

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	3591
GEF Agency project ID	43427
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF - 4
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	ADB
Project name	PAS: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific - under the Pacific Alliance for Sustainability Program
Country/Countries	Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu ¹
Region	Asia
Focal area	Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	<p>BD-SP2-Increasing representation of effectively managed marine PA areas in PA systems</p> <p>BD-SP4-Strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for mainstreaming biodiversity</p> <p>IW-SP1-Restoring and sustaining coastal and marine fish stocks and associated biological diversity</p> <p>IW-SP2-Reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with the GPA</p> <p>CC-SP8 (SPA)-Enhancing resilience and increasing capacity to respond to the adverse impacts of climate change</p>
Executing agencies involved	<p>Principal actor: The Transport, Energy and Natural Resources Division (PATE)² of the Pacific Department (PARD) within ADB</p> <p>The government co-implementing partner agencies in each of the five countries were as follows:</p> <p>Fiji: Department of Environment, Ministry of Local Government, Housing & Environment, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>PNG: Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA)</p> <p>Solomon Islands: Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology</p> <p>Timor-Leste: Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries</p> <p>Vanuatu: Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Climate Change, Geo-hazard Mapping, Meteorology, Energy and Environment</p>
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Secondary executing agencies: Conservation International, the International Food Policy Research Institute, IUCN Oceania, Wildlife Conservation Society, WorldFish
Private sector involvement	FCG ANZDEC
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	November 9, 2010
Effectiveness date / project start	June 2011
Expected date of project completion (at start)	December 31, 2017
Actual date of project completion	December 31, 2017

¹ As opposed to what stated in the “list of participating countries” column in GEF database, Paulau and Micronesia did not participate in this project. See footnote in Request for CEO Endorsement p.1.

² Now known as the Energy Division.

Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.3	0.3
	Co-financing	0.825 ³	0.825
GEF Project Grant		13.118	13.118
Co-financing	IA own	-	-
	Government	2.6	2.6
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	21.249	1.465 ⁴
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	-	-
Total GEF funding		13.418	13.418
Total Co-financing		24.674	4.89
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		38.092	18.308
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2019	
Author of TE		James T. Berdach	
TER completion date		January 2020	
TER prepared by		Kelis Wong	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

³ The amount was not mentioned in TE, but it can be found on p.4 in Request for CEO Endorsement.

⁴ A US Government's grant of US\$19.2M was marked N/A at completion (TE p.4).

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project aimed to assist PNG, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste in fulfilling their objectives under the Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security (CTI-CFF)⁵, and to engage Fiji Islands and Vanuatu, which were non-signatories of CTI-CFF, in the effort (PD Appendix p.1). The intended project deliverables included the promotion and adoption of best practices in the management of coastal and marine resources, especially those associated with coral ecosystems, to build their resilience in face of increased threats arising from human-induced and climate change impacts. While these best practices were introduced primarily at the country level, they could bring about significant global environmental benefits, such as the conservation of critical habitats and marine biodiversity (TE p.12; MTR, p.1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project offered regionally coordinated solutions to address the threats to the coastal and marine ecosystem, including mangrove forests, seagrass beds, and coral reefs - all of which provide critical spawning grounds for many fish species, as well as being areas that support other economic activities, such as ocean recreation and tourism (TE p.12). The project addressed priority development issues facing the future of coral reefs, fisheries, and food security, which have increasingly threatened a significant proportion of the coastal communities in the five Pacific countries (PD Appendix p.1).

The project planned to achieve its objectives through four project components:

Component 1: Strengthening of national and local institutions for sustainable coastal and marine resources management

Component 2: Applying best management practices in ecosystem-based management

Component 3: Increasing resilience of marine resources and communities to climate change impacts

Component 4: Establishing effective project coordination and implementation (Request for CEO Endorsement p.1-3)

⁵ The CTI-CFF is a six-country program aimed at safeguarding the Coral Triangle region's marine and coastal biological resources by addressing issues such as food security, climate change, and marine biodiversity.

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

A significant change in management arrangements for the project occurred about mid-way through its implementation. The change led to modifications in the overall direction of the project. The most apparent modification was a shift in focus from more regional and national-level activities (i.e. phase one) to more local, site-specific interventions (i.e. phase two).

Initially, an international development company in New Zealand (FCG ANZDEC), was awarded the contract as regional project management consultant to carry out and coordinate overall management functions for project activities in all five countries, as well as regional activities.

