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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3524	
GEF Agency project ID		4063	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		CTI Sulu-Celebes Sea Sustainable Fisheries Management Project (SCS)	
Country/Countries		Regional (Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines)	
Region		Asia and the Pacific	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		IW SO-1, SP1: Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS; Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) in Indonesia; Department of Fisheries (DoF), Sabah in Malaysia; National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI), Department of Agriculture, in the Philippines	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGOs as part of inter-sectoral committees (i.e. through consultations)	
Private sector involvement		Private sector as beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 7, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		December 10, 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 1, 2013	
Actual date of project completion		September 30, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.085	0.085
	Co-financing	N/A	N/A
GEF Project Grant		2.89	2.87
Co-financing	IA own	0.09	0.15
	Government	3.00	3.04
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.14	0.27
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.98	2.96
Total Co-financing		3.23	3.464
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.21	6.42
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2014	
Author of TE		James Lenoci	
TER completion date		March 7, 2016	
TER prepared by		Matteo Borzoni	
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	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	Moderately likely	N/R	Moderately likely
M&E Design	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
M&E Implementation	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of Implementation	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of Execution	N/R	Moderately satisfactory	N/R	Moderately unsatisfactory
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	Highly satisfactory

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was "to contribute to the sustainability of the economically and ecologically important fisheries in the SCS and their habitats, including its biodiversity and ecological processes, primarily for the benefit of communities that are dependent on these resources for livelihoods" (ProDoc, p. 36)

The Sulu-Celebes Sea (SCS) large marine ecosystem (SCS-LME) of the Indo-Malay-Philippines Archipelago covers an area of approximately 900,000 km^2 in the heart of the Coral Triangle, one of the world's most biologically diverse marine environments.

The ecosystem supports considerable numbers and species of important marine flora and fauna, including sea turtles, marine mammals, elasmobranchs, marine fishes, seaweeds, and sea grasses. The SCS is also a rich fishing ground for large and small pelagics, as well as demersal and reef fishes. The capture fisheries production alone is estimated to be more than USD 1 billion. Fish is also an important food security issue among the three countries, as the population of an estimated 35 million, growing 2-5% annually, relies heavily on SCS fisheries as their main source of animal protein and livelihoods.

The marine environment of the SCS is under threat by the expanding coastal area populations and increased economic activities, including agriculture, aquaculture, tourism, and mining. These pressures include unsustainable fishing practices, destructive fishing techniques, impacts associated with mismanaged aquaculture, pollution, and poorly planned and inappropriate land use. This situation brings about low fisheries productivity, equity problems, and undermined environmental integrity.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to "improve the condition of fisheries in the SCS to a sustainable level through an integrated, collaborative and sustainable tri-national management" (ProDoc, p. 36).

This objective was supposed to be achieved through the following expected outcomes:

- Regional consensus on transboundary priorities, their immediate and root causes
- Agreement on regional and national legal, policy and institutional reforms for improved fisheries
- Strengthening of existing institutions and introduction of reforms to catalyze implementation of policies on reducing overfishing and improving fisheries management in the SCS and strengthening national fisheries laws and policies.
- Increased fish stocks at demonstration sites (5-10 percent increase)
- Facilitated uptake of knowledge and lessons learned

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

There were no changes in Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives during implementation. A few changes were made to some of the outcomes and performance indicators, after the first Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meeting in November 2011. The changes were discussed and approved during the second PSC meeting, also held in that same month.

Under Outcome 2, the original design had included a target to achieve ministerial endorsement of the Strategic Action Program (SAP). This was changed to "endorsement or approval of the regional fisheries SAP by relevant national agencies and its implementation initiated during the life of the project". Outcome 3 was reworked by stressing that the institutional strengthening activities would be focused on existing institutions, rather than introducing new institutions. Outcome 4 was also re-focused, after the TAG members agreed that it was unrealistic to expect a 5-10 % increase in fish stocks at the demonstration sites, considering the relatively short timeframe and limited scope of the demonstrations. The emphasis of Outcome 4 was placed more on capacity building, contributing toward strengthening an enabling environment for rebuilding fish stocks and improving fishing incomes.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE rated relevance as "Relevant" and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates Relevance as Satisfactory.

