

# Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3713	
GEF Agency project ID		4049	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Establishing Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Djibouti	
Country/Countries		Djibouti	
Region		West Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems SP-2: Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry for Urban Planning, the Environment and Regional Planning (MHUEAT), also known as the Environment and Territory Planning Agency (DATE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		July 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 2014	
Actual date of project completion		31 December, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.02	0.02
	Co-financing	0.02	0.02
GEF Project Grant		0.98	0.98
Co-financing	IA own	0.2	0.2
	Government	0.82	0.62
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		1.0	1.0
Total Co-financing		1.04	0.84
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.04	1.84
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 2016	
Author of TE		Gondo Gbanyangbe	
TER completion date		December 29, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

Note: The Project Document (PD) for this project was written in French. The author of this TER interpreted and translated the PD to the best of her knowledge, but no official translation services were used. Small discrepancies might be present between the original sentence in French and the translated quotes provided in this TER.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The PD does not list a more specific global environmental objective for the project other than to work towards the strengthening of marine protected areas in Djibouti.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective as stated in the Project Document is “To catalyze the institutional and financial sustainability of the Djibouti’s system of marine protected areas” (Request for CEO Endorsement, p.1) This objective will be attained through work on the following project components:

1. Policy and regulatory framework for the management of MPAs
2. Efficient and financially sustainable management structures of the MPAs at central and site level
3. Financing for MPAs

(Request for CEO endorsement p. 2)

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

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation.

## 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.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the project as relevant, and this TER which uses a different scale rates it as Satisfactory. Indeed, the project is well very aligned to both Djibouti's national priorities and GEF priorities under the biodiversity focal area.

The project appears to respond well Djibouti's national priorities in terms of social and environmental protection as defined in the "Vision Djibouti 2035" document, as well as to the priorities laid out in the five years plan 2015-2019. (TE p.8)

The program is also very well aligned to the GEF priorities under the biodiversity focal area. The project focuses on providing global environmental benefits through strategic measures enhancing the marine protected area system in Djibouti. The project aims to reduce pressure on biodiversity, improve the statue of biodiversity in MPAs, and strengthen national capacity to manage biodiversity. Those objectives are particularly well aligned with GEF Strategic Objective 1 - Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems – and Strategic Priority 2 - Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
--------------------------	--

The TE rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory but does not provide a systematic assessment of project achievements against the indicators established in the logical framework, making it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of the project. Based on the limited information provided in the TE and the information from the 2015 PIR, effectiveness is rated as moderately unsatisfactory due to the relative success achieved under the first two project components, but the lack of progress under the third component - MPA financing. In the paragraphs below, we discuss the extent to which the project successfully achieved its intended outcomes.

#### **Component 1: Policy and regulatory framework for the management of MPAs**

The TE describes several activities that took place under this component. A new decree on the delimitation of MPAs was proposed and, at project end, was outstanding for signature by the Government. Buoys were installed to better indicate the MPA boundaries, codes of good conduct in

MPA were written, and MPA maps were created. (TE p.21) The 2015 PIR reports that the project has, over the years, “witnessed a gradual rise in interest in MPA, however more capacity building is needed to put in place a functional organizational framework that will enable smooth management of MPA” (p.5). The PIR also reveals that several awareness-raising activities were held on the need to legislate and delimit MPAs, and that several partnerships had been fostered with other line ministries involved in maritime resources in order to strengthen the MPA management framework. The legal documents produced by the project have not yet been adopted. Overall, this component appears to have been moderately satisfactorily achieved.

## **Component 2: Efficient and financially sustainable management structures of the MPAs at central and site level**

The TE describes several activities that took place under this component. Several management structures have been put in place throughout the project, including Wise Men Committees and a Regional Committee in Obock. A national MPA communication plan was developed, a regional forum on MPAs was held, and 19 training workshops were organized with various committees, local populations and MPA staff. In addition, several individuals have been trained in how to respect the codes of conduct developed as part of the project, and 50 fishermen were trained on the sustainable use of marine resources. (TE p.22) Overall, and as confirmed in the 2015 PIR (pp.9-10), substantial progress has been made towards raising capacity and awareness regarding MPA issues. However, METT scores were not used and tracked as planned, and the real impact in management remains unclear. Effectiveness of this component is rated as moderately satisfactory.

## **Component 3: Financing for MPAs**

According to the 2015 PIR (p.13), “very little progress has been made on this aspect (...) No studies have been undertaken to assess financial sustainability (of the MPAs)”. According to the TE, meetings were held with the Government on this topic, but with no success” (TE p.22). This component is rated as unsatisfactory.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	--

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates it as moderately satisfactory, mainly due to the fact that the budget had to be revised and project activities had to be reconsidered due to missing co-financing.

The TE reports that “due to the fact that the financial contributions of the Government was not received at indicated time, the project implementation unit has necessary to review the budget for the available resources (UNDP and GEF contributions) in order to effectively start the planned activities” (TE p.8). This

reduced project efficiency as the project's budget and the timeline had to be revised (TE p.24). The TER does not provide any additional information regarding efficiency, financial management or the project's cost-effectiveness.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Unlikely</b>
--------------------	-------------------------

The TE rates sustainability as moderately likely. This TER rates it as unlikely due to the lack of any evidence of financial support for MPAs in Djibouti going forward, and the lack of evidence that enough community capacity has been built to continue supporting MPAs after project end.