During a Pacific Regional Planning Meeting held in Brisbane, Australia in April 2015, key issues concerning the project were discussed among project stakeholders. Key findings and follow-up actions, including a revised list of pipeline subprojects, and a request to GEF for extension of the project deadline, were captured in an Aide Memoire⁶. As a result of decisions made during the Brisbane meeting, the contract with FCG ANZDEC was closed. The budget for activities under FCG ANZDEC supervision was reduced, from US\$10,405,236 to US\$5,267,589⁷. A project extension was granted, and main management responsibilities (and budget to carry them out) were shifted to three non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which were directly contracted by ADB.

The modifications in the project's overall direction have come about in part, in response to requests from country implementing partner agencies, to focus greater effort on subprojects that (i) could produce tangible impacts on the ground; (ii) would be more responsive to the objectives articulated in the CTI Regional Plan of Action and National Plans of Action; and (iii) would be more effective in responding to the urgent need to strengthen climate resiliency and food security in the wake of Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu in 2015 (TE p.28 & p.30).

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.

⁶ ADB. April 2015. Aide Memoire for the Pacific Regional Planning Meeting. RETA 7753: Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle of the Pacific (Phase 2). 26-29 April 2015, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

⁷ FCG ANZDEC. March 2016. ADB TA-7753 Strengthening Coastal and Marine Resources Management in the Coral Triangle Initiative of the Pacific, Phase 2, Final Report.

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

The TE rates relevance as Highly Satisfactory. This TER rates relevance as Satisfactory.

The project intended to increase the resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems attained in the five Pacific countries. This multi-focus project is aligned with the operational programs, namely BD-SP2, BD-SP4, IW-SP1, IW-SP2, and CC-SP8 (SPA).

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

The TE rates effectiveness as Satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating.

The TE gives a separate rank to the project's three main outputs: capabilities of national and local institutions strengthened in sustainable coastal and marine resource management, coastal communities experienced in applying best practices in ecosystem-based management, and resilience of coastal ecosystems to climate change enhanced, and they are all deemed satisfactory. The effectiveness of interventions carried out towards these three targets was in line with expectations. The TE author pointed out that the project was "instrumental in setting up the necessary enabling conditions, or intermediate states, which would ultimately lead to achievement of [expected] impact" (TE p.21). Given the institutional deficiencies in physical and technical capital to manage issues related to biodiversity and climate change in small-island economies, these enabling conditions would not have occurred without the influence and involvement of the project.

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

The TE rates efficiency as Unable To Assess, and this TER rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory due to achievement of intended outputs, with significant delays and lower than expected co-financing.

The TE gives a broad-stroke analysis on cost efficiency only : "While the budget for this full-size project was generous, the absorptive capacity was limited (TE p.19)". The project has received US\$13.418 million (35 percent) of GEF grant and US\$24.674 million (65 percent) of co-financing at endorsement. Ultimately, a US Government's grant of US\$19.2 million was marked non-attributable (TE p.4). The US co-financing was channeled into the US Coral Triangle Support Partnership, the US CTI Program Integrator, a State Department Grant and a Partnership with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Based on USAID's long-running support for these activities, it was assumed that co-financing was contributed as indicated. The TE mentions that significant financial adjustments were made when the project transitioned from management under a PMC to management under NGOs in each of the five countries. The transition led to significant delays in project implementation (to be elaborated in section 7), and initially low rates of grant disbursement (TE p.35). All but 6% of the GEF grant was disbursed by project end, though the project was extended from four to more than eight years to allow for this close to full utilization of allocated GEF funds.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
---------------------------	----------------

The TE rates sustainability as Likely, and this TER also rates sustainability as Likely.

Financial resource: Likely

The project has established enabling conditions for the continued implementing of similar projects. For example: the project initiated the creation of trust funds to finance improved natural resources management and biodiversity conservation. However, the five Pacific countries will continue to lack the economic and human resources required to adequately address challenges. How implementing agencies will share the financial responsibility and meet the levels of cost-sharing expected from them will be a point to note.