The Project was in line with the national development plans of the three countries. In Indonesia, the 2010-2014 medium-term development plan included a separate section dedicated to development of the Kalimantan area (where the demonstration project was implemented). The 10th development plan (2011-2015) for Malaysia included particular objectives for the Sabah Development Corridor. Also, Malaysia's 5th report to the Convention on Biological Diversity included the aim to conserve marine biodiversity in mangrove forests, coral reefs and coastal waters, while enabling sustainable development of traditional and commercial fisheries. The Philippine Development Plan for 2011-2016 outlined the strategy to reduce the vulnerability of natural ecosystems and biodiversity through ecosystem-based management approaches. The ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM) based demonstrations in Zamboanga and planned in Palawan are relevant to these objectives.

The project envisaged that that the persistent shared problem about the overexploitation of marine fisheries would be tackled jointly by the three countries, thus contributing to the two strategic objectives of the GEF International Waters focal area. In fact, the endorsement of the Regional Strategic Action Program (RSAP) fulfills the objective of IW Strategic Objective 1: "To foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority water concerns". The expected impacts of IW Strategic Objective 2: "To catalyze transboundary action addressing water concerns" include reducing over-exploitation of fish stocks.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Moderately satisfactory

The TE rated effectiveness as "Moderately satisfactory" and this TER agrees with that rating mainly because the quality of the finished Regional Strategic Action Program (RSAP) is sub-standard (TE, p. 30), with no logical linkages to the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion SSME comprehensive action plan, limited short and medium term targets, and a rather unattainable set of actions. However, the transboundary diagnostic analysis was properly updated and the field activities are considered successful.

For the first outcome (Regional consensus on transboundary priorities, their immediate and root causes) the project was supposed to update the transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) and to have TDA regional priorities accepted by the SSME Tri-National Committee (Tri-Com) and the Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries. The TDA was an updated version of the Global International Water Assessment

made in 2002, and the final ranking of priority regional environmental threats was mostly the same. The TDA was approved by the Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries in 2014. The TE noted (p. 31) that interviewed stakeholders were generally appreciative of the results of the TDA, in which scientific experts from the three countries provided input, based mostly on compilation of available secondary data.

For the second outcome -Agreement on regional and national legal, policy and institutional reforms for improved fisheries- the main targets were endorsement of the Strategic Action Program (SAP) by the SSME Tri-COM, the Ministerial endorsement of approval of the SAP implementation thereafter, and the establishment of collaborative agreements with regional organizations. A regional strategic action program (RSAP) was prepared and endorsed by relevant national authorities. National strategic action programs (NSAPs) were compiled after the RSAP was completed. However in the opinion of the evaluator, the RSAP has several inconsistencies, the document is difficult to follow, and the national responses do not seem rationalized among the countries (TE, p. 32). One main problem are insistent linkages between the SAP and the SSME Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP). Moreover the SAP mainly had long-term targets without a clear timeline, intermediate milestones and lines of responsibilities. The TE also noted that that participation by governmental stakeholders in the SAP development and consultation process was limited (TE, p. 32). A number of the national targets, mostly for Indonesia and the Philippines, are based upon continued progress at the demonstration sites. However, there are no apparent mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate the progress at the demonstration sites. Coordination of the implementation of RSAP and the NSAPs is also unclear.

For the third outcome (Strengthening of existing institutions and introduction of reforms to catalyze implementation of policies on reducing overfishing and improving fisheries management in the SCS) the project had a quite unclear target that consisted in general institutional strengthening activities and in the implementation of the SAP. A report on institutional strengthening for Fisheries Management in the Sulu-Sulawesi Seas was prepared by the Center for Coastal and Marine Resource Studies of the Bogor Agricultural University. This report is a compilation of fisheries management laws and institutional arrangements in the three countries, and discusses some optional institutional mechanisms. The TE (p. 34) considers that the report does not provide specific recommendations for the institutional arrangements moving forward for the Tri-Com and the Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries for implementing the SAP developed on this project. In addition, the 2014 PIR includes a statement under Outcome 3 that the institutional strengthening report was presented to the Tri-Com during the 7th meeting of the committee held in Balikpapan, but the TE noted (p. 35) that there is no evidence of adoption of an action agenda to follow up with institutional strengthening needs. The current strength of the Tri-Com has been weakened, due to the position by Malaysian officials recommending not approving the proposed extension of the SSME Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Outcome 4 was originally on the increase of fish stocks at demonstration sites. As mentioned in Section 3.3 this outcome was completely refocused. The new formulation was “Increased capacity of SSME national level institutions to implement site-specific Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) with local partners to rebuild fish stocks and improve fishing incomes”. For this outcome the project supported activities at both a regional and a national level in demonstration sites. From a

