1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3589	
GEF Agency project ID		6446	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Asian Development Bank (ADB)	
Project name		CTI Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle: Southeast Asia under Coral Triangle Initiative	
Country/Countries		Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Multifocal: Biodiversity, International Waters, and Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD SP-1 & SP-2; IW SP-1 & SP-2; CC SPA	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries in Indonesia; National Oceanography Directorate of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation in Malaysia; and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources in the Philippines.	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Indonesia: UNSRAT and UNHAS (technical support); Center for Fishing Gear Development of MMAF (executing subprojects); Wildlife Conservation Society (technical support); Malaysia: UMS-BMRI (research); UniSZA (technical support); Philippines: International Rice Research Institute (technical support)	
Private sector involvement		Not mentioned	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 7, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.5	.5
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		11.22	9.52
Co-financing	IA own	1	.69
	Government	3	3
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	24.33	1.66
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	-	-
Total GEF funding		11.72	10.02
Total Co-financing		28.33	5.35
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		40.05	15.37
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2019	
Author of TE		Asian Development Bank	
TER completion date		12/27/2019	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Sohn

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was "to provide significant global environmental benefits supporting the conservation of globally significant marine biodiversity, habitats, and ecosystem services, increasing the conservation area coverage of mangrove forests, sea grass beds and coral reefs in the Sulu-Suluwesi Marine Ecosystem" (TE pg. 19).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to install "resilient coastal and marine ecosystems and human communities in the CT3 [Southeast Asian country members of the Coral Triangle Initiative-Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines] by 2020" (TE pg. 51).

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

The TE indicates that there were no changes to project objectives and activities during implementation, however the funding from the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR) ($2 million) was used to implement a parallel project to improve sustainable livelihoods in coastal districts in Indonesia and the Philippines. The GEF project implemented a sustainable livelihoods component for Malaysia as expected, which focused on "improving the welfare of poor populations in coastal villages in Kudat, Sabah through ecotourism including handicrafts" (TE pg. 4).

It should also be noted that the results framework included in the GEF Request for CEO Endorsement is not identical to the framework included in the Asian Development Bank approval document (TE pg. 4). In general, results were reworded, and targets were adjusted. Additionally, activities under Output 3: *Supporting mechanisms for sustainable livelihoods in coastal communities* in the GEF document were rolled into activities under ADB Output 2: *Ecosystem-based approach to coastal and marine resources management pilot-tested* (TE pgs. 28-33). This TER will use the revised ADB framework to assess project outcomes.

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 provides a rating of "highly relevant" for this component of project outcomes. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project relevance. The project was consistent with GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic Programs 1- *Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level* and 2-*Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems*. The project was also consistent with GEF-4 International Waters Strategic Programs 1- *Restoring and Sustaining Coastal and Marine Fish Stocks and Associated Biological Diversity* and 2-*Reducing Nutrient Over-Enrichment and Oxygen Depletion from Land-Based Pollution of Coastal Waters in LMEs Consistent with the GPA*. In the area of Climate Change, the project was consistent with the Strategic Priority Adaptation-*Enhancing Resilience of Coastal and Marine Resources* (TE pg. 1).

The project was also consistent with the national priorities of Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines. The TE notes that project built on "fundamental policy and institutional frameworks within the CT3 countries including the establishment of MPAs [marine projected areas] and the CTI Regional Secretariat, and the use of EAFM [ecosystem approach to fisheries management] approaches to implement and monitor activities of the NPOAs [national plans of action] and RPOA [regional plan of action" (pg. 13).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates the project as "effective." This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project was designed to improve the management of coastal and marine resources in the Sulu-Suluwesi Marine Ecosystem (SSME) Priority Seascape within the Coral Triangle. By project end, management effectiveness tool (METT) scores in the marine protected areas (MPAs) increased by 21% (Indonesia), 31% (Malaysia), and 37% (Philippines). This greatly exceeded the target of a 5% improvement in management effectiveness scores. Additionally, five ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM) plans were prepared and climate change adaptation (CCA) frameworks were

demonstrated at three sites (Arakan, Indonesia; Marudu Bay, Malaysia; and Taytay, Phillipnes). The TE could not measure overall changes in coral reefs, sea grass beds, and mangrove forests due to inadequate baseline data. However, Tañon Bay Seascape and Dumanquillas Bay Seascape were declared protected areas (MPAs) in the Philippines, in addition to a new MPA in Sangihet, Indonesia (TE pg. 28).

A summary of the project's achievements, by output, is provided below. A third output on project management was included in the results framework, however this TER will only evaluate programmatic outcomes in this section.