The TE describes overall project sustainability in bleak terms:

“Up to the closing date of the project, the Decree on the MPAs’ was not signed; the fund for MPA uninitiated, the private sector still hesitating on its commitment and the monitoring/evaluation is insufficient. Despite of the will of the project team and the local community with regards to the project achievement, no strategy or measure is taken to ensure the profit of the project is sustainable after the end of the project, unless a second phase of the project is set up. Some measures should be taken to ensure the transition phase between the end of the project and the beginning of the second phase. “ (TE p.23)

Below, we describe specific aspects of sustainability.

#### **Financial Risks – Sustainability Unlikely**

The TE reports no official government commitment to continue supporting the project (TE p.23). Indeed, at project end, no source of funding had been confirmed to maintain project activities.

In addition, the TE indicates that at project end, the monitoring committees, the Wise Men and Regional Committees were set up but did not have sufficient capacities to work autonomously. The private sector did not have concrete commitment to support MPAs and the legal framework was not fully established. (TE p.29)

#### **Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely**

The TE claims that “the project has enormously contributed to (create) a total awareness both at the national and community level in favour of biodiversity protection in the MPAs” and that “the local communities and authorities committed themselves to make sustainable the undertaken actions and the impacts will be really positive and visible in a long term period” (TE p.9). Indeed, the project did conduct capacity-building activities (workshops, awareness-raising activities, training sessions). However, those were done with few individuals and at a very small scale, and it is unclear that this will suffice to ensure sustainability. Indeed, the TE reports that “the monitoring committees, the wise men and regional committees was set up but does not have sufficient capacities to ... work autonomously”

(TE p.29). Finally, the MPA decree that was developed as part of the project was not signed at project end, and political commitment was unclear (TE p.23).

### **Institutional Risks – Sustainability Unlikely**

At project end, the legal framework for MPAs in Djibouti was not fully established, threatening the future of the MPAs in the country.

### **Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely**

There are no reported or known environmental risks to this project. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as likely.

## **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?

About \$200,000 in cash co-financing expected from the Government of Djibouti has not been provided, which created pressure on the project to find alternative sources of funding and to revise the project implementation plan. The TE does not mention whether or not this funding gap negatively influenced project outcomes.

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?

There were important delays at project start. While the project was endorsed in 2009, the TE reports it did not really start before 2012, when the launching workshop was organized. This long initial delay necessitated the extension of the project by one year (TE p.17). According to the TE, the initial project delay was due to the co-financing expected from the Government not being available (TE p.8).

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 that country ownership "is still not really effective" and will require better communication between stakeholders to get better. More ownership over the project will start by the signature of the decree on the MPA, which will symbolize a real acknowledgement by the State of the importance of MPAs, and will make legal all new MPA provisions (TE p.28).

## 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: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E design at entry as moderately satisfactory. Instead, this TER rates M&E design as moderately unsatisfactory due to the weakness of the strategic results framework proposed in the Project Document (PD).

The PD proposes a basic M&E plan, including monitoring indicators, a basic logical framework, as well as mid-term and final evaluations (PD p.14). However, the strategic results framework presented is not sufficiently detailed, focusing on outcomes and objectives with no description of planned project outputs or activities. In addition, the indicators do not meet the SMART criteria, and the PD does not provide baseline data for those indicators. Finally, the project document does not specify a monitoring plan for the selected indicators. Overall, the strategic results framework is of little practical usefulness as a guide for project implementation, and does not provide useful data to track the project's contribution to outcomes. (TE p.22)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E implementation for the project as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates it as moderately satisfactory as the expected M&E activities appear to have been conducted, but with few resources.

As mentioned above, the PD presented no monitoring plan for the indicators selected. The TE also reports that, in addition to insufficient information about the M&E plan, there was no M&E specialist in the project team. The project coordinator was expected to perform all M&E activities (TE p.26). Project implementation reports (PIRs) have been produced every year since 2012, and the mid-term and final evaluations were carried out as planned. The TE provides no additional information on M&E activities conducted throughout the project, nor on the extent to which the project team incorporated lessons and recommendations from M&E.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout

project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
--	---------------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP's quality of implementation for this project is rated as moderately satisfactory. This TER does not have enough information to assess the UNDP's performance as project implementing agency.

The TE rates the performance of the UNDP as moderately satisfactory, but does not provide a clear justification for this rating. This TER does not have sufficient information to rate the UNDP's performance, but notes weaknesses in the design phase of the program, notably the weaknesses in the M&E framework reported above. In addition, the TE notes "that the chronogram of the activities was completely omitted in the PRODOC which could not facilitate the work for the project management team" (TE p.22).

