

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		363	
GEF Agency project ID		1323	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Protecting Biodiversity and Establishing Sustainable Development of the in Sabana-Camaguey Region	
Country/Countries		Cuba	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP2: Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Cuban Academy of Sciences (1994); Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (1995-present)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 1993	
Effectiveness date / project start		1994 (precise date is not provided in TE)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		1997 (precise date is not provided in TE)	
Actual date of project completion		1997 (precise date is not provided in TE)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.0	2.0
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	4.0	9.0
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		2.0	2.0
Total Co-financing		4.0	9.0
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.0	11.0
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		September 1997	
TE submission date			
Author of TE			
TER completion date		September 2014	
TER prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the global environmental objectives of the project are to help protect and conserve the globally significant biological diversity of the Sabana-Camaguey Ecosystem (SCE) in Cuba. The SCE is a large, 75,000 square kilometer expanse of low-lying islands and sea in the northern part of Cuba that has some of the highest levels of biodiversity in the West Indies. According to the PD, the region is a critical winter habitat for hundreds of migratory species and is home to several threatened species including sea turtles, crocodiles, and manatees. These areas are increasingly threatened by developmental pressures, primarily tourism development, and an absence of sustainable development planning and management systems for the region.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the PD, the project is the first phase of a three-phase assistance program that aims to establish the basis for sustainable development of the Sabana-Camaguey region – development that protects and conserves the region’s biodiversity. This will be accomplished by a mixture of institutional strengthening, increasing scientific understanding of the area’s biodiversity and environment, environmental planning, and a public-awareness campaign.

The following end-of-project Immediate Objectives and Outputs are defined in the PD:

1. *Objective 1 – To strengthen the technical capabilities of the Academy of Sciences of Cuba (ACC - charged by the Cuban Government with responsibility for management of the marine and terrestrial environment of the SCE) and other agencies to survey and assess coastal and marine ecosystems in support of biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.*
 - a. A fully equipped laboratory at Cayo Coco
 - b. Staff trained in the use of field and laboratory equipment
2. *Objective 2 – To strengthen the scientific and environmental planning and management capabilities of Cuban agencies at the national, regional and local levels*
 - a. Staff trained in current environmental planning techniques at the national regional and local levels
 - b. Operational GIS for the Sabana-Camaguey Archipelago

3. *Objective 3 – To develop a basic knowledge of the flora and fauna, habitat distribution, and the physical/chemical characteristics of the marine and terrestrial ecosystems adequate for planning, management, conservation, and sustainable development. This will serve as a baseline for permanent monitoring. This information will be compiled and organized using the project GIS.*
 - a. Preliminary physical survey and mapping of coastal waters of the SCA.
 - b. Preliminary coastal marine biological survey and mapping
 - c. Preliminary terrestrial survey and mapping archipelago
 - d. Survey and mapping of historic and current human activities in the SCE, including the watershed, archipelago and ocean zone.
4. *Objective 4 – To develop a strategic plan for the SCE that fully integrates tourism and other economic development activities with biodiversity protection to achieve sustainable development.*
 - a. A biodiversity protection strategy to integrate species protection plans, habitat preservation, and management of environmentally sensitive areas
 - b. A strategic plan for tourism development activities
 - c. A strategic plan for the Sabana-Camaguey Ecosystem
5. *Objective 5 – To establish a framework to enhance public awareness of the flora and fauna of the SCA, and to initiate public understanding of sustainable development approaches*
 - a. Public information program on natural resources (radio, museums, film, articles)
6. *Objective 6 – To compile, organize and analyze existing climatic data, and acquire information on issues pertinent to long-term management, such as global warming, climate change, international waters and oil-spill responses.*
 - a. Climate data

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

No. According to the TE, the Executing Agency was changed in 1995 to the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment. However, the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, and other activities remained the same. No information on why the change in Executing Agencies was made is provided in the TE.