Sociopolitical: Likely

Sociopolitical instabilities exist, but while four of the five target countries have recent past history marred by conflicts and weak institutions, the situation is stable in all countries at the moment. The transition of engaging NGOs, rather than a consulting firm, on project implementation has laid a foundation for local ownership and participation, enabling effective partners to execute future actions at the grass-root level (TE p. 36 – 37). High poverty and population growth rates will likely continue to put increasing pressure on natural resources. On the other hand, the project has carried out a suite of activities which have helped to combat these risks: (i) strengthening site-specific management of coastal and marine resources aimed at conserving biodiversity; (ii) conducting policy reform to support conservation and the sustainable use of marine and coastal resources; and (iii) improving resiliency, both among human populations and of the living marine resources themselves, in the face of climate change (TE p. 36 – 37).

Institutional framework and governance: Likely

Institutional structures and policy frameworks are still weak in the five Pacific countries. Weaknesses include lack of sufficient number of qualified personnel, lack of reliable data for informed decision-making and policy formulation, and governance issues. However, initiatives begun under the project have made progress in addressing a number of these weaknesses, through activities such as training, knowledge and awareness-raising, and legal and policy reform. The TE mentions of encouraging signs that the project has helped to catalyze an overall trend toward improvement of institutional capacity, especially relating to better management of marine and coastal resources (TE p. 36 – 37).

Environmental: Moderately Likely

Environmental risks are present, and they can have a negative impact on project sustainability. These countries face a high risk of natural and anthropogenic environmental hazards which may absorb limited resources (TE p. 36 – 37). The project has however addressed these risks through the initiatives noted in the discussion of sociopolitical sustainability above.

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?

As mentioned in section 4.3, only 20% percent of expected co-financing was realized due to an accounting adjustment of a US\$19.2-million-worth of US Government's grant, which made up the bulk of the co-financing arrangements in the project design. The adjustment is deemed insignificant to

project outcomes because the grant should have been channeled into relevant activities under the scrutiny of the USAID.

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 was extended by four years, until December 2017. The project was marked by lengthy delays at inception due to consultant selection and contracting process. This had immediate repercussions on implementation, and caused added delays, since some consultants who had been identified initially were no longer available and replacements had to be found and fielded. In addition, by the time that the project got underway, some areas of intervention identified during the design phase were no longer needed and the scheduled program and corresponding consultants had to be changed (TE p.30). A switch from engaging NGOs, instead of a private consulting firm, at project implementation further set back project implementation. However, the overall extension in duration has improved the sustainability of the project, allowing close to full utilization of the allocated grant funds, as well as laying a foundation for local ownership and participation.

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 reports strong country ownership, with national agencies and NGOs both taking part in project implementation. It notes that "many processes initiated under the project, especially at the grass-roots community level, have apparently developed sufficient momentum to be self-sustaining...these improvements at the grass-roots level have been backed up by significant legal and policy reforms at the national and provincial levels" (TE p.37).

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 unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rates M&E design as Satisfactory. This TER revises that rating to moderately unsatisfactory, as the indicators were not measurable as designed.

The project was conceived with a clear design and monitoring framework, outlining the indicators, targets, data sources, assumptions, risks, allocation of resources in key activities, and intended outputs in phases during the original four-year-long timeline (PD p. 8 – 13). The executing and implementing agencies have been named in each of the five Pacific countries, with clear line of reporting established at the national and regional level (PD p.5 – 6). Projected cost estimates and financing plan are closely aligned with the actual financing at completion (PD p.14).

The TE reviews the project design using the SMART framework, and points out two major shortcomings. Firstly, the indicators were set without the support of available data. This made the indicators non-measurable, and targets disproportionate to inputs, at project monitoring and evaluation. Secondly, most of the risks and assumptions stated in the project design are not legitimate external factors. Some were the targets for change through project actions. Therefore, the causal linkage of which actions led to which impacts constitutes a significant weakness in the project design (TE p.18 – 19).

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E implementation as Moderately satisfactory because, while the project reported progress through annual implementation reports, the project results framework has not been reviewed and followed rigorously.

The TE notes that a midterm review process was finished in September 2014 (TE p.11). While significant changes were made around the midterm in project implementation, and some identified inputs became redundant due to the delay in project start-up (2013 TIR p.4), no corresponding updates were made to the results framework. The TE mentions “a lack of effort to make revisions in the framework, before de facto scope changes were put into effect.” The TE concludes that while these updates might not have affected the outcome, outputs and indicators should have been reviewed and re-designed. The TE suggests that not updating the project results framework could have negatively affected implementation. The project could lose as a roadmap to guide the implementation of the project, to correct weaknesses as they were detected, and to properly monitor and evaluate project performance (TE p.14 – 15).