Output 1: Policy and institutional frameworks for sustainable coastal and marine resources management improved

Expected results under this output included: (1) Policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks for institutionalizing effective coastal and marine resources management established, (2) National operational guidelines (NPOAs) for ecosystem-based management of coastal and marine resources adopted, (3) Scaled-up investment program for coastal and marine resources management (including coral reef rehabilitation and management) submitted for governments' consideration by 2012, and (4) a minimum of 200 government staff (at least 30% women) trained on ecosystem-based coastal and marine resources management. The TE indicates that policies and regulations were largely in place when the project began. However, draft legislation on the management of coral reef fishes, particularly the live grouper fish trade, was prepared in Indonesia. In Malaysia, the implementation of the existing integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) policy was piloted. In the Philippines, support was provided to PA management boards. Additionally, NPOAs were updated in all three countries. The project also greatly exceeded its training targets, with 947 persons (35% women) trained in Indonesia, 484 (26.6% women) in Malaysia, and 3,326 (36% women) in the Philippines. Although there is evidence that institutional capacity building in planning investments and promoting sustainable financing took place, a scaled-up investment program was not submitted by project end (TE pgs. 29-30).

Output 2: Eco-based approach to coastal and marine resources management pilot-tested

Expected results under this output included: (1) Five local ecosystem-based management plans pilot tested, (2) MPA management plan with monitoring, control, and surveillance system for transboundary network pilot-tested, (3) climate change adaptation measures piloted in three coastal communities, and (4) sustainable livelihood and microenterprise models for 100-250 household beneficiaries, with at least 15% micro-industries or enterprises headed by women, established in 4-5 coastal villages in Sabah, Malaysia. By project end, five EAFM plans were prepared and implemented; two in Indonesia, one in Malaysia, and two in the Philippines. Additionally, a regional agreement was reached to include Sebatik (Indonesia), Turtle Islands Park (Malaysia), and the Balabac and Turtle Islands Wildlife Sanctuary (Philippines), in a transboundary MPA network for marine turtles. Additionally, an MPA was established in Sangihet, Indonesia; Park Rangers were trained in Malaysia; and law enforcement officials were trained on the revised fisheries code in the Philippines (TE pg. 30). By project end, CCA measures were pilot-tested in three communities, including a community-based mangrove reforestation project (TE pg. 4). The project did fall short of its target for sustainable livelihood and microenterprise models, reaching 82 households out of 100. However, 33 of these households were headed by women, which was 220% over the target (TE pg. 31).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rates the project as "efficient," while noting that under GEF criteria the project would be rated as "marginally efficient" given the delays in implementation early in the project (TE pg. 4). This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project efficiency. The TE indicates that project was slow to get off the ground "due to the need to seek approval of subprojects and sites from the NCCs [National Coordinating Committees] (TE pg. 14). In Indonesia, the project management unit also faced difficulties in preparing subprojects and needed extended consultations with partners. Additionally, some project sites had to be switched due to technical considerations. For example, the TE notes that Nain Island in Indonesia lacked the grouper resources and live fish trade to justify the pilot testing of EAFM. The approval process by the Asian Development Bank, while effective, was also lengthy and caused delays (TE pg. 15). Additionally, the TE notes that some activities took longer to implement due to the amount of time needed to collect data using the approved methodologies; weather and sea conditions; accessibility of project sites; as well as security concerns in the Philippines and Malaysia (TE pg. 14). Delays during implementation ultimately resulted in the project's timeline being extended 2.5 years, until the end of 2017. However, all project activities were completed within the original budget (TE pg. 15).

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Likely**

The TE provides a rating of **Likely** for project sustainability, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

This TER rates the sustainability of financial resources as **Moderately Likely**. The TE notes that the policies and regulations facilitated by the project in Indonesia and Philippines include mechanisms for budgetary support. By project end, there was also evidence that Coastal and Marine Resource Management (CMRM) activities were expanded by beneficiaries using their own financial resources. Examples include: a coral plantation in the Philippines; a demonstration farm in the Philippines; an ecotourism collective in Malaysia; a solid waste management program in Indonesia; and a health unit in Indonesia. Additionally, there was evidence of funds being allocated for new activities, particularly in Palawan, Indonesia, where school-led activities were replicated, and a budget was provided for a yearly youth camp (TE pgs. 16-17). At the national level, the TE indicates that financial risks to sustainability are greater, particularly in financing the regional and national agencies, including the CTI Secretariat and NCCCs, as well as enforcement mechanisms such as the monitoring, control, and surveillance systems (MCS) and marine protected areas (MPAs) (TE pg. 17).

