

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3532	
GEF Agency project ID		CO-X1004 (09/08/2009, GEF+FSP approval)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	
Project name		Protecting Biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea	
Country/Countries		Colombia	
Region		Latin America and Caribbean	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-SP2: Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems	
Executing agencies involved		Corporation for the Sustainable Development of the Archipelago of San Andres, Old Providence, and Santa Catalina (CORALINA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency; e.g. The NGO Forest Trends/ The Ocean Foundation (TE, p.28)	
Private sector involvement		N/A	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 3 rd , 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		July, 2010 (TE, p.15)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 17 th , 2014 (TE, p.52)	
Actual date of project completion		September 17 th , 2015 (TE, p.52)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M) (TE, p.6)	At Completion (US \$M) (TE, p.53)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.15	0.15
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.00	3.15
Co-financing	IA own	1.02	
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	5.23 (local funding)	
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.15	3.15
Total Co-financing		6.25	7.16
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		9.25+0.15 (PPG) =9.40	10.16+0.15(PPG)=10.31 (TE, p.52)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 8 th , 2015	
Author of TE		Lourdes Alvarez	
TER completion date		06/22/2016	
TER prepared by		Chenhao Liu	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

- 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is “the protection, conservation and sustainable use of important marine and coastal ecosystems and biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea.” (PD, p.5)

- 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s specific objectives, which correspondent to the four major components of the project, are to:

- I. “implement effective adaptive management in collaboration with stakeholders and in accordance with the IMP (Integrated Management Plan);
- II. design and implement sustainable financial mechanisms for the long-term funding of MPA (Marine Protection Area) management;
- III. render key economic activities in the archipelago compatible with the objectives, guidelines and regulations of the MPA;
- IV. implement a management-oriented monitoring and analysis system that supports adaptive management and informed decision-making.” (PD, p.5)

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

There were no changes in global environment objectives, development objectives. But there have been some minor modifications to expected project activities, such as during the FY 2015 an expected output “to buy a climate change station hydro meteorological station to improve environmental monitoring” was added under project component IV. (PIR 2015, p.4) Also, the project cost evolved along with the need of project execution, and by the end of the project the project cost was 109.8% of the project’s initial budget (excluding PPG, TE, p.53). The project experienced a number of delays, both in its inception phase and during its implementation, and the project had extension of two times, which postponed the project’s final closing date to September 17th 2015. (TE, p.57)

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE discussed the project's relevance without providing a rating. In a binary scale (Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory), this TER will rate the project's outcome relevance as "Satisfactory". The project is consistent with relevant strategic priorities for development at the national and international level.

The project belongs to GEF's biodiversity focal area and was consistent with the GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic Program (SP) 2- Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems (TE, p.10/9-08-09 GEF_FSP_Proposal). The project is also in alignment with relevant country-level legal institutions and strategic priority for development: the MPA (Marine Protected Areas) Seaflower (project focus area) was the first MPA established by the Columbian government (2005) which serves as a model for the following MPAs. The project is also consistent with national priorities and national framework laws for environment and tourism, and it supports key national policies, including the long-term National Development Program 2019, the medium-term National Development Plan 2006- 2009, the National Biodiversity Policy and the Environmental Policy for Coastal Areas, Islands and Seas (GEF, 2009). As part of a broader and interconnected ecosystem in the Caribbean, the improvement in the MPA management will have positive impacts in the entire region, beyond the MPA Seaflower's boundaries. At the same time, international decisions linked with the project, for example, the International Court of Justice ruling, or the Nicaraguan canal, will affect the MPA ecosystem and management. (TE, p.10)

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

In a 6-point scale, the TE rated the project's outcome effectiveness as "Moderately Satisfactory". This TER will adopt the same rating. Based on the evidence presented by the TE, the expected outcomes of project component I and IV have been achieved with satisfaction, that of project component III have been partially achieved, and that of project component II have been achieved below the expectation. A comparison of the project's achievements against the expected outcomes is presented below: (TE, p.19-40)

