water quality, particularly in Argentina (2014 PIR pgs. 11-13). However, the capacity for promoting PPP projects remained weak, and overall, private sector participation in environmental management was limited. There is no evidence provided in the TE that a demonstrative PPP project was developed (TE pg. 31).

- **Outcome 3: Implement a set of pilot activities that contribute to the reduction of priority pollutants:** <sup>[1-]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

Under this outcome, it was expected that an artificial wetland project would be implemented to reduce pollution loads in untreated or partially treated wastewater. Additionally, it was expected that agro-industry and dairy farming demonstration projects in micro basins would incorporate pollution prevention measures into wetland management plans. Finally, it was expected that pilot projects in the tannery sector would reduce heavy metal loads. By project end, the artificial wetland had not been constructed, although some progress was made in addressing long-standing issues with the solid waste treatment plant (TE pg. 7). Wastewater management plans were developed for pilot projects in the dairy sector, however there is no evidence that this contributed to a reduction in organic waste effluents by project end. Similarly, cleaner production processes were developed for several pilot projects in the tannery sector, however there was no evidence that these improved processes reduced heavy metal loads. This is largely due to the fact that only one company implemented the cleaner production process, and it was implemented on a small scale (TE pg. 32).

- **Outcome 4: Establish an Evaluation and Monitoring Program (M&E) and an information system to support decision makers and management of the River Plate and Maritime Front (RPMF):** <sup>[1-]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

Under this outcome, it was expected that an integrated monitoring and evaluation system would be operating and financially sustainable by the end of the project, in addition to an Integrated Bi-National Information System (IBIS). The TE notes that this was the least successful component of the project. By project end, neither the monitoring and evaluation system nor the IBIS was established. Moreover, there was no mechanism to consistently exchange information between the two countries (TE pgs. 32-33).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
----------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. Project implementation began in November 2009, however a regional coordinator was not hired until August 2010 and the Inception Workshop was not held until November 2010. Additionally, the national coordinators were not appointed until May 2011. The TE notes that the delays at project start-up were largely due to changes in government authorities, particularly in Argentina, and challenges setting up internal management structures (TE pg. 12). Both the Midterm

Evaluation (MTE) and the TE note that the management arrangements, in addition to tensions between the Steering Committee, Regional Project Coordination Unit (RPCU), and national coordinators, continued to affect efficiency throughout implementation (MTE pgs. 31-32; TE pg. 30). As a result of the delays at start-up and during implementation, the project received a one year extension, shifting the closing date from November 2013 to November 2014.

By project end, many project outcomes had not been achieved despite the full disbursement of GEF funds. The TE notes that the cost-efficiency of the regional component of the project was particularly low. 130% of the budget allocated for Outcome 4 (establishment of an integrated monitoring and evaluation system and Bi-National Information System) was spent by project end, however none of the results under this outcome were achieved (TE pg. 19).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Unlikely</b>
--------------------	------------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for project sustainability, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unlikely**. Significant risks to sustainability include political conflicts between the Uruguayan and Argentine Governments as well as the lack of a legal framework for implementing the Strategic Action Program (SAP). It should also be noted that the TE does not provide enough information to assess financial and environmental sustainability.

#### Financial Resources

The TE does not provide enough information to adequately assess the sustainability of financial resources. The TE does note that the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank were implementing projects that could provide opportunities for replicating activities piloted under the UNDP-GEF project (i.e. cleaner production processes in the tannery sector) (pg. 34-35).

#### Sociopolitical

This TER assesses sociopolitical sustainability to be **Moderately Unlikely**. The project suffered from a lack of political will throughout implementation, in large part because key political players could not agree on goals and priorities (TE pg. 34). The Uruguayan and Argentine governments came into conflict over a cellulose plant on the Uruguay River and tensions from this case bled over into other binational environmental issues. The TE notes that as a result all issues related to transboundary pollution were avoided or postponed (TE pg. 14). At the time of the TE, both Argentina and Uruguay were also approaching changes in government, which added to the uncertainty around the continuation of project outcomes in the long-term (TE pg. 19).

#### Institutional Frameworks and Governance

This TER assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance to be **Moderately**

**Unlikely.** National-level institutions in both Argentina and Uruguay were strengthened as a result of the project. For example, a national monitoring system was created within the National Secretary of Environment and Sustainable Development in Argentina (SAyDS), and a department of marine area was created within the Environmental National Direction in Uruguay (DINAMA) (TE pg. 19). However, legal frameworks for implementing the Strategic Action Program (SAP) were not developed by project end, and there was no bilateral mechanism to consistently exchange information between the two countries (TE pgs. 32-33). The existing Binational Commissions (CARP and CTMFM) were strongly biased toward fisheries management rather than the prevention of pollution and maintenance of water quality (TE pg. 19).

## **Environmental**

The TE does not provide enough information to assess 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?

Actual co-financing was substantially lower than expected, with only 10% of the \$15.42 materializing by the end of the project. The TE notes that low co-financing could be attributed to high staff turnover in government agencies and low political will for the project (TE pg. 30). The MTE notes that the low level of co-financing affected project administration and management as the RPCU did not have a permanent office out of which to operate (pg. 31). Neither the TE nor the MTE directly assess the impact of low co-financing on sustainability, but it is an indication of weak support for project outcomes.