regional perspective, the project sponsored research on the genetic diversity, population genetic structure, and demographic patterns of small pelagics, thus assessing if stocks are distinct among sub-regions or rather common across the SCS ecosystem. The genetic studies are significant contributions to the scientific knowledge base of small pelagics in the SCS, and provide sound, technical back-up for addressing the identified transboundary problems jointly. Regarding interventions at national level in Indonesia the focus was on the demersal species *Harpodon neherus* (also known as Bomaby duck). Here the team conducted field surveys and concluded that the main concern locally was unintended juvenile catch. Also, an integrated fisheries management plan (IFMP) was developed. This was facilitated through the establishment of an inter-sectoral committee, consisting of Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) staff, local fisheries officials, NGOs, fishers associations, community-based surveillance groups, and university researchers. One of the management approaches implemented through the IFMP is protection of spawning and nursery grounds of the Bombay duck and parties agreed to establish a 9,730-ha fisheries restricted area. The project supported these efforts through sponsoring scientific surveys to back up the management decision made and rolled out an awareness-raising campaign. In Malaysia the project provided scientific contributions for the demonstration project. In addition, the project facilitated the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Department of Fisheries Sabah and a total of 19 local stakeholders, ranging from government agencies, private agencies, industry operators, entrepreneurs in downstream industries and researchers. By applying the ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM), the expert team produced a draft integrated fisheries management plan (IFMP), with consultations facilitated by the MOU signatory stakeholders. In the Philippines the project significantly contributed to the sardine closure, by sponsoring monitoring and studies to provide scientific support to the management response (the three-month suspension of fishing has continued each year since). These efforts were facilitated through the establishment of an inter-agency demonstration site committee. The committee was instrumental in guiding the implementation of the demonstration activities, including facilitating stakeholder involvement in the preparation of an integrated fisheries management plan for the city, and also liaising with the local government, industry, and the general public. In order to document seasonal trends and population parameters the project also hired enumerators for various landing sites and supported an effective awareness-raising campaign, made in partnership with the Ateneo de Zamboanga University. In the Philippines, the project also supported the development of an integrated coastal and fisheries resource management plan (ICFRMP) for the City of Zamboanga, which was approved by the provincial board.

For outcome 5 (Facilitated uptake of knowledge and lessons learned) the project was expected to create websites and disseminate reports. The project developed its own website. Also UNDP Philippines had a page dedicated to the Project but information were out of date at the time when the TE was conducted (TE, p. 43). Moreover, the website of UNDP Indonesia and Malaysia did not report any information on the project. Project staff and representatives participated in a number of capacity building activities, and also presented results and lessons learned at a number of local, regional and international conferences and workshops. Also, genetic diversity study sponsored by the Project, under Outcome 4, was summarized by the researchers into a scientific article, which was accepted by an international, peer-reviewed journal. A newsletter was produced by UNDP. Local and national newspapers covered some of key milestones achieved by the project, such as the endorsement of the RSAP on October 2013. The

Zamboanga sardine closure was also nationally covered by media. The TE noted that no costs were incurred in the last year of Project implementation (2014). This was unfortunate, because the best practices and lessons learned, including those from the demonstration activities, were not organized into consolidated case study reports that could have been shared throughout the region, and also among the GEF IW portfolio.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately satisfactory

The TE rated efficiency as "Moderately Satisfactory" and this TER agrees with that rating. This is because of a high turnover in project staff, low disbursements, low value for money on outcome 3 and no money spent on knowledge management (outcome 5) in 2014.