The project's first component is the implementation, effective adaptive management in collaboration with stakeholders and in accordance with the IMP (Integrated Management Plan). Nearly all of its

expected outcomes have been achieved. Expected outcome 1 was that the Demarcation Plan reflecting ground-truthing and zoning adjustments will be updated to and implemented. By the end of the project, the target was achieved as the Demarcation Plan has been updated and the actual area demarcated was 2216.79 km² (against a target of 2000). Expected outcome 2 was that the Enforcement System for effective MPA (Marine Protected Area) adaptive management, relevant regulations and procedures (including penalty structure, cooperative compliance agreements and infractions database) will be developed and implemented, and by the EOP the target was achieved as the systems and procedures were developed and their implementation was in process. Expected outcome 3 was achieved, as it was expected that 4 inter-institutional enforcement agreements will be signed and implemented, and the end of project value was 4. Expected outcome 4 was achieved, as it was expected that 18 of additional CORALINA (project executing agency) staff will be trained in compliance-enhancing education and the EOP value was 31. Expected outcome 5 was achieved, as it was expected that 3 community programs to foster compliance with MPA regulations will be fully implemented, and the end of project value was 3. Expected outcome 6 was achieved, as it was expected that the MPA Co-management and Advisory committees (SAC: Stakeholder Advisory Committee, IIC: Inter-Institutional Committee, and IAB: International Advisory Committee) will be actively assuming their respective roles in adaptive management, and by the end of the project such committees are active. Expected Outcome 7 was that the Integrated Management Plan II will be reviewed by key stakeholders, updated as required, and presented to CORALINA Board of Directors for approval, and this was fully achieved. Expected outcome 8 was that the proposal for revised Integrated Management Plan Part III (Operational Manual) will be developed and presented to CORALINA Board of Directors for approval, by the end of the project this outcome has been fully achieved. Expected outcome 9 was that the operational licensing system for marine users will be developed and implemented, and the target has not been achieved by the end of the project as such system was not developed. Expected outcome 10 was that the Conflict Resolution Action Plan and Training Program will be implemented in the form of 8 trainings, and this target has been achieved and the actual no. of trainings conducted was 8. Expected outcome 11 was that Disaster Management Plan has been developed, consulted and presented to relevant entities for approval, and by the end of the project the target has been fully achieved. Expected outcome 12 was that the Action Plan for training, education, research, outreach and communication activities will be implemented, and by the end of the project this target has been fully achieved.

The project component II is designing and implementing sustainable financial mechanisms for the long-term funding of MPA (Marine Protection Area) management. A significant portion of its expected outcomes has not been achieved in line with expectation. Expected outcome 1 was that a comprehensive Willingness-to-Pay study (including sensitivity analysis) will be developed and accepted by CORALINA, and this target was fully achieved by the end of the project. Expected outcome 2 was that an entrance fee collection system will be designed and implemented, and this target has not been fully achieved as by the end of the project the system has been partially implemented. Expected outcome 3 was that the operational license system will be designed and implemented, and this target has not been achieved by the end of the project as the system has not been implemented. Expected outcome 4 was that the Marine PES (Payment for Ecosystem Services) feasibility study will be completed, Marine PES demonstration projects are being implemented underway with their replicability determined, this target has not been

fully achieved by the end of the project, as although feasibility study has been completed, PES demonstration projects have not been developed due to legal obstacles. Expected outcome 5 was that a private donation scheme “Friends of Seaflower” will be operational, and this target has not been achieved as the scheme has been cancelled. Expected outcome 6 was that a Trust Fund managing revenues from Payment for Ecosystem Services and corresponding management arrangements will be formally established, and this target has not been achieved as the Trust Fund was cancelled by the project management. Expected outcome 7 was that 3 Feasibility Studies for complementary financial mechanisms (special dive site fees, additional PES schemes, tourist tax, etc.) will be completed, and by the end of the project the target was achieved with 5 Feasibility Studies completed.

The project’s third component was rendering key economic activities in the archipelago compatible with the objectives, guidelines and regulations of the Marine Protection Area. A significant portion of expected outcomes under this component were achieved, with also some underachievement. Expected outcome 1 was that 600 local community members will receive entrepreneurial training through the project, and the target has been exceeded with an end of project value of 1661. Expected outcome 2 was that 8 comprehensive feasibility studies for all proposed alternative livelihood pilot projects will be completed, and the target was achieved at 75% with the end of project value of 6. Expected outcome 3 was that 7 alternative livelihood pilot projects will be in execution, and this target was achieved at 57%, with the end of project value 4. Expected outcome 4 was that 3 compatibility programs (focused on artisanal fisheries, small-scale agriculture and MPA management) will be in execution, and by the end of the project this target had been fully achieved. Expected outcome 5 was that annual participatory evaluation of private sector partner’s effectiveness in fostering productive activities compatible with MPA by beneficiaries will be submitted to project management, and by the end of the project the target has been fully achieved. Expected outcome 6 was that the analysis of pilot projects and compatibility programs to determine lessons learned for replication/scaling-up of initiatives will be submitted to project management, and by the end of the project this target has been fully achieved.