**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 moderate delays at start-up due to changes in government authorities, particularly in Argentina, and challenges setting up internal management structures (TE pg. 12). Inefficient management structures and tensions between management bodies also resulted in delays during implementation. As a result of these delays, the project received a one year extension, shifting the closing date from November 2013 to November 2014.

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 was low. There was strong ownership over the design, however political will in both countries diminished over time, particularly regarding the binational components of the project. This was due in part to clashes over a cellulose plant on the Uruguay River and changes in governance. As a result, outcomes related to transboundary waters were not achieved by project end, including the strengthening of bi-national institutions and integrated information systems.

## 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: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The results framework presented in the Project Document was logically sound, however it contained indicators of mixed quality. A number of the indicators were SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely), such as Indicator 3.3, *Number of enterprises in the tannery sector with Cleaner Production (CP) plans formulated*. Other indicators were not specific and lent themselves to different interpretations, such as Indicator 1.2, *Coordination mechanisms with GEF projects and initiatives relevant to the project objective agreed and operative* (MTE pg. 26). In other cases, indicators and targets were simply not achievable by project end. In particular, indicators associated with reduction of pollutants and heavy metals were highly unlikely to be achieved given the size and scope of the pilot projects (TE pg. 7).

The Project Document does include a general M&E plan, which outlines M&E activities (inception workshop, data collection, annual and periodic reports, reviews, and a midterm and final evaluation), responsible party, and associated budget and timeframe. In total, a dedicated M&E budget of \$163,000, approximately 6% of GEF funds, is provided (Project Document pgs. 7-8).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
------------------------	--



The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. Despite the weaknesses in the design of the results framework, the TE notes that it was an appropriate instrument to monitor the project (TE pg. 14). However, the results framework ceased to be a useful monitoring and evaluation tool when the operating environment shifted. Due to tensions between the two countries, the project decided to focus on the national coastal zones rather than the binational-shared waters. The MTE recommended amending the results framework to reflect the reduction in the scope of the project, however this action was not taken. Furthermore, the TE notes that these adjustments to the project design were not formerly raised in the Steering Committee, and the Steering Committee did not meet frequently enough to oversee project monitoring and evaluation (pg. 14).

Additionally, the annual project reports were of mixed quality. The 2014 Project Implementation Review for example, did not include the actual indicators and there were information gaps throughout the report. On the other hand, the annual project reports consistently noted that the project was behind in achieving its outcomes. The project team did not use this information to improve and adapt project performance (TE pg. 25).

## 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: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
---------------------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. As the implementing agency, UNDP was responsible for the project design. The MTE notes that the design process was inclusive of the public, private, and civil society sectors in Uruguay and Argentina, and therefore there was strong ownership over the final project design. However, UNDP prepared three Project Documents (the binational document signed by the GEF and two national documents) which was confusing, and encouraged partners to execute the project as two separate projects rather than one, binational project (pg. 18). It should also be noted that the M&E design had moderate shortcomings, including some indicators and targets that were not specific or achievable by project end.

The project was implemented by the UNDP Country Offices in Uruguay and Argentina, and the regional component was implemented by UNDP Uruguay (TE pg. 12). UNDP representatives participated in the Steering Committee, but only as an observer, which affected its oversight over project implementation (MTE pg. 21). Additionally, the TE notes that UNDP could have played a stronger role in mediating the differences between the Argentine and Uruguayan partners (TE pg. 36).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
----------------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for quality of project execution, which this TER downgrades to **Unsatisfactory**. The executing agencies for Uruguay and Argentina were the Ministry of Housing, Territory, and Environment (MVOTMA) and the National Secretary of Environment and Sustainable Development (SAyDS), respectively. In the Project Document, it was envisioned that a Regional Project Coordination Unit (RPCU) would be responsible for all project products and directly liaise with the national executing agencies. However, national project management units were established without clearly defined roles and responsibilities. These management arrangements caused tensions between the Project Steering Committee, RPCU, and national coordinators, resulting in delays and affecting efficiency throughout implementation (MTE pgs. 31-32; TE pg. 30). The role of the RPCU diminished over time, and by 2013, the RPCU was effectively dismantled (MTE pg. 22).

Additionally, the Project Steering Committee met infrequently and provided weak guidance and oversight over implementation. There was an informal agreement between national partners to move away from the binational components of the project, however this was never addressed in Project Steering Committee meetings (TE pg. 14). It should also be noted that there were other inconsistencies between what was envisioned in the project design and what was implemented. For example, interviewees noted that the pilot projects were meant to establish best practices rather than to be implemented on a scale that would directly contribute to the reduction of pollutants and heavy metal loads. This understanding directly contradicts what was outlined in the Project Document (TE pg. 20).

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

**Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case**

***and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not cite any environmental changes that occurred 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.