Sociopolitical

This TER rates sociopolitical sustainability as **Likely**. The TE indicates that local support in the coastal communities has been strong due to the knowledge management and communication campaigns undertaken by the project, and that heightened public awareness will "continue to encourage local officials, village heads, and community advocates to pursue the CMRM and environmental protection interventions that were initiated by the project" (TE pg. 16). The TE does note however, that in the Philippines there could be risks if local officials who supported project activities are not reelected. Additionally, the TE notes that there are still security concerns at some project sites in the Philippines which could limit services and affect monitoring (TE pg. 17).

Institutional Framework and Governance

This TER rates the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Likely**. By project end, effective policies and institutional frameworks were in place to support the sustainability of project outcomes. Examples include the establishment of the CTI Regional Secretariat and MPAs, as well as EAFM approaches (TE pg. 15). The TE also indicates that the local governments and NGOs that the project partnered with have committed to continuing to support activities (TE pg. 16).

Environmental

This TER rates environmental sustainability as **Moderately Likely**. The TE provides the following risks to environmental sustainability: (1) climate change impacts such as saltwater intrusion to low-lying areas can affect farmlands and food supplies, (2) sea level rise and shoreline erosion can affect nesting areas of marine turtles, and (3) marine debris and plastic pollution can affect overall ocean health (TE pg. 17).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

Actual co-financing ($5.35 million) was substantially lower than expected ($28.33 million), largely due to funds being used to implement separate parallel projects. This included funding from the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR) ($1.42 million); the Australian government ($.22 million), and the bulk of the expected co-financing from the United States government (of which only $.02 million materialized). The TE does not indicate the reasons for the co-financing being diverted to other parallel projects, nor the impact of this on outcomes and sustainability.

Co-financing from the implementing agency, Asian Development Bank (ADB), was also lower than expected ($.69 million vs. $1 million). In-kind contributions of $1 million from each partner government (Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines) materialized by the end of the project as expected.

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?

As noted above, the project experienced delays early in the implementation timeline which resulted in multiple extensions. The TE notes the following reasons for the delays: (1) slow project approval by the National Coordinating Committees (NCCs), (2) lack of technical expertise in preparing projects, specifically in Indonesia, (3) changing project sites due technical considerations and security concerns, (4) lengthy ADB approval process, (5) the time needed to collect data, (6) changes in consultants, deputy team leaders, and CTI focal points, and (7) reorganization of the NCC in Malaysia (TE pgs. 7; 14-15).

The project ultimately closed on December 31, 2017, 2.5 years later than the expected end date of February 2015. Despite these delays, the project achieved its objectives within the original budget.

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:

The TE does not directly assess country ownership, however there is evidence to suggest that country ownership played a considerable role in the achievement of project outcomes. The project's executing agencies were the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries in Indonesia; the National Oceanography Directorate of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation in Malaysia; and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources in the Philippines (TE pg. 6). Additionally, the TE notes that the project was "very proactive in developing partnerships with government agencies at both the national and local levels, and with other NGOs and development partners" (TE pg. 8). Moreover, the NCCs played a crucial role in developing and approving project proposals (TE pg. 7). Additionally, the TE notes that that buy-in from the local communities greatly affected the sustainability of project outcomes in regard to expanding and replicating projects (TE pgs. 16-17).

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: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E design as "fully satisfactory." This TE, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project document included a design and monitoring framework which included activities, results (outputs, outcomes, and impacts), indicators, targets, data sources/reporting

mechanisms, and assumptions and risks. The framework is logical and hierarchical, and the indicators are generally SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely). However, baseline values were not set for key impact indicators, such as *10% increase in the area of mangrove forests and seagrass beds and live coral cover in the SSME* and *10% increase in the biomass of coral reef fish in MPAs in the SSME*.

The Project Document does provide for a project coordinator/monitoring and evaluation specialist who would be tasked with "monitoring the progress of project implementation against the targets and evaluate the regular progress reports submitted" (PD pg. 18). Additionally, funding was included in the original cost estimate for key M&E activities, such as the M&E system ($20,000), midterm review ($20,000), and the GEF tracking tool and surveys ($25,000) (PD pg. 15).

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

The TE assesses M&E implementation to be "successful." This TE, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. An M&E system was established at project start-up, headed by a project coordinator/monitoring and evaluation specialist at ADB. A project performance monitoring system at the regional project management office in Manilla was established to monitor and evaluate project performance and the achievement of targets and objectives (TE pg. 10). Each country project management unit was responsible for preparing progress reports and linking the NCCs to the monitoring and evaluation system at the regional level. The TE also notes that the regional office also provided training on monitoring activities and the project's social, environmental, and economic impacts (TE pg. 11).