The project component IV is implementing a management-oriented monitoring and analysis system that supports adaptive management and informed decision-making. All of the expected outcomes under this component have been achieved. Expected outcome 1 was that existing monitoring protocols and programs for ecological and socio-economic monitoring will be revised or expanded as necessary and regularly applied, and by the end of the project the target has been fully achieved as such monitoring and analysis systems have been updated and are being applied. Expected outcome 2 was an integrated data management system which will collect and manage data in a coherent manner. The target has been fully achieved, and by the end of the project such a system is being implemented. Expected outcome 3 was that a program to monitor MPA management effectiveness (including assessments of inter-institutional collaboration, partnerships and stakeholder participation) will be implemented, and this target has been fully achieved by the end of the project as such a system was being implemented. Expected outcome 4 was that 3 existing community-based monitoring programs will be strengthened and amplified, and this target has been exceeded by the end of project with 4 programs strengthened and amplified. Expected outcome 5 was that a rigorous methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of education and outreach activities will be developed and regularly applied, and by the end of the project this target has been

achieved as the methodology has been applied. Expected outcome 6 was that analyses and evaluations of monitoring data will be conducted to give useful insights into the impact of MPA implementation on ecosystem health, social-economic and cultural conditions, management effectiveness, and public knowledge/awareness of MPA. The target has been achieved, and by the end of the project the studies about evaluations and monitoring data have been delivered. Expected outcome 7 was the implementation of a climate change station in the south section of the MPA, and this target was achieved.

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

The TE assessed the project's efficiency and provided an informal rating as "in general satisfactory" (TE, p.16). In a 6-point scale, this TER will rate the project's outcome efficiency as "Moderately Satisfactory". Evidence presented by relevant project documents confirmed the project's cost-effectiveness, but there was also some evidence of delays and inefficiencies in project implementation.

The project's finance has been well-managed, on balance, with a reasonable cost-budget ratio. The TE rated the execution of project finance as "satisfactory" (TE, p.52). The project's total executed cost is 10,162,301,48 USD (TE, p.53), which is 109.8% of the initial budget (calculation excluding GEF PPG), in which the GEF project funding remains the same from the project start to project end. The project is also facing challenges in its implementation efficiency, such as difficulty in recruiting relevant project staff, high turnover within CORALINA (the project executing agency), the lack of harmonization between IDB and CORALINA regarding requirements and procedures for project implementation, and legal restrictions imposed by local governments. These challenges have led to delays, such as a delay in recruiting coordinators for each project component, the delay in initial execution due to the mismatch between IDB and CORALINA in requirements and procedures, the delay in signing agreements with co-financing institutions due to legal issues, and the delay of 2-years for project component III to fully start due to lack of timely financial support. (TE, p.16-17) Also, during project implementation the project also experienced delays due to external factors, such as delays due to the ICJ (International Court of Justice)'s ruling of the sovereignty issues of MPA (Marine Protected Area) (TE, p.8). These delays, some of which were overcome as the project implementation went on, finally have led to two project extensions for a, total of 9 months, to September 17th 2015. (TE, p.51) Most of the delays didn't have any impact on project outcomes, except that the delayed start of project component III has led to the incomplete implementation of some of its originally planned activities. (TE, p.48)

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

The TE rated the project's overall sustainability as "Moderately Unlikely" based on its assessment of three sub-categories of sustainability: Financial resource sustainability (Moderately Unlikely); Socio-political sustainability; and Institutional sustainability. This TER will rate the project's sustainability as "Moderately

Unlikely” after assessing the four sub-categories of sustainability below. Based on the evidence presented by the TE, the project is facing substantial financial constraints and some institutional risks in order to sustain its impact.

Financial Resource Sustainability- Moderately Unlikely

The TE assessed the project’s financial sustainability and rated this area as “Moderately Unlikely”. (TE, p.55) Based on the relevant information provided by the TE, this TER will rate the project’s financial sustainability as “Moderately Unlikely”. The project’s second component aims at developing a system providing sustainable financial support to the MPA (Marine Protected Area), but its outcome was unsuccessful. Relevant project documents did not identify any immediate scale-up or replication of the project, or confirm financial commitment from any sources with the aim of sustaining the project impact, and this is specifically mentioned by the TE “Currently CORALINA (the project executing agency) relies on international programs and local contributions that do not give financial stability to establish a long-term program in coordination with the local government and other institutions.” (TE, p.53)

Socio-political Sustainability- Moderately Likely

The TE assessed the project’s social sustainability but it didn’t provide a rating. This TER will rate this the project socio-political sustainability as “Moderately Likely”. The TE presented the evidence that the community participation in project activities and alternative livelihood trainings is at a high level. All the activities related with the MPA have had a significant participation of the community” (TE,p.iii), and “the ownership of the project is positive.”(TE,p.54). The project’s reputation among the community, however, has been positively affected by the ICJ ruling which re-demarcated the Marine Protected Area. (TE, p.53-54) This high-level community participation and national ownership will provide a good foundation for the project’s sustainability from a social and political perspective.