The high turnover of regional project managers (RPMs) had a detrimental effect on cost effectiveness. Considerable time and resources were required each time there was a change, to allow time for the new manager to adapt and also build up trust among the key national and regional stakeholders. Shortfalls in efficiency were manifested in several ways, e.g. by the fact that the Regional Strategic Action Program (RSAP) was not sufficiently rationalized among the three countries, there are no clear goals indicated in the document, and consultations seemed to have been incomplete (TE, p. 47). However, endorsement was realized by national agencies.

The project spent no money on knowledge management (Outcome 5) in 2014. This is unfortunate because the last year of a project is typically a period when results are disseminated and consolidated.

Approximately 19% (USD 536,552) of the total project expenditures was spent on outcome 3, but the main output was a report produced by the Bogor Agricultural University. In the opinion of the evaluator, the added value from this report and other activities under Outcome 3 are disproportional with the money spent (TE, p. 47).

However, the project was efficient in sponsoring an updated scientific assessment of transboundary threats and causal linkages, through completion of the TDA, and also through developing a framework of measures. In addition, government co-financing sums exceeded the committed amounts.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately likely

The TE rated sustainability as "moderately likely" and this TE agrees with that rating. This is because the financial sustainability, environmental sustainability and socio-political stability were also considered moderately likely.

Financial sustainability was rated as "Moderately likely" in the TE and this TER agrees with that rating. The approximate USD 10.5 million estimated to be required by each of the three countries for the first three years of implementation of the RSAP/NSAPs seems unrealistic, as the TE noted no evidence indicating that the countries have included these sums into their development plans (TE, p. 50). However the countries are committed to finance at least some of the activities included the RSAP/NSAPs. For example, the Philippines spent approx. USD 330,000 on the replication site in Palawan. The municipality of Tarakan (in Indonesia) received more than USD 500,000 in government funding for fisheries related issues in 2013-2014, and an additional approximately USD 325,000 were proposed for 2015.

The TE rated socio-political sustainability as "Moderately likely" and this TER agrees with that rating. There is continued socio-political risks in the region, including in Semporna, Malaysia and in Zamboanga, Philippines. These risks continue to be significant, and could potentially compromise the implementation of the activities agreed upon in the RSAP/NSAPs.

The sustainability of the institutional framework and governance was rated as "Moderately likely" in the TE. This TER downgrades that rating to "Moderately unlikely". The reluctance of certain representatives of the Government of Malaysia to approve the proposed extension of the MoU for the SSME Tri-Com was clear. This is a critical aspect that may jeopardize the overall viability of the SSME Tri-Com. The RSAP/NSAPs provide a starting point in terms of an institutional framework, but un-committed participation by one of the three countries substantially reduces the likelihood for a regional response to the key transboundary problems.

The TE rated environmental sustainability as "Moderately likely" and this TER agrees with that rating. Each of the three countries are implementing programs, including the ones agreed to in the NSAP's and the SSME CAP, on encouraging fishers to shift to non-fishing livelihood alternatives, which in most cases are related to aquaculture. Without proper design and operation, intensive aquaculture can lead to significant disruptions to ecosystems and ecosystem services. Such risks are not sufficiently addressed in the RSAP/NSAPs. In the opinion of the evaluator, the transboundary problem of Habitat Loss and Community Modification, the second highest ranked in the TDA process, should have been be addressed in conjunction with Unsustainable Exploitation of Fish.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The total amount of government co-financing that materialized was USD 3.0389 million, slightly exceeding the USD 3 million indicated in the project document.

The great majority of co–financing was from the Indonesian government (1.69 million USD). These funds were mainly used for development of the RCFMC. Malaysia contributed the least of all three countries with only 0.20 million USD. However this is also due to the fact that the Government of Malaysia did not count ongoing activities that contributed to the foundational baseline on SCS fisheries, as the other two countries did.

The USD 0.04 million of in-kind funding from the Bureau for Development Policy (UNDP) did not materialized as planned, because there were no activities on value chain analysis included under outcome 4. The UNDP CO of the Philippines, however, exceeded their in-kind contribution, and also provided an additional USD 0.015 million in cash co-financing to support printing of some of the project deliverables.