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 is relevant to both the GEF and Cuba. For the GEF, the project’s objectives are in-line with GEF Operation Program 2, which seeks to conserve globally significant biodiversity found in coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems. According to the PD, the Sabana-Camaguey Ecosystem has some of the highest levels of biodiversity in the West Indies, and the region is a critical winter habitat for hundreds of migratory species and is home to several threatened species including sea turtles, crocodiles, and manatees. These areas are under increasing threat from development in the region. For Cuba, as stated in the TE, “the importance of the project to the Cuban government is reinforced by the significance of the SCE ecosystem in the country’s strategy to promote international tourism as a means of earning urgently needed foreign currency” (TE, pg 21). As stated in the PD, Cuba is concerned that in absence of a sustainable development framework for the SCE – which this project seeks to address – development pressures will increasingly degrade the biological resources that are themselves the region’s principle draw.

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

According to the TE, the project met or exceeded all six objectives specified in the Project Document. A comprehensive strategic plan for sustainable development of the SCE region has been produced. While the TE finds that the document would have been more useful had it been organized around a few key issues instead of a large collection of priorities, the process of generating the document, as well as the document itself, has already had some positive effects on land-use planning in the region (TE, pg 13). Moreover, while the project’s lack of indicators and targets for the capacity building and public awareness campaign components limit the degree to which progress of these components can be assessed, TE states that they were by and large effective in achieving their stated purpose.

Progress is detailed further under each of the project’s stated Immediate Objectives:

1. *Objective 1 – To strengthen the technical capabilities of the Academy of Sciences of Cuba and other agencies to survey and assess coastal and marine ecosystems in support of biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.* Under this objective, the laboratory at Cayo Coco was configured with scientific equipment and transportation (vehicles and boats), without which, TE states the project would not have been able to achieve its objectives (TE, pg 11). TE states that equipment purchases using GEF funding were a slightly higher percentage of GEF funds than budgeted for in the PD (62% vs 54% of GEF funds), but no accounting for why is provided in the TE. A GIS system was also installed and has been utilized by many collaborating institutions.
2. *Objective 2 – To strengthen the scientific and environmental planning and management capabilities of Cuban agencies at the national, regional and local level.* TE finds that although the number of personnel trained through the project was small, trainings were effective in

addressing the goal of improving the capacity of Cuban agencies to develop and manage sustainable land management. TE states that training in integrated data management, cross-sectoral planning, and innovative approaches to environmental planning and site development took place. TE finds that overall, the most notable accomplishment of the project has been the establishment of “stronger functional links between the sciences and development interests,” and notes that there “is abundant evidence that scientists and other technical specialists were directly involved in the development of policy, new laws and regulations, and strategies for development and conservation. All scientists interviewed said their involvement in such activities had increased during the project and that they were adequately prepared for such involvement” (TE, pg 14).

3. *Objective 3 – To develop a basic knowledge of the flora and fauna, habitat distribution, and the physical/chemical characteristics of the marine and terrestrial ecosystems adequate for planning, management, conservation, and sustainable development. This will serve as a baseline for permanent monitoring. This information will be compiled and organized using the project GIS.* TE finds “very considerable achievements” under this objective, with a large increase in the understanding of SCE physical, marine, terrestrial, and cultural resources, as called for in the PD (TE, pg 15).
4. *Objective 4 – To develop a strategic plan for the SCE that fully integrates tourism and other economic development activities with biodiversity protection to achieve sustainable development.* Under this objective, a document entitled “Proteccion de la Biodiversidad y Establecimiento de un Desarrollo Sustentable en el Ecosistema Sabana-Camaguey” was prepared which presents the major findings of the project’s work to better understand the SCE ecosystems and includes a strategic plan for the archipelago. TE finds the document would be more forceful if organized differently, but at the same time, TE finds that the document is already shaping the planning and development process in the SCE, and provides a few examples of tourism and infrastructure projects – existing and proposed – that have been modified on the basis of the project’s outputs (TE, pg 17). The planning document includes recommendations for a system of protected areas within the archipelago, including a large coastal marine park. TE finds that while these protected areas had not been formally designated at the time of the final evaluation, “the proposal appeared to be supported by the responsible institutions” (TE, pg 18).
5. *Objective 5 – To establish a framework to enhance public awareness of the flora and fauna of the SCA, and to initiate public understanding of sustainable development approach.* Under this objective, a public education campaign that included television, radio, and newspaper, targeting issues addressed by the project has been pursued both nationally and provincially. The campaign has been targeted at both school children, and fishermen who operate in the archipelago’s waters. In addition, TE finds that the project has had a major impact on school and university curricula, with new university programs in landscape architecture and resource economics that “may be directly attributed to this project” (TE, pg 19).
6. *Objective 6 – To compile, organize and analyze existing climatic data, and acquire information on issues pertinent to long-term management, such as global warming, climate change, international waters and oil-spill responses.* TE states that the compilation of climatic data was