Institutional Sustainability- Moderately Unlikely

The TE assessed the project’s institutional sustainability but it didn’t provide a rating. This TER will rate the project’s institutional sustainability as “Moderately Unlikely”. The project was supported by the strong expertise and motivated staff of the CORALINA (project executing agency), their partnership with other institutions, which has provided significant support to project execution, and the project’s good reputation among the local communities. (TE, p.16 & 54) But the project’s institutional sustainability is also threatened by the high staff turnover the CORALINA due to the project’s weak prospect of financial sustainability, an unclearly defined the legal framework related to the MPA, and “ineffective enforcement” of MPA management measure, all of which will hinder the project’s sustainability. (TE, p.9 et p.54)

Environmental Sustainability- Unable to Assess

The TE didn’t assess the project’s environment sustainability nor had it provided a rating for this area. Relevant project document didn’t provide sufficient evidence to support the assessment of this area. Climate change factors that may potentially affect the project results were identified as an element of the

project's risks at the project start, but they became no longer relevant toward the end of the project (TE, p.8-9), nor it is clear with current evidence available if they will affect the project's long-term impact. The TE did mention that some project activities, such as "the demarcation of the MPA with delimited areas for different uses" may have long-term environmental impact such as helping to manage the ecosystems and improve its quality, but these long-term impacts "are difficult to assess" (TE, p.51).

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 project's initially planned level of co-financing was USD 6,253,000 (TE, p.53), but the level of co-financing materialized was USD 7,162,301 (PIR 2015, p.6), indicating a materialization rate of 115%. The additional co-financing to the originally planned co-financing comes mostly from local government. The GEF project funding has remained constant from the project start to completion, and the actual project cost is 109.8% of the initial budget (calculation excluding PPG), implying an important contribution of co-financing to the project outcome. As the project's actual outcome is at a level in general in line with expectation, it is difficult to assess how has the higher-than-expected co-financing has contributed to the project outcome.

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 formally started in July 2009 with an initial duration of 4.5 years. The project was completed on September 17th, 2015 after two extensions totaling a period of 9 months. (TE, p.52) The project has undergone a number of delays, such as the delay at its initial stage due to CORALINA's (project executing agency) administrative structure (TE, p.15), due to the slow process of recruitment of project general coordinator and the coordinators for each component (TE, p.16), due to delays of signing signature with co-financing institutions. (TE, p.17) The initial delays were overcome gradually as the project implementation goes on, but the TE also mentioned a few delays during the project implementation, such as the delay due to the ICJ (International Court of Justice)'s ruling of the sovereignty issues of MPA (Marine Protected Area) (TE, p.8), and the delay of execution of project component III due to lack of financial support. The delay of the project component III has limited the opportunity to assess the planned achievement of the component (TE, p.17), and some of its originally designed activities have not been implemented (TE, p.48). No linkage between the project's sustainability and delays was reported by relevant project documents.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal link

The country ownership of this project is at a satisfied level. The project provides tangible benefits to the local community, and the participation in the trainings organized under this project was high. As pointed out by TE: “All the activities related with the MPA (Marine Protected Area) have had a significant participation of the community” (TE,p.iii), and “the ownership of the project is positive.”(TE,p.54). But at the same time certain events, such as the ICJ’s ruling which re-demarcated the MPA and redefined the beneficiaries of the project, has created challenges in this area through decreasing the willingness of the local community to participate with public institutions (TE, p.23). But the reputation of the project among the community, although affected by the ICJ ruling, is considered good according to the interviewees during the TE (TE, p.53-54) In general, the project’s country ownership is at a satisfied level, and it becomes an integral part of the contributing factors for the project’s social, political and institutional sustainability.

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The TE provided assessments on the project’s M&E system and informally providing a “Satisfactory” rating. (TE,p.i) In a 6-point scale, this TER will rate this area as “Moderately Satisfactory”. The project has a detailed M&E design at entry in general in line with GEF standard, but instead of establishing a set of project indicators following the SMART principle, the project’s initial M&E design proposed a number of expected activities under each project component fulfilling the same role of project indicators.