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 completion was one year and nine months later than the original plan. This is a significant difference. One of the main causes was the high turnover of project managers, with three different project managers in four years. In addition, UNPOS required six months to recruit the first project manager.

These inefficiencies resulted in restricted allocation of funds for some of the activities carried out in the later stages of the Project, including SAP consultations and knowledge management (TE, p. iii).

Moreover, there was no functional PMO in place for a few months after the second regional project manager resigned at the end of 2012, so the MTR was made a bit later than originally planned (TE, p. 6).

In 2012, the demonstration activities in Indonesia were significantly delayed, partly due to disbursement by UNOPS to a wrong bank account, but mostly due to regulatory changes in Indonesia regarding how international projects are registered and administered (TE, p. 19).

According to the original concept, the lessons and best practices learned at the demonstration site in Tarakan (Indonesia) would be replicated in the town of Kwandang (in Gorontalo Province). Because the activities in Tarakan got off to a late start, the project was able to facilitate limited field surveys and desk studies (TE, p. 37).

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:

An indication of good country ownership is the realization of government co-financing, which slightly exceeded pledged amounts. In addition, there was also proactive, cross-sectoral involvement by both sub-national (for the demonstration projects) and national government stakeholders for the TDA. Ownership of demonstration projects was also high. For instance in Indonesia an inter-sectoral committee was established and formalized though local regulation. In the Philippines the Bureau of

Fisheries and Aquatic Resources used their own funds to continue data collection with the enumerators hired by the project. Also here the integrated coastal fisheries and resources management plans for the city of Zamboanga was approved through a formal resolution of the executive committee of the city.

Country ownership was diminished, however, based on relatively incomplete consultation during the Strategic Action Plan process. For example, some of the activities that ended up in the National Strategic Action Plans (NASP) are not consistent with national priorities or plans. More specifically, Malaysian federal agency did not support the extension of the SSME MOU because they saw it as redundant with the priorities and programs under the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Securities and Adaptation to Climate Change (CFFC) (TE, p. 12). Moreover, in Indonesia during interviews conducted as part of the TE, officials were perplexed since they considered that several of the items in the NSAP were not only unattainable within the indicated timeframe, but also not consistent with the priorities of the ministry (TE, p. 33).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Moderately satisfactory

The TE rated M&E Design at entry as "Satisfactory" while this TER downgrades that rating to "Moderately Satisfactory". This is because the target indicator for outcome 4 was unrealistic and probably not measurable and the target indicator four outcome 3 was too generally formulated to be measurable.

The target indicator of outcome 4 envisaged a 5-10% increase in fish stock at demonstration sites. In review of the project document the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) encouraged UNDP to specify how the results from the "growth" mechanisms will be measured and monitored. STAP considered this data collection important for the adequate management, monitoring of ecosystem based fisheries, and control efforts to reduce fishing in the project area (TE, p.25). Shortly after starting up the project, the Technical Advisory Group recommended removing the indicator target of 5-10% increases in fish stocks in the pilot areas, partly because the project was unprepared with the necessary plans and resources to carry out the required monitoring to support this target (TE. p. 25) and partly because the target was considered unrealistic.

The M&E plan was reasonably extensive. It included measurement and verification for International Waters (IW) indicators and project performance indicators, PIR, tripartite reviews, steering committee meetings, a mid-term external evaluation, a final external evaluation, audits and sufficient funds.

However the TE noted (p. 25) that the planned costs of the M&E plan exceeded acceptable ranges, without much detailed planning. The total indicative cost for Project M&E was 185,000 USD , which was 6.4% of the USD 2.89 million implementation budget (GEF grant), while the cost of the M&E plan is typically 3-5% of total cost. The cost estimate was made using the standard M&E project document template used for GEF-financed project, and there does not seem to have been much information put into the figures. For example, USD 50,000 was allocated for "Measurement & Verification for IW Indicators and Project Performance Indicators", but it is unclear what is included behind this estimate.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Moderately satisfactory

The TE rated M&E implementation as "Moderately Satisfactory" and this TER agrees with that rating.