The TE does not cite any socioeconomic changes that occurred 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

The TE notes that there was some progress made in strengthening national institutions. The project implemented a communication strategy which served to increase awareness of water use and wetland protection among local authorities, sector groups, and coastal municipalities (TE pg. 31; 2014 PIR pg. 10). By project end, RIIGLO (Local Governments Information Exchange Network in Argentina) and DINAMA (Environmental National Direction in Uruguay) had also established standards for monitoring pollution sources locally. In Argentina in particular, municipal governments increased their capacity for monitoring water quality (2014 PIR pgs. 11-13).

b) Governance

The TE does not note any changes in governance that occurred by the end of the project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

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 GEF initiatives that had been adopted at scale by the end of the project. The TE does note the possibility of replicating project activities under new projects implemented by the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank, however these opportunities had not emerged by the end of the project (pg. 34-35).

## 9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pg. 39):

*Is there anything worth mentioning that is special or critical we learned during implementation of the project that is important to share with other projects so that they can avoid this error or use this opportunity?*

In future initiatives more attention should be directed to project governance and the alignment with the sectorial policies in which it is framed. These points were mentioned and developed in paragraphs 3 and 4 and are relevant to the appropriation of the project by the main institutions with responsibilities at the study area.

Another consideration is the development of specific communication plans targeting high-level political sector to maintain project issues in the political agenda. The plan should be designed to generate information products, concise, in plain language, with clear proposals and recommendations to address major environmental problems identified.

*What would you do differently if the project started again?*

The project governance should have been modified or more care put in choosing the regional coordinator because of the important role played under the management model. The technical capabilities of the regional coordinator are not as important as the ability to relate empathy and skills to articulate actors and create synergies. Empirical evidence shows that these points had not enough weight in the selection. The involvement of key stakeholders of the strategic-political level with the project was weak, particularly in transferring directives to the operative level and doing the follow up, so perhaps some actions should have been taken to promote these articulations.

A systemic approach must be promoted from the initial stages of implementation, and this requires making every effort to strengthen the links between actors and align them on a common vision of the problem, and in the implementation strategy where their actions are complementary and not competitive.

Another important aspect that emerges from the lessons learned is the need to strengthen mechanisms for monitoring the implementation and implement efficient procedures for corrective action if appropriate.

*How does this project contribute to the transfer of technology?*

The major contributions of the project in technology transfer were in the component of pilot projects, particularly to introduce best practices of CP in the tanneries and dairy sector, as well as contributions in the management of protected areas. In all cases, the coordinating role of the project was found effective to promote the synergistic relationship of the academic, government and business sector. The project allowed the identification of best practices to reduce pollution from industrial effluents, developed a specific methodology for it and allowed to generate useful outputs for the development of environmental public policy and management information. Actions were also identified to replicate the findings to the entire industrial sector that can be supported with funding from national or multilateral credit agencies. The results obtained in project implementation show the need of improving the efficiency of the current protected areas before proceeding administratively to creating new ones.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

**Outcome 1:**

- Maintaining commitment to environment issues and water quality RPF on the agendas of both governments
- Strengthening governance for addressing environmental issues in border areas produced by the inclusion of the environmental authorities in the Board of the project, along with the administering of bilateral commissions with jurisdiction in these areas

- The start of the consolidation of a regional system of environment innovation that links to the academic, government and business sectors of both countries in order to promote their ties to generate environmental value

**Outcome 2:**

- The strengthening of inter-institutional coordination is a key directive for the achievement of project objectives
- Include other key actors in the implementation of the SAP [Strategic Action Program]. It is particularly recommended to strengthen ties with ANCAP [National Administration of Combustibles, Alcohol and Portland] and harbor management agencies of both countries
- Develop communication tools in future projects at the design stage and in implementation, to consider political actors as target clients

**Outcome 3:**

- The adoption of best practices for implementing CP [Cleaner Production] processes that have involved the industrial sector
- Promoting linkages between binational commissions and the environmental authorities with the national research system in both countries for the development of disciplines related to geosciences and marine sciences
- Strengthen the monitoring and implementation of environmental policies and projects developed for RPMF [Río de la Plata and Maritime Front]

**Outcome 4:**

- Completing the development of a binational monitoring system and binational environmental information system

**Other recommendations:**

- UNDP can be a strategic partner on an operational level, in order to help finish consolidating the governance system, and project sustainability, providing professional management skills according to international standards, and officiating as a coordinator between parties

## 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 systematic and somewhat comprehensive. More detail could have been provided on the achievement of expected results (specifically the project's outputs). It is possible this was included in an Annex that this TER did not have access to.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	There are information gaps in terms of evidence, however the report does note that this is a result of flawed performance indicators. Ratings are slightly inflated, however this TER agrees with the rating for effectiveness.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project adequately assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance, as well as sociopolitical sustainability. Financial and environmental sustainability are not addressed.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are presented in a confusing manner and largely superficial. The recommendations are essentially restricted to following through with the original intended activities.	<b>U</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs and actual co-financing used.	<b>S</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's assessment of M&E implementation is highly inflated.	<b>MU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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

Request for CEO Endorsement (2009); Midterm Evaluation (2013)