The project’s logic framework rolled out at the project start in the project document was constantly observed throughout the project period for the use of project monitoring with no significant change. According to the project document, under each project outcome there are a few expected activities as project targets. For example, “implementing an MPA (Marine Protected Area) entrance fee and collection mechanism, based on a comprehensive willingness-to-Pay and financial analysis” and “implementing marine user (e.g., water sports) operators’ licenses with an annual fee structure” (PD, p.6), were identified as expected activities under the project outcome component 2 “designing and implement sustainable financial mechanisms for the long-term funding of MPA (Marine Protection Area) management”. Furthermore, in addition to these expected activities, the project document presented a number of indicators for use of monitoring and evaluation, such as “% of estimated annual operating costs directly related to the integrated management of the Seaflower MPA covered by income from sustainable financial mechanisms” and “# of local community members, including women and youth, receiving economic benefits from participation in alternative sustainable livelihood projects and compatibility

programs” (PD,p.9), and these indicators are not categorized based on project components. Apart from the limited number of project indicators specified, the project’s “expected activities” under each project component are functioning as indicators, and it is difficult to assess them based on the “SMART” principle. Also, the TE clearly pointed out some of the project indicators proposed by the project’s M&E design is not realistic, such as the “Number of community members, including women and youth, receiving economic benefits from participation in alternative sustainable livelihood projects and compatibility programs” was set at an unrealistic target of 1,200 without a thorough analysis or reason supporting this target. (TE, p.7)

The project document provided a detailed implementation plan setting up the project’s key M&E activities, responsible personnel, bi-annual/annual reporting, Mid-Term/Terminal Evaluation. The TE pointed out that an M&E budget was also mentioned in project document, but the project document in hand didn’t include this information. (TE, p.9)

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

The TE provided assessments on the project’s M&E system and informally providing a “Satisfactory” rating. (TE, p.i) In a 6-point scale, this TER will rate the M&E implementation as “Satisfactory”. Evidence presented by relevant project documents is drawing a picture of a strong and successful M&E implementation.

The most significant success of M&E implementation is the consistency of the project logic framework in measuring the project’s progress toward achieving expected outputs as compared to other similar GEF projects. All project PIRs since the project start have observed the same project logic framework in tracking the project’s process toward its targets, and all of the PIRs are following the IDB’s standard by incorporating assessment of the project’s periodic status regarding project performance and project risk, with project modifications reported and lessons learned summarized. Although not as indicators per se, the expected activities of each project component proposed in the initial M&E design were able to fulfill their role in monitoring the project’s progress toward project objectives, and the TE uses them to evaluate the project’s outcome achievement by comparing them with the project’s actual achievements.

The MTE was conducted in 2013. Its recommendations were adopted in the project implementation afterwards and the MTE was “was an important tool to reinforce the execution of the project” according to relevant project staff. (TE, p.18) Specifically, the MTE’s recommendations adopted have improved the flexibility in the procurement and administrative processes between the IDB and CORALINA, also the relationship between the CORALINA staff and the staff linked with the project improved (TE, p.19). The Terminal Evaluation is comprehensive, evidence convincing with a very thorough assessment of project outcome, but it can be further improved through providing specific ratings for project M&E, execution and implementation.

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 project's implementing agency is IDB (Inter-American Development Bank). The TE didn't provide a rating for the project implementation. In a 6-point scale, this TER will rate the quality of project implementation as "Moderately Satisfactory" considering the IDB's performance as the project implementing agency. Based on the evidence presented by the TE, IDB has successfully fulfilled its role as the project's implementing agency, but at the same time is facing certain challenges.

Apart from contributing to co-financing and project design, the IDB assumed the major role in project supervision. The IDB has in general fulfilled its role with success. "The IDB's value-added is high and interviewees (during the TE) emphasized the (IDB's) day-to-day follow-up of the activities, as well as the missions to review the activities." (TE, p.17) "Regarding the contractual terms, all the contractual clauses defined in the project design between the IDB and CORALINA were satisfactorily fulfilled." (TE, p.17) But the IDB also faces challenges in its role as the project implementing agency. For example, the TE clearly pointed out that the project's initial execution was delayed due to the lack of harmonization between IDB and CORALINA regarding the requirements and procedures for project implementation (TE, p.17); better communication between IDB and the project executing agency is expected to mitigate future misunderstandings that negatively affect the implementation of the project (TE, p.12); The IDB also had some turnover in the project coordination and the team leaders, but according to the CORALINA staff interviewed in the TE, it didn't have a significant impact in the implementation of the project. (TE, p.17) In the face of challenges, the IDB has proposed solutions to improve the implementation of the program. (TE, p.17)

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

The project's executing agency is CORALINA (Corporation of the Sustainable Development of the Archipelago of San Andres, Old Providence and Santa Catalina), which is the environment authority in charge of the project focus region. The TE didn't single out a chapter assessing the CORALINA's performance as the project executing agency, nor had it provided a rating in this area. This TER will rate the project's execution as "Moderately Satisfactory" considering the CORALINA's performance as the

project executing agency. The CORALINA has endeavored to ensure the achievement of project objective with a moderately satisfied result, but it faces some internal and external challenges throughout its execution process.