There was no evidence that the team developed specific targets for the implementation performance indicators, during the first year of the implementation of the project, as specified in the M&E plan. The logical results framework was used as the main M&E tool. Monitoring on activities was fairly good, including the field surveys carried out at the demonstration sites. But, results-based monitoring was found to be generally weak. This is evident in the relatively low level of coherence of the RSAP, and the limited results produced under Outcome 3, on institutional Strengthening (TE, p.26). Moreover the TE noted (p. 26) that the completed GEF IW tracking tool contained unsupported stress reduction results.

Progress reporting was consistently delivered and the PIRs are of good quality.

The mid-term review (MTR) was originally scheduled for December 2012, but this time period coincided with the resignation of the second Regional Program Manager (RPM) and the other members of the project management office (PMO). The MTR was shifted to April-May 2013, at which time there was an interim RPM in place, but no other staff of the PMO. Based upon the MTR report, the evaluator had considerable difficulties obtaining files and arranging logistics for the field mission. The management response to the MTR is dated 30 January 2014, more than six months after submission of the report. During the PSC meeting held on January 2014, some of the national government delegates stressed frustration regarding why the MTR results and management response were not included on the agenda of the meeting (TE, p. 26). In any case, a good part of the recommendations of the MTR were accepted and implemented by the project.

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 satisfactory

The TE rated Quality of Project Implementation as "Moderately Satisfactory". This TER agrees with that rating considering the overall good quality of the project design, and support provided in by the UNDP country office in the Philippines, but also taking into account the fact that UNDP country offices in Indonesia and in Malaysia did not actively participate in the project (TE. p. 28). This is unfortunate because these agencies might have facilitated advocacy to move forward the National Strategic Action Program (NSAPs).

The UNDP Philippines provided regular support to the project including assistance with procurement, logistics, and financing document reproduction. The different involvement of UNDP country offices (COs) is also due to the fact that the project management office (PMO) was based in the Philippines.

The project design is of good quality. In addition, the TE reports that key fisheries sector stakeholders were provided with sufficient opportunity to give input to the project design, and many of them participated in the consultations held.

The activities under Outcome 4 were mostly centered around Ecosystem Approach to Fishery Management (EAFM) demonstrations on municipal scales in each of the participating countries. Consistent with the incremental analysis made to justify the GEF support, there should have been a greater regional dimension to the demonstration activities, albeit within the funding levels available. Also, the project document contains a breakdown of assumptions and associated risks for each outcome and output planned. However, there were no specific risk mitigation plan in the project document or later during implementation.

The UNDP has implemented several GEF-financed IW projects throughout Southeast Asia, and through this regional experience they have built up favorable connections with national stakeholders, as well as with regional and international interventions. The UNDP leveraged this experience in implementing the project, starting in the preparation phase and continuing through the implementation timeframe. The same regional UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) was in place for the entire implementation period, adding continuity to the overall process.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory

The TE rated Quality of Project Execution as “Moderately Satisfactory”. This TER downgrade that rating to “Moderately satisfactory”. This is because payments from UNOPS were often delayed and also because of the high turnover of regional project managers (RPM).

There were occasions when disbursements of payments from UNOPS were delayed (TE, p. 29). The TE did not find specific evidence that these delays resulted in interruptions in the progress of work, but the situation did contribute to the rather contentious relationship that developed between UNOPS and the National Coordination Units (NCUs) in at least two of three countries (TE, p. 29).

The PMO staff members were either directly or indirectly hired by UNOPS, and after UNOPS signed the project document in January 2010, it took six months to recruit and appoint a RPM in June 2010. The first RPM resigned after for one year, in June 2011. The second RPM was brought on board in January 2012, and only served one year, until the end of 2012, at which time all of the Project Management Office (PMO) staff also resigned. So, there were a few months when there was no functioning PMO. One of the consequences of this was that the mid-term evaluation was conducted a few months later than planned. The third and final RPM acted as interim RPM after the February 2013 PSC meeting and was formally appointed in the summer of that year (TE, p. 29).