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 implementing agency was ADB. ADB formed a technical assistance coordination unit headed by an international program coordinator and assisted by technical support staff (TE p.29). The TE provides a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for project implementation for ADB, with which this TER agrees. Despite shortcomings noted below, ADB did manage to fulfil the basic requirements for implementing the project. ADB has ensured that a project management structure was put in place. It has disbursed funds, liaised with GEF, and carried out oversight functions. Also, to its credit, the ADB was able to apply a very unconventional, yet necessary adaptive measure, to set the project on-course and ensure better implementation results in its final phase (TE p.35).

The TE noted two factors which affected implementation:

Project followed a modality atypical for ADB

The majority of ADB's projects are loan investments, especially for infrastructure development. For ADB to execute a long-running, standalone technical assistance project solely funded through grants, and one which is not linked to other investments, is rather unusual. Even many of ADB's other projects that involved partnering with GEF, have been technical assistance projects that have been tied to lending. ADB procedures for guiding the implementation of loan projects are well developed. However, given the rarity of stand-alone grant projects, ADB does not have deep experience in guiding and managing such projects. Also, project officers, who are more accustomed to processing and guiding loan investment projects, are typically not as well attuned to the different requirements for managing a purely technical assistance project.

Frequent changes of project officer

In the seven years during which the project was implemented, four different project officers were assigned, with an additional three officers filling in on a temporary basis or for specific purposes. The frequent changes of personnel have caused some lack of continuity and loss of institutional memory regarding the project. The TE concluded that the issue would have a weakening effect on project execution (TE p.29).

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

The project's executing agencies were FCG ANDEZ in phase one, and later the following NGOs in phase two:

- Fiji: Conservation International
- Papua New Guinea: Wildlife Conservation Society
- Solomon Islands: WorldFish
- Timor-Leste: Conservation International, WorldFish
- Vanuatu: Conservation International

The TE provides a bundled rating of Satisfactory for project implementation for all the agencies involved, noting that, while there was some confusion due to lack of familiarity between these NGO's and ADB on administrative procedures, these entities were successful in completing activities and desired outputs as planned. This TER agrees with the rating.

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 discusses project impacts at both the regional and country-specific level (TE p.22 – 27).

In Timor-Leste, original target for establishing two marine protected areas (MPA) under the project was far exceeded, with 13 MPAs established on Atauro. Also in Timor-Leste, notable recovery of fish stocks has been observed in Beloy since the deployment of fish aggregating devices. These devices attract small pelagics nearer to shore, making the fish more accessible for capture. Pelagics are more nutritious than reel fish. By reducing the effort of fishers to obtain food, the program has reduced pressures on vulnerable reef fishery.

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.

In Fiji, the deployment of fish aggregating devices has motivated women to assume a more active role in fishing.

In PNG, the project has raised awareness at the community level, inspiring community members to appreciate the threats to their inshore marine resources, and to work within their communities to take actions for sustainably managing their coastal customary resources.

In Solomon Islands, the project has facilitated government outreach to communities, strengthening the linkage of communities at provincial and national levels.

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

Regionally, training on ecosystem approach to fisheries management was conducted. In Timor-Leste, the training introduced community stakeholders to concept of integration and harmonization of tarabandu (traditional law) with conventional legal instruments for biodiversity protection and environmental protection.

b) Governance

In Fiji, progress of integrated coastal resources management approaches was achieved. The planning process of integrated coastal management was disseminated, replicated and institutionalized in provinces, including Ra, Kandavu Bua, and Macuata.

In Solomon Islands, best management practices for biodiversity, coastal resources, and fisheries were piloted on the islands of Isabel, Choisul, and Malaita. As a result, there has been increasing demand from other communities for provincial planning and marine spatial planning.

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 of the project are reported affecting ecological or social aspects.

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.

Regionally, the project has strengthened environmental law associations as platforms and advocates of the countries' environmental law and policy development. This led to the legislation of protected areas policy in PNG, as well as the internalization of the guiding principles of CTI-CFF by three government agencies.