CORALINA has undertaken the sole major responsibility in executing the project, and it has worked hard to secure a project outcome at the “Moderately Satisfactory” level. In the project executing process led by CORALINA, documents/strategies/procedures developed through the project have been submitted to CORALINA Board for approval, such as the revised IMP (Integrated Management Plan) (TE,p.41); CORALINA also organized capacity building trainings, and CORALINA did a great effort to take advantage of the agreements with other institutions and other CORALINA programs to implement the trainings planned (TE, p.30); CORALINA is also a major responsible party for project finance, apart from using and effectively managing the budgeted project funding, it made attempts to develop partnership with other institutions in order to secure funding for the project component III. (TE, p.12)

However, the TE pointed out a number of internal and external challenges that CORALINA has been facing throughout the project execution. Even though CORALINA has endeavored to seek alternative sources of project financing (TE, p.53), the project lacks sustainable financial support, and the CORALINA’s needed actual cost for managing MPA (Marine Protected Area) is high above its current financial capacity (TE, p.47). This lack of financial sustainability also contributed to the high rotation of qualified technical experts at CORALINA. (TE, p.54) Also, the administrative structure of CORALINA which limited the project’s financial execution, and the asymmetry between the CORALINA and IDB in terms of the procedures and requirement for project implementation, have caused delays at the project start (although the project caught up with its original planned progress after MTE). (TE, p.15, p.17, p.i) The CORALINA’s management team has undergone some change in 2013, which shifted the organization’s priority, and negatively affected the project execution. (TE,p.16) In addition, the TE recommended that the CORALINA improve its communication with beneficiaries and the IDB in order to facilitate the information exchange and coordination to make the project execution more effective (TE, p.12), and in the lessons learned section it pointed out the importance of other project stakeholders such as the local government in contributing to project design and finance (TE, p.55), all of which are pointing out to the weakness of CORALINA’s stakeholder engagement strategy.

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 project aims at establishing effective and sustainable MPA (Marine Protected Area) management system, and it attempted to achieve this goal through building capacities for relevant stakeholders. Relevant project documents didn't report any immediate environment changes as the result of the project. But the TE mentioned that, some of the activities achieved at the end of the project could have an impact on global environmental benefits and local population in the MPA and its area of influence. For example, the better demarcation of the MPA with delimited areas for different uses could help to manage the ecosystems and improve its quality (e.g. control of fishing of banned species and decrease in illegal activities that negatively affect coral). In addition, the interrelation with other MPA and territories in the region are key to preserve the biodiversity and the natural characteristics of the MPA and have global environmental benefits. (TE, p.51)

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 alternative livelihood and compatibility programs have led to some social and economic changes in local communities through diversifying the economy, alleviating poverty, and reducing pressure on marine biodiversity and ecosystems (TE, p.30, p.51), but the project didn't develop the mechanism to measure/monitor the economic and social benefits (e.g. % of income increase in families participating) or the improvement of the economic benefits linked with the activities of the project. (TE, p.48)

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 reported the following project achievements related to changes in capacities: (TE, p.29-36)

The Demarcation Plan for the MPA (Marine Protected Area), reflecting the ground-truthing and zoning adjustments, has been updated and was also being implemented with the actual area demarcated 2216.79 km². The enforcement system for effective MPA adaptive management, relevant regulations and procedures (including penalty structure, cooperative compliance agreements and infractions database) have been developed and the implementation was ongoing. 4 inter-institutional enforcement agreements have been signed and implemented. 31 additional CORALINA staff have been trained in compliance-enhancing education and 3 community programs to foster compliance with MPA regulations have been fully implemented. Integrated Management Plan II has been reviewed by key stakeholders, updated as

required, and presented to CORALINA Board of Directors for approval. The proposal for the revised Integrated Management Plan, Part III (Operational Manual) has been developed and presented to CORALINA Board of Directors for approval. The Conflict Resolution Action Plan and Training Program has been implemented in the form of 8 trainings. A Disaster Management Plan has been developed, consulted and presented to relevant entities for approval, and an Action Plan for training, education, research, outreach and communication activities has been developed and implemented.