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
---	---------------------------------

The executing agency for this project was the Ministry for Urban Planning, the Environment and Regional Planning (MHUEAT). In the TE, the MHUEAT's quality of execution for this project is rated as moderately satisfactory. This TER does not have sufficient information to rate project execution.

Under a National Execution (NEX) arrangement, the MHUEAT was responsible for all aspects of project execution. The main challenge the Project Management Unit encountered was the lack of resource mobilization at the beginning of the project. This caused challenges to project execution, but was not in the control of the MHUEAT. The TE does not provide much information regarding the MHUEAT's performance, other than the fact that it eventually hired a United Nations Volunteer to support the project, which "helped to boost the implementation of the project in an operational way with some key important progress" (TE p.27). Due to the limited information available, this TER is unable to assess 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.

According to the TE, the project has had the following global environmental benefits:

1. Reducing the pressure of threats on the biodiversity in MPAs
2. Improving the state of biodiversity in MPAs
3. Strengthening the national management capacity of MPAs

(TE p.29)

However, as no quantitative data was collected, there is no evidence that those benefits did indeed take place.

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.

NA

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

Several capacity-building activities were held as part of the project. A regional forum on MPAs was held, and various training workshops were organized with various committees, local populations and MPA staff. In addition, several individuals have been trained in how to respect the codes of conduct developed as part of the project, and 50 fishermen were trained on the sustainable use of marine resources. (TE p.22)

Overall, and as confirmed in the 2015 PIR (pp.9-10), substantial progress has been made towards raising capacity and awareness on MPA issues.

#### b) Governance

Several MPA management structures have been put in place throughout the project including a Wise Men Committee and a Regional Committee. In addition, a national MPA communication plan was developed. (TE p.22)

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

No unintended impacts were reported as part 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.

Replication has not yet taken place. However, there is potential for replication:

“The MPA project can be replicated with a possibility of extending its activities to other important marine areas in the country. This appear to be possible in a way that the locale communities and authorities expressed even the establishment of new marines protected areas in the area of Sagallou, Gulf of Ghoubbet and white sand at Raissali. This should facilitate the replication of the MPA project for a better conservation of aquatic resources of the country “ (TE pp.23-24)

## 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 report does not present any lessons learned.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

**The report makes the following recommendations:**

1. At the design stage, the project planned only for 3 MPAs but it should have considered other important MPA sites.
2. The UNDP/GEF should consider the possibility of extending this project in order to improve sustainability and extend the project to 3 new MPAs where the marine biodiversity is threatened.
3. A better M&E framework should have been put in place to ensure regular monitoring and to ensure the project could realize its expected results.
4. An IEC (information-Education-Communication) unit should have been put in place to ensure a better visibility of UNDP/GEF actions and ensure a good communication between the various stakeholders.
5. UNDP should become actively involved in the implementation of projects through:
  - a. The recruitment of project technical staff with clear TORs
  - b. The recruitment of a Technical Advisor to organise, co-ordinate and ensure better monitoring of all project activities.
6. Establish a real capacity building programme for the Environmental Agency.
7. Support institutional governance, ensure better synergy between stakeholders and make sure that the political will expressed by the Government during the design stage of this project materializes.
8. Undertake all necessary measures to ensure that the payment of \$US 200 000 planned by the Government comes through.
9. Organizational and regulatory measures should be put in place to ensure the autonomy of the Wise Men Committees established as part of the project. These established committees need clarified terms of reference and technical support to become really operational.
10. The MPA eco-guards need to be given a legal status and to be integrated into the public workforce.
11. Support should be provided to indigenous populations living around the MPAs by setting up and developing livelihood/income generating activities.
12. Local community leaders should be trained on the importance of MPAs and of species with high conservation value.
13. A governance framework should be established, allowing all stakeholders to meet and discuss issues related to institutional and resource mobilization.

14. A real institutional, technical and financial capacity building programme for the environmental agency (DATE) should be set up to enable it to efficiently fulfil its mission.
15. The new MPA codes of conduct should be validated and operationalized.
16. The new fishing code should be approved and validated by the concerned authority in order to ensure rational and sustainable management of resources in this sector.
17. A regulatory framework should be established to facilitate the creation of community associations (community based organisations – CBO) and make them work in an autonomous manner .The project should support these CBO in obtaining their status.
18. A national workshop should be organized on the topic of MPAs, inviting all relevant stakeholders and proposing the establishment of a special funds dedicated to the conservation of MPAs.
19. A meeting with all stakeholders and MPA managers should be organized to establish measures to protect project gains and to reflect on modalities of conflict resolution.

(TE pp.30-32)

## 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 presents a very basic discussion of the project's achievements in terms of activities conducted, but does not present a logical and effective discussion of the extent to which outcomes have been achieved.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, but some of the evidence necessary to make assessments is missing, and ratings are often not well substantiated.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not provide a thorough assessment of sustainability. The exit strategy is not presented, but some elements of sustainability are discussed.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned and recommendations are comprehensive and consistent with the rest of the TE.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes total costs, but not costs per activity. Co-financing figures are provided.	<b>MS</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report only provides basic information about the implementation of M&E. An assessment of the M&E framework is provided.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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

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