In Solomon Islands, current provincial government in Malaita worked with the NGO WorldFish to pass a resolution that encourages provincial leaders to work with communities to create a network of MPAs and terrestrial protected areas. In addition, provincial fisheries officers have shown strong commitment and interest to continue project activities, and communities have approached WorldFish to replicate project activities in their areas.

In Vanuatu, a ten-year ecosystem management plan was prepared for Vunausi River Estuary and Coastal Area. In addition, environmental and climate change trust fund has been designed.

In Timor-Leste, the project led to the development of a catch monitoring database. Fishers are participating now to address data deficiencies.

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.

- NGOs can be more effective partners than ADB for implementing on-the-ground actions at the community level. While the impacts of community-based activities may be small initially, they can grow as successes are replicated.

- NGOs and ADB operate according to very different business models. Therefore, for such partnerships to be effective, extra effort is needed to ensure a clear understanding of procedural requirements on both sides. Otherwise, serious delays and non-accomplishment of project targets can surface like this project did.
- Effective application of the “adaptive management” approach (an approach which is actively encouraged by the GEF) can be used to overcome barriers, cope with changing conditions and requirements, and to make needed course corrections to enable achievement of targeted project outcomes.
- The results framework should serve as a reliable and up-to-date roadmap to guide ongoing project implementation. If changes are made in project activities as part of an adaptive management approach, it is important that such changes are also reflected in the results framework.
- Training of teachers provides an effective mechanism for dissemination best management practices for biodiversity, coastal resources, and fisheries, impacting especially the student and youth populations.
- Strategic sharing of responsibilities among partners (e.g., assignment of distinct geographic areas among ADB, USAID, AusAID in CT-Pacific Solomons) can avoid redundancy and create synergies.
- Using local materials, and encouraging local construction, can enhance sustainability. This was observed in Fiji and Solomon Islands on the provision of fish aggregating devices. The locally constructed devices were more affordable and easier to repair, maintain, and replace, than the imported ones.
- Coral reefs which have been damaged or subject to excessive pressure, and their associated fish populations, are highly resilient. Quick recovery can be achieved once effective management regimes are restored. This was demonstrated in Timor-Leste, where the establishment of marine protected areas led to rapid recovery of damaged coral reefs, and accompanying increases in fish populations.
- Collaboration and coordination between various levels within government hierarchies – national, provincial, district, local, and ward – needs to be more consistent. The CTI’s national coordination committees proved to be cohesive management entities that could identify and deal with key issues and establish regular coordination among the various government levels and other stakeholders (TE p.38).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

- To augment ADB’s Strategy 2030 (published July 2018), the initiatives in the Pacific which were begun under the project should be expanded. Opportunities for scaling up include the inclusion of additional countries for cooperative programs, as well as economic development that links key productive sectors across the Pacific Island countries.
- Additional opportunities for fostering engagement between NGOs and ADB, and for promoting more efficient interactions between them, should be explored. An integral part of this should be exploring ways in which to facilitate smooth administrative processes, especially in obtaining approvals for expenditures and improving efficiency for funds disbursement. Lump-sum contracting is one simple way in which some of these issues could be addressed.
- Project design that deals mainly with management and sustainable use of marine and coastal resources should strive to take a more holistic view. When using the integrated coastal zone management “ridge-to-reef” approach, project managers should consider the downstream

effects that land-based activities have in the coastal zone and nearshore area. This could lead to achieving better outcomes for marine and coastal biodiversity conservation, sustainable livelihood, climate resiliency, and food security.

- Opportunities for innovative financial instruments and mechanisms should be explored during government policy reform. Examples: natural capital accounting, payment for ecosystem services, trust funds, and blue/green economy models.
- Policies should be put in place to protect both juveniles and mature breeders for target species. While ensuring the survival of juvenile fish to adulthood is important for maintaining healthy fish stocks, larger fishes are typically the more fertile breeders (TE p.39).

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 assessment of relevant outcomes, impacts, and achievements of objectives is both thorough and consistent with the project design.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE gives separate rating for the criteria under GEF guidelines. The ratings are always substantiated, and in most cases, fair.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The assessment of sustainability, while brief, covers all the areas needed to be covered under GEF guidelines. As no exit strategy was mentioned in the PD and PIRs, the TE does not discuss an exit strategy.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project includes actual total project costs per year only. Assessment of project costs per activity (component) and per source is missing.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of project M&E is comprehensive. More details on executing agencies at the government level would be useful.	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).

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.