

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		354	
GEF Agency project ID		1818	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Patagonian Coastal Zone Management Plan	
Country/Countries		Argentina	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Fundacion Patagonia Natural and Wildlife Conservation International: implementing partners	
Private sector involvement		Not involved.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		February 1993	
Effectiveness date / project start		UA; PMIS says 12/6/1999 but this is incorrect (TE was written in 1997)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		UA; PMIS says 10/11/2004 but this is incorrect as well.	
Actual date of project completion		9/30/1996	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		2.8	2.77
Co-financing	IA own	UA	UA
	Government	UA	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	UA	UA
	Private sector	UA	UA
	NGOs/CSOs	UA	UA
Total GEF funding		2.8	2.77
Total Co-financing		UA	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		UA	UA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2/7/1997	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Stephen Olsen and James Tobey	
TER completion date		September 2014	
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective is to preserve the biodiversity of the fauna along Patagonia's coastline. The Patagonian coast is in largely pristine condition and has a rich endowment of marine resources that support large populations of coastal mammals and birds. The project would provide the Patagonian coastal region with a scientific baseline and tools to support future sustainable management efforts.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document for this project is not available, but the TE summarizes the development objectives as follows:

- (1) To upgrade baseline data, management techniques and legislation on coastal resources relevant to the protection of biodiversity.
- (2) To establish a participatory process to integrate the information that will be the basis of the Coastal Zone Management Plan.
- (3) To upgrade institutional and human capabilities for responsible coastal management.
- (4) To promote community participation in the management process.

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

The TE did not report any changes to project objectives or activities.

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 project falls under GEF Operational Program 2: Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems. The Operational Program’s objective is to conserve and sustainably use biological resources in coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems. The project fulfills the Operational Program by increasing the information available on the Patagonian coastal ecosystem and improving sustainable management of the region.

Unable to assess the project’s alignment with country priorities because the Project Document was unavailable and the TE does not contain that information.

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

Project effectiveness is difficult to assess, because the TE did not have a comprehensive list of project outputs and activities, and the Project Document was not available for review. The TE’s explanation of project outputs also appears incomplete. Project effectiveness along each of the stated project objectives is assessed as follows:

- (1) To upgrade baseline data, management techniques and legislation on coastal resources relevant to the protection of biodiversity.

The TE reports that “excellent progress has been made on developing a scientifically sound baseline of information on marine birds and mammals against which future trends can be estimated” (TE, page 12). Almost all of the technical studies requested in the Project Document were completed; the TE states that some of the studies were not completed but does not explain which studies or why. The studies were “well written and well documented,” and were disseminated as a document series (TE, page 8). Together, the studies and reports “provide an objective, scientifically sound benchmark against which future change in the populations of the species of concern can be measured” (TE, page 8). This effort “has also drawn together the research community within the three provinces and has provided them with a shared perspective on the relative importance of the threats to biodiversity and the actions that need to be taken to manage these forces effectively” (TE, page 9).

While the scientific component of this objective was satisfactory, the socioeconomic and institutional aspects of biodiversity protection were given “relatively slight attention” by the project (TE, page 4). It is unknown whether this was a flaw in project design or execution. Only one review of the legal and institutional framework for coastal management was undertaken, and there was only one survey of the economic forces present in Patagonia. The TE states that this resulted in a flawed draft Coastal Zone Management Plan with “limited practical guidance” for management and regulation of conservation activities (TE, page 4).

- (2) To establish a participatory process to integrate the information that will be the basis of the Coastal Zone Management Plan.

The project intended for a Coastal Zone Management Plan to be developed, revised, and submitted for adoption and implementation. A draft Coastal Zone Management Plan was written, but it was not distributed for review and comments and therefore has not been finalized or submitted. The TE states that this was due to the short time frame of the project. There were also several weaknesses in the draft Plan: there was no institutional analysis or description of the institutional framework for coastal management, there were no policy statements, there was no provision for environmental education, and the Plan did not identify actions to be undertaken during the initial implementation phase.

The Project Document called for the formation of provincial-level Coastal Commissions to formulate and test natural resource management policies and plans. However, the project did not accomplish this for unknown reasons. Project design also intended the creation and submission of legislative proposals and regulations, but this did not occur.

- (3) To upgrade institutional and human capabilities for responsible coastal management.

The project implemented an educational program in 19 towns in Patagonia in order to create awareness and capacity for addressing coastal issues. Around thirty teacher training courses were held in 3 Argentinian provinces.