achieved in 1994, although this has not yet been integrated with other information systems established by the project.

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

The TE does not directly assess project efficiency, however, evidence is provided in the narrative that the project was efficient overall in its operations and management. For example, TE noted that the project called for the coordinated efforts of a large and diverse group of scientists, planners and policymakers in 15 governmental agencies. TE finds this effort was well-managed by a small, six-person project staff. While TE finds that the planning process might have been more efficient if project working groups were organized by key issues instead of along the established divisions in the Cuban government, the large number of participants and agencies taking part in the project appears to have strengthened the effectiveness of the project, by creating local buy-in and ownership of the project and its outputs. TE also notes that local project staff were especially pleased with the performance of the senior technical advisor to the project, James Dobbin. “The project staff feels strongly that Mr. Dobbin has made a major positive contribution to the project and that his methodology has provided a consistent approach and sequencing of activities, giving the project a road map that has been welcomed by all involved” (TE, pg 10). In addition, TE notes that supporting external technical assistance was provided by 12 specialists who conducted various workshops in Cuba on environmental planning and resource economics. TE states that this training added important dimensions to the strategic planning process.

TE states that the Executing Agency changed one year into the project, from the Academy of Sciences of Cuba to a newly created Ministry of Science, Technology, and the Environment, with a new director for the project appointed at the same time. TE states that this change slowed project activities for several months, but following the transition, the project was able to move forward rapidly and respond to opportunities. No further information on why the change in Executing Agencies was made is provided in the TE.

A detailed breakdown of project expenses was not available at the time of the TE review.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to Assess
---------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating on likelihood of sustainability nor assess risks to likelihood of sustainability sufficiently in the narrative to provide a rating here. TE does state the following regarding sustainability: “*The substantial progress made during the GEF project will produce significant benefits in biodiversity conservation and sustainable forms of tourism development if the effort continues into an initial phase of implementation. Continued GEF support appears both necessary and justifiable to sustain the momentum*” (TE, pg 2).

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?

TE states that co-financing contributions from the government of Cuba are estimated to be \$9 million, compared with an expected contribution of \$4 million. However, no accounting is provided in the TE for how the co-financing was used or its contribution to project outcomes and sustainability.

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 started and completed on time. Some internal delays are noted in the TE: TE notes that the Executing Agency changed one year into the project, from the Academy of Sciences of Cuba to a newly created Ministry of Science, Technology, and the Environment, with a new director for the project appointed at the same time. TE states that this change slowed project activities for several months, but following the transition, the project was able to move forward rapidly, and the changeover does not appear to have affected project outcomes or sustainability.

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 project appears to have benefitted from a high degree of country support. TE states that just prior to the project's approval the government of Cuba made a major commitment to reforming its policies and restructuring governmental institutions to follow the recommendations of the 1992 UN Conference on the Environment and Development. TE states that "this has created a positive context for this GEF ecosystem management initiative and has provided the project with a remarkable degree of governmental support" (TE, pg 6). Although no assessment on sustainability is provided in the TE, TE finds that the document is already shaping the planning and development process in the SCE, and provides a few examples of tourism and infrastructure projects – existing and proposed – that have been modified on the basis of the project's outputs (TE, pg 17). The planning document includes recommendations for a system of protected areas within the archipelago, including a large coastal marine park. TE finds that while these protected areas had not been formally designated at the time of the final evaluation, "the proposal appeared to be supported by the responsible institutions" (TE, pg 18). Thus overall, both project outcomes and sustainability appear to have been facilitated and supported by a high level of country ownership.