The results framework was reworked at start-up, with sustainable livelihood activities rolled into the piloting of ecosystem-based approaches to coastal and marine resources management. Targets were also adjusted during this time, however baseline values for key results were never set. As a result, the project was unable to report on overall changes in coral reefs, sea grass beds, and mangrove forests. The TE does indicate that the project took advantage of the GEF biodiversity tracking tool and the Management Effectiveness Tool (METT) (TE pg. 11).

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: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates the Asian Development Bank's (ADB) performance as **Satisfactory**, and this TER concurs. The project was implemented by ADB's Southeast Asia Environmental, Natural Resources and Agriculture Division (SEER). A technical assistance coordination unit was set up at SEER and overseen by a project coordinator/monitoring and evaluation specialist. ADB hired PRIMEX as the project management consultant (PMC) and set up a regional project management office (RPMO) in Manilla, Philippines, which oversaw the work of the project management units (PMUs) in each country (TE pg. 7).

The TE indicates that ADB set up a robust M&E System and regularly monitored project activities, including site visits and a Midterm Review in 2015. The TE also notes that ADB "was flexible and responsive to requests from the from the PMC and NCCs [National Coordinating Committees" (TE pg. 22). On the other hand, the TE reports that ABD contributed to delays in project implementation, including a lengthy ADB project approval process (pg. 15). Additionally, the TE indicates that key stakeholders were not included in the project design, which led to changes in project sites and activities during implementation (TE pg. 23).

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

The executing agencies for the project were the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries in Indonesia; The National Oceanography Directorate of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation in Malaysia; and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources in the Philippines. The TE rates the performance of these agencies as **Satisfactory**, however it provides the caveat that "under the GEF rating system this is probably marginally satisfactory as performance was slow and overly bureaucratic in the early years" (pg. 21). The TE notes that activities at project start-up were delayed due to the late approval of budgets in all three countries. Additional reasons for delays included the resignation of the CTI focal person in Malaysia, the reorganization of the NCC in Indonesia, changes in consultants and deputy team leaders in Indonesia and Malaysia, and a general lack of understanding of ADB's processes and procedures (TE pg. 7; 21). The TE does indicate that project activities accelerated after 2015 and efficiency improved, allowing the project to achieve its objectives within budget (pg. 15). However, due to these moderate shortcomings, the TER provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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

> The TE was unable to measure overall changes in coral reefs, sea grass beds, and mangrove forests due to inadequate baseline data. However, the TE reports environmental changes at some sites: (1) In Taytay, Philippines, there was a 10% increase in mangrove forests due to 40 mangrove cutters switching to seaweed farming, (2) In Taytay, Philippines, there was a 23% increase in coral cover, and (3) In the Tañon Strait area in the Philippines there was a fish biomass increase 4-5 times in 8 years (TE pg. 28).
>
> New marine protected areas (MPAs) were also established, including two in the Philippines (the Dumanquillas Bay Protected Landscape and the Tañon Bay Seascape), and one MPA in Sangihet, Indonesia (TE pg. 28; 30). The TE also notes that global environmental benefits "are expected to result from the replication of biodiversity conservation models…and local deterrents to reduce illegal fishing" (TE pg. 19). The TE also reports a 61% reduction in the threat level at the Tañon Strait and a 30% reduction in Dumanquillas Bay (TE pg. 20).

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 project supported sustainable livelihood activities in all three countries, including handicrafts, ecotourism, seaweed and abalone culture, moving of giant clams, and the establishment of coral gardens in the MPAs (i.e. Payment for Ecosystem Services models). In total, 82 households were beneficiaries of these activities, including 33 women-led households (TE pg. 19; 31).

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

By project end, more than 400 people in Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines had been trained in climate change adaptation (CCA) techniques (TE pg. 19). The TE notes that knowledge management activities, such as youth learning camps, peer-to-peer meetings and knowledge sharing exercises, increased beneficiaries' capacities in the areas of coastal resources management (CRM) and CCA (TE pg. 19).

Additionally, the TE indicates more effective marine protected areas (MPAs) management at the five pilot sites. The TE reports that the management effectiveness tool (METT) scores in the MPAs increased by 21% (Indonesia), 31% (Malaysia), and 37% (Philippines). Five ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM) plans were also prepared by the end of project and climate change adaptation (CCA) frameworks were demonstrated at three sites (Arakan, Indonesia; Marudu Bay, Malaysia; and Taytay, Phillipnes) (TE pg. 13).

b) Governance

The TE notes that policies and regulations were largely already in place when the project began. However, draft legislation was prepared in Indonesia on the management of coral reef fishes, particularly the live grouper fish trade. In Malaysia, the implementation of the existing integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) policy was piloted. In the Philippines, support was provided to PA management boards. Additionally, NPOAs were updated in all three countries (TE pg. 29).