There were some adaptive measures implemented during times when there were gaps in PMO staff representation (like the direct work of UNOPS in Copenhagen with the NCUs), but there was no evidence of a risk management response, trying to find out the root causes and coming up with mitigation responses to reduce PMO staff turnover (TE, p. 12).

During the last 1-1/2 years before the project end, the project was at a critical stage, needing supervision for the Strategic Action Program (SAP) process and also support for the demonstration activities, which peaked in spending in 2013. It would have been more constructive to have a separate RPM and fisheries expert during this period, however the RPM also covered the fishery expert position.

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.

This was the first project implemented under the Sub-Com on Sustainable Fisheries, and the RSAP and NSAPs have set out the first set of concrete responses to over-exploitation of small pelagics. However, SAP implementation typically requires a timeframe of 10-15 years, and additional time is then required before intended impacts are attained.

Following the concepts of ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM), the project facilitated demonstrations of management approaches in Tarakan (Indonesia), where approximately 10,000-ha fisheries restricted area was established, and in Zamboanga (Philippines), where a seasonal, 3-month closure of the sardine fishery has been implemented annually since 2011.

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 Zamboanga sardine closure affected several thousand cannery workers and a few hundred fishers, who could not fish for three months per year.

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

Despite some shortcomings in the coherence of the SAP, the RSAPs and NAPS provided a solid foundation, and the process of developing the RSAP/NSAPs was equally important, through strengthening regional collaborative capacity and networks.

The demonstration activities also made strong capacity building contributions, through extensive trainings, workshops, and on-the-ground experience for sub-national administrations, local experts, including academics (TE, p. 56).

b) Governance

A regional strategic action program (RSAP) was developed and endorsed by relevant national authorities. National strategic action programs (NSAPs) were also compiled after the RSAP was completed.

At each of the three demonstration sites, Tarakan in Indonesia, Semporna in Malaysia, and Zamboanga in the Philippines, integrated fisheries management plans (IFMP's) were developed, and two of them, Tarakan and Zamboanga, were formally approved through sub-national administrative decisions.

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.

One unintended consequence of the sardine closure in the Philippines has been the tendency for some furloughed cannery workers to not return to work, because they had found another job (TE, p. 40). Local authorities have tried to provide support them as much as possible, for example, there is a program administered through the labor department that pays the laid off workers one month of the three months they are off. The other concern from the industry side is maintaining their market position during the closure. In this regard at least one of the canneries has bought supply from China to ensure there are no disruptions to their supply to market.

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.

There was a catalytic role of the project built into the design, specifically in Outcome 4, in which the Growth, Maintenance, and Control management approaches applied at the demonstration sites were envisaged to be utilized at pre-selected replication sites in each of the three countries. Implementation of integrated fisheries management at the replication sites was achieved to varying degrees among the countries. The most significant progress was made in the Philippines at the replication site in Palawan, where approximately USD 330,000 were funded by government sources over the period of 2011-2014 (TE, p. 52). In Indonesia, researches from the Gorontalo University carried out some secondary data collection in support of the preparation of an integrated fisheries management plan for the replication site in Kwandang.

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 most important lessons from the TE are reported below:

- Advocacy is an important part of the process. While part of the TDA/SAP process requires intense inputs by the scientific community, the role of advocacy should not be under-valued. Ensuring

that communication lines remain open and positive among regional, high-level officials is critical. And, promoting the added value of the RSAP in a landscape of numerous regional initiatives requires concerted attention by qualified experts. The terms of reference of particular partners and/or individuals tasked with advocacy responsibilities should be clear in this regard.