A number of technical workshops and courses were held on the management of coastal wildlife, tourism, marine bird and mammal population dynamics, coastal zone planning, onboard biological observation, environmental impact assessments, and environmental education. Two courses were implemented on using public hearings as a tool for community participation.

In addition, “the beginnings of a computerized data base of information on coastal resources was developed” in order to promote data-sharing and updating between the three Argentinian provinces located in Patagonia (TE, page 11). However, the TE reports that “it has not yet been technically possible” to create a connection between the agencies, and “the Provinces have been slow to designate with whom the data should reside” (TE, page 11).

- (4) To promote community participation in the management process.

Community participation was a significant feature of the project. The courses and workshops were selected through consultation with local officials and the research community. The teacher-training

program was based on subjects that the teachers themselves had identified as being critical for coastal biodiversity. The project formed local working groups including town officials, representatives from the research community, the church, and the private sector to discuss issues of local importance. One such group was able to address garbage dumping in the bay by purchasing a garbage scow and requiring that all waste be placed on it and moved to the town dump.

Public awareness efforts included the production of 30,000 brochures and 2,000 posters on the southern right whale, three newsletters distributed to 350 people (mostly government officials), and a beach walk that attracted 4,000 volunteers and created a census on beach litter and oil-stricken birds. The beach walk and other project components were widely covered in the media.

On the whole, the TE states that the objectives for data-gathering, education, and public involvement have met or exceeded the targets in the project document. But the objectives concerning the coastal zone management framework and advancing public policy were not achieved. Project effectiveness is rated moderately satisfactory for the achievements the project made in public involvement and education, as well as creating a baseline for future monitoring and drafting a preliminary coastal zone management plan.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE states that the project’s accomplishments were “attained with remarkable efficiency,” but does not elaborate (TE, page 1). There is no further information in the TE on project efficiency, and no information is available on financing or delays.

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

Financial: **Moderately unlikely**; there is currently no financial system for the Coastal Zone Management Plan and no financial prospects for the continuation of project activities. The TE states that “sustained financing for coastal management in developed nations invariably is provided primarily by the national government,” but “such financing is currently unlikely in Argentina” although the TE does not explain why (TE, page 16). The current financial system for nature reserves in Argentina is that the visitor fees go to a national account rather than circling back to that nature reserve. Therefore a new system would need to be set up to fund implementation of the Coastal Zone Management Plan.

Sociopolitical: **Likely**; coastal zone management is under discussion in the Argentinian national government, and the project was able to raise awareness in the media and among the Patagonian public regarding biodiversity conservation. However, the TE states that Patagonian society considers biodiversity conservation to have only a “modest degree of importance” (TE, page 8). This will be mitigated by the efforts the project made to implement environmental education. As noted below, country ownership is high, and the Fundacion Patagonia Natural is a respected, capable, and well-connected organization whose mission aligns with this project’s.

Institutional: Moderately unlikely; the main instrument of institutional sustainability is the Coastal Zone Management Plan, although at the time of writing of the TE it was only in draft form. The TE does not mention if there are plans to continue the work on the Plan. In addition, if the work on producing a baseline for the Patagonian ecosystem is to be sustained, it must be regularly updated with a monitoring plan. However, no such plans were in place.

Environmental: Unable to assess; there is no information on environmental risks in the TE.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

Unable to assess; the TE does not include any information on cofinancing.

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?

Unable to assess; there is no information on delays or extensions in the TE. The dates for project start and end are also unknown, because the dates as stated in PMIS were obviously wrong (e.g. PMIS listed the project start date in 1999 and the estimated end date in 2004, even though the TE was written in 1997).

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

Country ownership is high for this project. The TE commends the project design for using the Fundacion Patagonia Natural to help implement the project, as it is a well-respected Patagonian institution with ties to the research community, provincial and national governments, and the private sector. The project has strengthened the Fundacion and provided it with a greater capacity to further its own goals, which are synonymous with the project's goal of conserving coastal Patagonia. The president of the Fundacion was invited to address a Senate committee on national coastal zone management, which the Argentinian government was discussing at the time. In addition, the project made efforts to include local stakeholders in decision-making and participating in some project activities, such as the volunteer beach walk that drew 4,000 locals and raised awareness in the media for conservation efforts. Had the provincial-level Coastal Commissions been formed as planned, they would have been another outlet for country ownership of the project.

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: Unable to Assess
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The Project Document is unavailable and the TE does not contain any information on project M&E.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not contain any information on project M&E.