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

The TE does not cite any unintended impacts by the end of the 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.

The TE does indicate that key project activities have been replicated, including: (1) composting techniques in Indonesia, (2) solid waste management in Indonesia, (3) school-led activities in the Philippines, and (4) a yearly youth camp in the Philippines (TE pgs. 16-17).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. 23-24):

- **Project Implementation Period:** The Project scope and geographical coverage was wide with numerous stakeholders and partner institutions involves, covering three countries. More than 100 community-based activities were implemented, and various external experts engaged. Considering the complex nature of natural resource management projects, the original project implementation period should have been longer (perhaps six years).

- **Project Design and Stakeholder Involvement:** The key stakeholders need to be involved in detailed Project design, including selection of subprojects and sites. It was apparent from national inception workshops that ADB processes and procedures were not sufficiently understood by the IAs [i.e. GEF executing agencies], the NCCs and other stakeholders, resulting in initial lack of clarity of respective roles (such as consultant selection). ADB should provide clearer guidance to IAs on procedures and implementation methods. Lack of involvement in Project design also led to requests for changes in sites and subproject activities, although these had been included in the project design and approval documents. Security issues were a concern in some proposed sites which could have been avoided.

- **Project Implementation Arrangements:** Careful attention is needed to Project implementation processes, and in particular approval processes. In this Project, the decisions of the IAs had to be approved by the NCCs, and in the case of Malaysia by the SCC and then the NCC. The NCCs are inter-agency committees and were not always easy to convene, greatly delaying implementation. ADB then needed time to give approval also.

- **Community Involvement:** Institutional support and community engagement are key in generating participation of local communities in coastal and marine resource management, climate change adaptation and sustainable financing. This needs to include local chief executives and village chiefs as well as the communities, together with private resort owners, boat owners/operators, and other private associations. One of the main successes of the Project has been its ability to reach communities and schools and develop successful projects with very little investment.

- **Partnerships:** The Project was very proactive in developing partnerships with government agencies at both national and local levels, and with NGOs, development partners and the private sector to attain synergy in the use of resources and to avoid duplication of effort. The Project linked well with ongoing GIZ and NGO activities in the same areas, but more formal partnerships with GIZ, TNC, CI and others could have improved coordination and sustainability of outcomes, particularly in livelihood activities. Many of these partnerships are continuing, and some with the private sector are developing further, increasing the likelihood of sustainability.

- **Youth Engagement** was not a part of the original design of the Project, however the Project drew on this hitherto untapped human resource in the Philippines and Indonesia. Involving schools and youth in environmental projects and community-based projects was very effective and sustainable. This shows that young people can be a potent force in community-based CMRM and environmental protection.

- The power of **knowledge management** (KM) was another project innovation that generated excellent results. The KM stakeholders did not only play the role of participants, they were also active partners in the generation of ideas, problem solving, and action planning, as well as in actual CRM and CCA implementation. KM products like publications, posters, social media, and video enabled the dissemination of technical information to carious audiences and serves as effective channels of the advocacies.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pg. 24):

- **Peer Review Process:** For a Project such as this, with a substantial number of technical reports and knowledge publications that are beyond the capacity and role of ADB as the financier to review, ADB could help establish a separate peer review process whereby comments are sought from academics, technicians, and other peers to enhance the value and credibility of the reports, adding to the impact and value of the project.

- **CT3 countries** should adopt policy papers and study reports produced under the Project in their coastal resources management plans.

- **CT3 countries** and the ADB should disseminate and use knowledge products to deepen awareness of the coastal and marine environment.

- **CT3 countries** should continue institutional, personnel, and budgetary support to national coordinating committees on CTI and CTI-RS to implement activities and attain NPOAs and RPOA by the government.

- **Future Monitoring:** The GEF tracking tools and the METT assessment system are in place. Action should be taken by the CT3 countries and partners, including ADB, to continue to monitor the impact of this Project and other support program activities. Such an impact assessment might best take place at least three years after Project completion to determine the longer-term impact and sustainability of the sustainable resource management efforts.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	**GEF IEO comments**	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report thoroughly assesses project outcomes and impacts using the project's results framework.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidence presented is complete and convincing.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Although the TE does not provide ratings for different aspects of sustainability, it does break down the risks in these areas.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported with evidence and are comprehensive.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does include actual co-financing and project costs; however, it doesn't explain the reasons behind the difference between expected and actualized co-financing or the implications.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report satisfactorily assesses the project's M&E system.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

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