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
------------------------------------	--

M&E design lacked indicators and targets for the global environmental goal, development objectives, and the immediate objectives. While PD does contain a detailed list of activities and outputs under each objective, there are no indicators or targets to assess the quality of outputs, and progress in achieving the overall objectives. For example, under Immediate Objective 5, a public awareness campaign is expected to be designed and implemented, and that would enhance public awareness of the biodiversity of the SCE and increase public understanding of sustainable development approaches. However, no indicators are provided to measure and assess public awareness, nor are targets specified for number of programs produced, or people reached. The same can be said for the capacity development activities under Objectives 1 and 2, which aimed to increase the capacity of various Cuban ministries and departments to develop and manage sustainable development plans for the SCE region.

PD does state that the project will be subject to annual joint review by UNDP and representatives of the Government of Cuba, and that a mid-term review and terminal evaluation are to be prepared. No dedicated budget is provided for M&E in the PD.

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

The TE does not provide a rating or assessment of M&E implementation and there is insufficient information in the TE narrative to provide one here.

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
--	--

TE finds that the “project design is cumbersome and lacks a structure that promotes a logical sequencing of objectives and actions...in some cases, results in the End of Project Status are not provided for in the lists under the relevant intermediate objective” (TE, pg 8). In addition, the design of the M&E system was flawed, as detailed in section 6.1 above. At the same time, TE finds the UNDP inputs and supervision during project implementation were strong. In particular, TE states that the inputs of the UNDP senior technical advisor to the project made a “major positive contribution to the project and that his methodology has provided a consistent approach and sequencing of activities, giving the project a road map that has been welcomed by all involved” (TE, pg 10).

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

The TE does not provide a rating for quality of project execution, however, there is sufficient evidence in the TE narrative that quality of execution was satisfactory. TE states that overall, “the quality of the work has been excellent” (TE, pg 37). TE reports that all of the project activities were undertaken as planned, and that the highly participatory process undertaken by project management facilitated strong buy-in and ownership in the project’s outputs and objectives.

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 below that this is indeed the case. 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 change in environmental stress or status is reported to have occurred in the TE by the end of the project.

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 changes in human well-being are reported in the TE to have occurred by the end of the project.

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 project sought to strengthen the scientific and environmental planning and management capabilities of Cuban agencies at the national, regional and local level. To this end, TE finds that although the number of personnel trained through the project was small, trainings were effective in addressing the goal of improving the capacity of Cuban agencies to develop and manage sustainable land management (TE, pg 13). TE states that training in integrated data management, cross-sectoral planning, and innovative approaches to environmental planning and site development took place. In addition, project made investments in scientific monitoring equipment as well as a GIS system. Project also sought to develop a basic knowledge of the flora and fauna, habitat distribution, and the physical/chemical characteristics of the marine and terrestrial ecosystems adequate for planning, management, conservation, and sustainable development. This will serve as a baseline for permanent monitoring. TE finds “very considerable achievements” under this objective, with a large increase in the understanding of SCE physical, marine, terrestrial, and cultural resources, as called for in the PD (TE, pg 15).

b) Governance – TE finds that overall, the most notable accomplishment of the project has been the establishment of “stronger functional links between the sciences and development interests,” and notes that there “is abundant evidence that scientists and other technical specialists were directly involved in the development of policy, new laws and regulations, and strategies for development and conservation. All scientists interviewed said their involvement in such activities had increased during the project and that they were adequately prepared for such involvement” (TE, pg 14). Moreover, the project produced a document entitled “Proteccion de la Biodiversidad y Establecimiento de un Desarrollo Sustentable en el Ecosistema Sabana-Camaguey” which presents the major findings of the project’s work to better understand the SCE ecosystems and includes a strategic plan for the archipelago. TE finds that the document is already shaping the planning and development process in the SCE, and provides a few examples of tourism and infrastructure projects – existing and proposed – that have been modified on the basis of the project’s outputs (TE, pg 17). The planning document includes recommendations for a system of protected areas within the archipelago, including a large coastal marine park.