A comprehensive Willingness-to-Pay study (including sensitivity analysis) has been developed and accepted by CORALINA, and an entrance fee collection system has been designed and partially implemented. Marine PES (Payment for Ecosystem Services) feasibility study has been completed; and 5 Feasibility Studies for complementary financial mechanisms (special dive site fees, additional PES schemes, tourist tax, etc.) have been completed.

1661 local community members have received entrepreneurial training throughout the project, and 6 comprehensive feasibility studies for all proposed alternative livelihood pilot projects have been completed. 4 alternative livelihood pilot projects were in execution, and 3 compatibility programs (focused on artisanal fisheries, small-scale agriculture and MPA management) were in execution. Annual participatory evaluation of private sector partner's effectiveness in fostering productive activities compatible with MPA by beneficiaries has been submitted to project management and analysis of pilot project and compatibility programs to determine lessons learned for replication/scaling-up of initiatives has been submitted to project management.

Existing monitoring protocols and programs for ecological and socio-economic monitoring have been revised and were being applied; an integrated data management system was built up and being implemented which will collect and manage data in a coherent manner; a program to monitor MPA management effectiveness (including assessments of inter-institutional collaboration, partnerships and stakeholder participation) was established and being implemented; 4 existing community-based monitoring programs have been strengthened and amplified; rigorous methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of education and outreach activities has been developed and was being applied; analyses and evaluations of monitoring data have been conducted and delivered to project management to give useful insights into impact of MPA implementation on ecosystem health, social-economic and cultural conditions, management effectiveness, and public knowledge/awareness of MPA; a climate change station in south section of the MPA has been established and was in operation.

b) Governance

The TE reported following change in governance: (TE, p.19-40)

The enforcement system for effective MPA (Marine Protected Area) adaptive management, relevant regulations and procedures (including penalty structure, cooperative compliance agreements and infractions database) have been developed and implementation was ongoing.

The MPA Co-management and Advisory committees (SAC: Stakeholder Advisory Committee, IIC: Inter-Institutional Committee, and IAB: International Advisory Committee) have been established and were actively assuming their respective roles in adaptive management.

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.

Relevant project documents didn't identify any unintended impacts of this project.

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.

Relevant project documents didn't report any immediate scale-up or replication of the project, and the TE pointed out that "the replicability of the project is directly linked with the possibility of achievement of financial mechanisms to effectively manage the protected area" (TE, p.51), which is so far among the most significant weaknesses of the project.

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 summarized the following lessons learned (TE, p.55-56):

"The "Protecting Biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea" is a complex and ambitious program implemented in a complex context. Several external and internal factors impacted the effective execution of the project, highly relevant at the local, national and international level. The analysis of the project design, implementation issues and sustainability dimensions reveals important lessons learned to take into account.

Regarding the design of the project the prioritization of the activities is the key to be realistic and to focus in the main priorities for the MPA. The close collaboration with other institutions with responsibilities in the MPA management is essential to implement a sustainable management in such a wide area. CORALINA alone will not be able to manage the MPA, neither financially nor administratively.

The project should have included an earlier participation of key stakeholders –as the local government– to devise financial strategies and define specific roles and competencies to develop them. This should have better outlined the available and feasible financial instruments to develop during the program. The

limitations in the achievement of results related with the financial activities, constrains the short and medium term sustainability of the MPA. The role of CORALINA in the management of the MPA requires recurrent financing, especially for the monitoring and enforcement activities that allows a long-term programming. Furthermore, the role of CORALINA should not rule out the role of other institutions in the financial sustainability of the MPA.

The analysis and studies on different financial mechanisms to ensure the financial sustainability of the MPA have been an important exercise to know the alternatives and possibilities that CORALINA and other institutions have to manage the MPA. However, the project showed that these studies need to be prepared in the first stages of the project or, even, as a requirement in order to know the reality regarding the real options to develop other alternatives during the project.

Regarding the implementation of the project, the experience shows that effective harmonization and coordination among institutions is essential in order to effectively manage the MPA. This includes, for example, the participation in key activities to achieve the financial sustainability of the MPA. Furthermore, the constant tracking and evaluation of agreements and programs would help the improvement of the MPA management, the appropriation of the program and the implementation of the IMP.