- Strong financial control and M&E are required to ensure good value-for-money. Results-based management requires that there is sufficient focus on delivering the intended outcomes, and avoiding an over-emphasis on outputs.
- Biodiversity conservation is inter-twinned with sustainable fisheries management. As fisheries management moves towards a more ecosystem-based approach, biodiversity considerations become more important, and successful implementation of EAFM essential requires mainstreaming biodiversity into the productive sector and resource use planning.
- The participating countries committed obligations on numerous national and regional programs. It is important to ensure that a SAP be developed complementary to other relevant initiatives, e.g., through highlighting logical linkages. Programmed activities should fall within the frameworks of the medium term funding cycles of the countries.
- Logistics need to be carefully factored into the selection pilot areas. Poor road conditions and distance to the nearest airport make travel to/from the replication site in Kwandang, Indonesia very cumbersome. These factors did not seem to be fully factored into the decision of selecting this as the replication site there.
- The Executing Agency should provide more instruction to the implementation partners on issues associated with cooperative implementing agreements and payment procedures. UNOPS should provide early and more detailed guidance to the implementation partners on issues associated with the cooperative implementing agreements and payment procedures, as a means to mitigate risks of conflicts surrounding disbursement modalities.
- Regarding fishery restricted areas, buy-in by private sector fish processors can be jeopardized if they cannot fill gaps in supply disruptions and if furloughed workers do not return because of landing alternative employments.
- Regarding participation in regional value chains by small-scale fishers and producers, lack of capacity and capital to fulfill certain quality and safety requirements can be prohibitive.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

- The reluctance of Malaysia to support extension of the MOU of the SSME Tri-Com after the first one expires in 2015 is a critical risk to the overall viability of the tri-national collaborative framework. The other members of the Tri-Com, with support from the Sub-Com, UNDP, GEF, and also the CTI Secretariat should implement concerted advocacy efforts to communicate the added value of maintaining the SSME Tri-Com, and trying to persuade Malaysian decision makers to reconsider their position.
- A sustainability strategy should be prepared to aid the Sub-Com in over-seeing subsequent implementation activities. This should include: i) Suggest steps for deciding upon how coordination of the RSAP implementation will be operationalized; ii) Request the countries to indicate roles and

responsibilities for implementation of the NSAPs, iii) request the countries to outline how continued progress from the demonstration sites will feed into the NSAPs monitoring and evaluation program.

- The RSAP should be rationalized by considering the following suggestions: An executive summary should be added; There should be clear, logical linkages to the SSME Comprehensive Action Plan; A Year-1 review should be made, including a detailed account of activities completed, costs incurred, and contributions made toward the SAP targets; Short-term and medium term targets should be developed; National responses should be rationalized, and activities should be reconciled to the medium-term development funding cycles of the countries; A financing strategy should be made; There should be a strategy for eventually agreeing upon common baselines, information management and sharing, and financial reporting; A simple flow chart showing how the RSAP is complementary to other regional initiatives would greatly aid advocacy efforts.
- The results and lessons learned on the project, including the demonstration sites should be documented in concise, informative case study reports and made available on the IW.
- Biodiversity should be included in the RSAP/NSAP.
- Scaling up EAFM within the SCS might be more prudent on a sub-regional scale, rather than at the municipality level. The recommendation is to analyze and map out sub-regional areas, which could be within national borders or trans-national, broken down by criteria such as supply chain connectivity, type of fishery, demographics, etc., to create a general framework that could be amended to the TDA, and also used in subsequent development of the RSAP.
- Design and sponsor regional demonstration initiatives. These could include: linking universities together from each of the three countries on joint research topics; mapping out supply chain linkages, and highlighting weaknesses and needs for improvement; organizing joint training and experience-sharing workshops for local level surveillance officers; bringing together ethnic communities who are using traditional methods, to spotlight commonalities and to bridge cultural divides; etc.
- Advocate consolidating national inter-sectoral coordination bodies for some of the complementary regional initiatives
- Link sustainable land management with EAFM objectives
- Support improvements to local enabling infrastructure, e.g., jetties, cold chain facilities, etc., as a way to increase ownership and awareness among local stakeholders.

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?	Outcomes, achievements of the objective are very well assessed. However, the analysis of impacts could have been more comprehensive and detailed.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. Evidence is detailed and concrete. Rating are well substantiated	**HS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability is properly analyzed. Considerations on the exit strategy are missing	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lesson learned are really informative and comprehensive. The context that generated them is clearly explained	**HS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Actual costs are included for each outcome along with details of co-financing used.	**HS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The analysis of the M&E is comprehensive and informative. Considerations on adaptive management are included.	**HS**
Overall TE Rating		**HS**

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