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 are reported in the TE to have occurred as a result 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.

TE is unclear as to whether or not any adoption of project initiative have been taken to scale by project end, but does suggest that this may be taking place. As noted above, TE finds that overall, the most notable accomplishment of the project has been the establishment of “stronger functional links between the sciences and development interests,” and notes that there “is abundant evidence that scientists and other technical specialists were directly involved in the development of policy, new laws and regulations, and strategies for development and conservation. All scientists interviewed said their involvement in such activities had increased during the project and that they were adequately prepared for such involvement” (TE, pg 14).

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.

TE provides the following key lessons:

- Integrated coastal management is informed but is not driven by science. According to the TE, this essentially means that coastal management, as practiced in Cuba, is fundamentally a political process. TE states that “This fundamental realization came as a surprise to some participants for whom this project was an initial exposure to the process of formulating a resource management strategy.” (TE, pg 40).
- As the project matured, it became clear that new institutional frameworks with supporting policies and regulations would be required to successfully implement the SCE management strategy. This makes this project a first opportunity to apply the policy reforms that are being designed in response to UNCED’s Agenda 21 to a specific geographic site and a specific set of management issues.
- Several participants reflected that this project strongly reinforced that public education and public engagement must be at the core of an initial phase implementation.
- Several participants in the project have become very aware that the issues posed by biodiversity, conservation and sustainable development in the SCE ecosystem will be successfully met only through a sustained effort extending out over many years.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE provides the following recommendations (some specific recommendations for a Phase II project have been omitted here as they are no longer relevant. They can however be found in the original TE):

- A scientific basis should be developed for assessing the role of the SCE in regional ecosystem processes affecting biodiversity in the Caribbean.
- The extensive biodiversity surveys undertaken during Phase I provide the basis for more intensive biodiversity studies and permanent data sets that document the high biodiversity and endemic life that is known to be present.
- A top priority for the SCE is a reduction in the organic loadings from sugar refineries that have produced anoxic conditions and are degrading seagrass beds and coral reefs. Another major concern is the reduction in fresh water flow to the lagoons brought by the construction of dams within the watershed.
- Information systems need to be developed by a full range of institutions that more forcefully promote direct electronic access to standardized databases and its multivariate analysis for resource management and conservation.
- The lessons emerging from this GEF project should be applied to the protection of biodiversity in other areas of Cuba. Areas such as the archipelago of the Jardines de la Reina and the Canarreos archipelago, which are known to contain significant biodiversity resources, should be targets for an outreach effort within Cuba that features: public education; university education programs including thesis projects and teaching case studies; study tours; training in environmental planning techniques; the coastal planning process.

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?	Report does a good job at assessing the achievement of outcomes and in providing some preliminary assessment of the impacts of the project.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE does not provide ratings as these were not a requirement of GEF projects at the time. Report provides sufficient evidence to support its assessment of the achievement of project outcomes. Report however does not provide an assessment of management processes, or UNDP supervision, sufficient to understand how Implementation and Execution progressed. In particular, TE says nothing about why Executing agency was changed 1-year into the project. TE also makes claims of the wide-reaching effect of the project on planning and policy development in Cuba, but does not support these claims beyond anecdotal evidence.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Report does not assess sustainability except to say that a second phase of the project would appear necessary to sustain the “momentum” of the project.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Overall, lessons are not detailed nor specific enough to be of much use, and don’t cover key project components such as the capacity building or the public awareness campaigns. This would appear to be a missed opportunity to provide insights into a reportedly very successful and well-executed project.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE states overall project costs and co-financing but does not detail what co-financing was used for.	MU
Assess the quality of the report’s evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does not assess M&E systems at all beyond noting some of the arrangements for biological monitoring. M&E of project activities and process is not discussed.	U
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating: $(0.3*(5+4)) + (0.1 * (2+4+3+2)) = 2.7+1.1 = 3.8 = MS$

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