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: Unable to Assess
--	---------------------------------

The TE reports some flaws in project design. The length of time allotted for implementation was too short for the completion of the Coastal Zone Management Plan. For some of the listed activities, there was no budget appointed for that activity, and there were also some items in the budget that did not apply to any of the listed activities. Also, the project design "is not linked to a clear conceptual framework. There is no logical sequencing of groups of activities" (TE, page 4). Lastly, project design "is not helpful in setting forth how this goal [the Coastal Zone Management Plan] will be achieved in practical operational terms" (TE, page 4).

Unable to assess project supervision; there is no mention of UNDP's conduct in the TE.

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

The TE does not mention UNOPS at all, but praises the NGOs involved in the project, Fundacion Patagonia Natural and Wildlife Conservation International. For Wildlife Conservation Society, the TE states: “The worldwide experience and high level of technical excellence within the WCS on topics related to wildlife conservation and management has doubtlessly contributed to the technical quality in the activities that have produced the baseline of information on Patagonia’s marine birds and mammals...The sustained support of the WCS is believed by the project team to have played a central role in the successes of the GEF project” (TE, page 6).

Fundacion Patagonia Natural had a helpful network of contacts in the research community, provincial and national governments, and the private sector. The Fundacion “contributed to the high standard and efficiency with which project activities have been conducted” (TE, pages 5-6). However, the Fundacion had little experience with economics, institutional analysis, and policy formulation, which contributed to the aforementioned weaknesses of the Coastal Zone Management Plan. The Fundacion “would have benefited from exposure to experience in coastal management in other countries, to training in the techniques of coastal management and in stronger backup in how a Coastal Zone Management Plan is formulated and implemented” (TE, page 6).

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.

No environmental impacts were recorded in the TE.

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.

No socioeconomic changes were reported in the TE.

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 main achievement in capacity was the creation of a scientific baseline for the future monitoring of coastal Patagonia. The TE reports that “excellent progress has been made on developing a scientifically sound baseline of information on marine birds and mammals against which future trends can be estimated” (TE, page 12). The studies and reports created by the project “provide an objective, scientifically sound benchmark against which future change in the populations of the species of concern can be measured” (TE, page 8). The project also implemented an educational program in 19 towns in Patagonia in order to create awareness and capacity for addressing coastal issues. Thirty-some teacher training courses were held in three Argentinian provinces (TE, page 10). An unknown number of technical workshops and courses were held on the management of coastal wildlife, tourism, marine bird and mammal population dynamics, coastal zone planning, onboard biological observation, environmental impact assessments, and environmental education (TE, page 11). Two courses were implemented on using public hearings as a tool for community participation. It is unknown how many people participated in the workshops and courses. No further information is available in the TE.

b) Governance

The project produced a draft Coastal Zone Management Plan for the Patagonian region, but as of the time of writing of the TE the plan was not yet finalized or put into action. Therefore there was no governance impact at the time of writing of the TE. No further information is available.

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

No unintended impacts were reported in the TE.

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 were no plans or evidence of adoption reported in the TE.

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.

No lessons learned or good practices are mentioned in the TE.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE lays out a plan for the future implementation of the draft Coastal Zone Management Plan. The Coastal Zone Management framework must be formally enacted by establishing commissions, creating an inter-provincial assembly, securing funding for a Coastal Zone Management program, and completing and formally adopting Coastal Zone Management plans. Then the program must transition from research and planning to implementation. A biodiversity monitoring program must be sustained, additional research should be conducted on offshore fisheries and oil pollution, public education efforts should be maintained, and there must be a role for capacity building and technical assistance.

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?	Without the Project Document, it is unclear whether the TE fully reported on the project's outcomes and impacts. The TE does not list the project's intended outcomes, so it is unknown whether the TE's presentation of outcomes is complete or not.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	There are some discrepancies in the TE. For example, at one point it states that the Fundacion Patagonia Natural made a partnership with another NGO prior to the start of the project, and at another point it stated that this occurred during the project. The evidence does not seem to be complete. For example, it states that some of the technical reports were not completed, but does not state which or why. It is also unknown how many workshops were completed, and how many participants there were.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE does not assess project sustainability except in terms of financing the future Coastal Zone Management Plan.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	There are no lessons learned stated, only recommendations for the implementation of the Coastal Zone Management Plan.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No. The only financial information given is the \$2.8 million GEF contribution to the project. The TE implies that the Argentinian government gave cofinancing to the project, but does not give any information on cofinancing.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	There is no assessment of project M&E.	HU
Overall TE Rating		MU

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