Important activities with the community have been developed and strengthened in order to develop an integrated, participatory and effective management plan. The social appropriation of the project is key to be able to sustain the results and develop an effective IMP. In this project, although some obstacles external to the project (e.g. ICJ rule), the participation of the community has been high and the appropriation of the project in the main stakeholders, including CORALINA, is satisfactory. A better decision-making strategy needs to be put in place in order to make the stakeholders participation – including the private sector– stronger and binding in some important management decisions that can affect the community. The close work with other institutions has been also a key factor to implements of the education and training activities. However, more efforts are needed to effectively implement the agreements and the definition of responsibilities.

The project has generated good data and has tried to compile it in an integrated data management system to house collected data in a coherent manner, together with older information from studies and projects. However, currently there's only one staff managing the database. Protocols have not been developed yet and, even if other institutions have received specific training, the system is not online and only CORALINA has access to it. The main goal is to use the system as a common and public repository for all the institutions in the MPA, and a tool for decision-making."

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided the following recommendations (TE, p.56-57):

"Regarding the component I. Adaptive management

- The Demarcation Plan needs to be complemented with specific maps, especially for the offshore areas in order to effectively manage the MPA in all the areas.

- CORALINA's Board should officially approve the IMP and its update. This will help the definition of roles within CORALINA and with other local and national institutions.
- CORALINA has good relations with other institutions and for decades has signed agreements and memorandum of understandings to collaborate in the MPA management. However, more efforts are needed to develop common operational protocols for the sustainable IMP.
- The enforcement system, regulations and procedures should be clearly defined and better monitoring and assessment evaluation should be conducted to control the compliance of the agreements.
- The participation of the stakeholders needs to go beyond the simple information sessions Co-management and binding participation in the decision-making should be considered for some decisions impacting the community.
- The community needs to be aware of the management of the MPA. More information and transparency is needed. One option could be to deliver a monthly magazine with information to distribute to the main stakeholders and public spaces. This information would include periodic evaluations of the MPA management activities.
- Include in the school's curricula an educational program about the MPA to work with children about the characteristics, threats and alternatives for management.

Regarding the component II. Financial Sustainability

- Efforts to ensure the financial sustainability of the MPA needs to be developed. CORALINA should keep the dialogue with the local and national government and the private sector to find sustainable financial mechanisms to successfully manage the MPA. Long-term sustainable mechanisms develop among the public institutions with competition in the Archipelago and with the community, including the private sector.
- Alternative strategies for the financial management of the MPA need to be explored taking into account the legal restrictions for each institution and with the effective participation of all the stakeholders.
- CORALINA cannot effectively manage the MPA Seaflower alone. Develop a common program to framework all the management activities with the rest of institutions from an integrated perspective.

Regarding the component III. Alternative livelihoods

- The alternative livelihood program is relevant to decrease the pressure over the natural resources. However, the training and capacity sessions need to be accompanied over longer periods of time. CORALINA should attend the beneficiaries of the alternative livelihood programs for longer periods in order to consolidate the activities (including the marketing and commercial stages) and have more impact in their income and welfare.
- The definition of accurate feasibility studies is very important in order to define the characteristics and limitations of the alternative livelihoods projects. In this program some limitations have been revealed in the quality of the studies, that have limited in some cases the success of their implementation.

- CORALINA, the local government and other institutions need to help stakeholders and entrepreneurs to find financial resources to develop new business and activities (seed capital).

Regarding the component IV. MPA Monitoring and analysis

- A central office of control managed by all the institutions involved in control and surveillance would help to gather the information and control the procedures.
- Build a common repository place to gather all the information of all the institutions in the island. A public space for consultation. The information needs to be used in decision making by CORALINA and the local government.”

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE compared with detailed information the project's targeted outcomes and the project's actual outcome achievements. It didn't assess the project's impacts.	Satisfactory
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE report is internally consistent, evidence presented complete and convincing, but it didn't provide ratings for project efficiency/relevance/sustainability, M&E design/evaluation, project implementation/execution although it assessed these areas.	Moderately Satisfactory
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE assessed the project's sustainability with sufficient information but it didn't provide sustainability ratings. The TE didn't mention the project exit strategy.	Moderately Satisfactory
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The “Lessons Learned” section was thorough and comprehensive.	Satisfactory
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE specified the project's total costs and actual level of co-financing and it presented the breakdown of GEF project funding and co-financing by activities	Satisfactory
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE's evaluation of the project's M&E design was relevant, but it didn't specifically assess the project's M&E implementation; Its rating for the M&E system is informal (TE,p.i)	Moderately Unsatisfactory
		Moderately Satisfactory

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

In the preparation of this TER, no additional documents were referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, and PD.