

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		393	
GEF Agency project ID		340	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Water Pollution Control and Biodiversity Conservation in the Gulf of Guinea Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)	
Country/Countries		Benin, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-8: Waterbody-based Operational Program	
Executing agencies involved		United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGOs were partners for some project activities, but the TE did not say which NGOs were involved.	
Private sector involvement		Not involved.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 1, 1991	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 28, 1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 30, 1998	
Actual date of project completion		March 1, 1998	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		6.00	6.00
Co-financing	IA own	0	UA
	Government	0	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.51	UA
	Private sector	0	UA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	UA
Total GEF funding		6.00	6.00
Total Co-financing		0.51	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.51	UA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 1, 1999	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Prof. Mahmoud Kh. El-Sayed and Dr. Robert Williams	
TER completion date		August 2014	
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project are to prevent pollution and conserve biodiversity in the Large Marine Ecosystem of the Gulf of Guinea. The Gulf of Guinea is threatened by increasing coastal populations and industry waste, and there is little regional information or cooperation on monitoring and managing the Gulf. The project will support the creation of a regional approach to protecting the Gulf of Guinea ecosystem.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objectives of the project are as follows, as quoted from the Project Document (PD):

- 1 To strengthen regional institutional capacities to prevent and remedy pollution of the Gulf of Guinea Large Marine Ecosystem, and the associated degradation of critical habitats.
 - 1.1 A network of scientific and monitoring institutions equipped for monitoring and assessment of the Gulf of Guinea Large Marine Ecosystem.
 - 1.2 Scientific and technical personnel at Center for Oceanic Research and National Focal Point Institutes trained to carry out the project monitoring and assessment program.
 - 1.3 Personnel of government regulatory and management agencies trained in environmental assessment and management techniques related to pollution control and resource management.
 - 1.4 Enhanced capacity of NGOs to participate in an environmental management and generate public awareness.
- 2 To develop an integrated information management and decision-making support system for environmental management.
 - 2.1 A regional environmental information management system, including a multi-purpose GIS and other data base modules in Center for Oceanic Research.
 - 2.2 A multi-purpose GIS data base assembled from all known national and international electronic sources, and from the relevant scientific literature.
 - 2.3 "Manager's Version" GIS data base transferred to National Focal Point Agencies. The Manager's Version will be more user-friendly without the full GIS analysis capabilities in order to aid management.

- 3 To establish a comprehensive program for monitoring and assessment of the health of productivity of the Gulf of Guinea Large Marine Ecosystem.
 - 3.1 Integrated monitoring program design for the Large Marine Ecosystem.
 - 3.2 Mangrove survey.
 - 3.3 Pollution monitoring program in coastal lagoons to identify status, trends and critical areas.
 - 3.4 Pollution monitoring program for nearshore waters and sediments.
 - 3.5 Living marine resource survey program.
 - 3.6 Plankton survey program.
 - 3.7 Large Marine Ecosystem working meetings to develop ecosystem health indices.
- 4 To prevent and control land-based sources of industrial and urban pollution.
 - 4.1 Inventory and assessment of industrial pollution.
 - 4.2 Case studies for demonstration of industrial waste treatment and management.
 - 4.3 Feasibility study of urban sewage waste management.
 - 4.4 Development of a strategic plan outlining options for industrial and urban pollution control.
- 5 To develop national and regional strategies and policies for the long-term management and protection of the Gulf of Guinea Large Marine Ecosystem.
 - 5.1 Guidelines for integrated coastal zone management planning to guide coastal development and conservation at the national and regional levels.
 - 5.2 Mechanisms for financial support for the long-term continuation of the Large Marine Ecosystem monitoring programs, GIS data base development, and coastal resources and environmental management activities.
 - 5.3 Mechanisms for regional policy and strategy formulation and implementation.

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

Yes, but unable to assess the extent of the changes. According to the TE, the plan and schedule for implementation were revised three times by the project steering committee. The TE does not state the changes that were made or the reasons behind the change.

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

This project is in line with GEF Operational Program 8: Waterbody-based Operational Program, the goal of which is to assist countries so that their waterbodies and drainage basins can sustainably support human activities. The project conforms to the operational program by aiming to protect the Gulf of Guinea and including capacity-building components, conducting transboundary environmental analyses, supporting communication infrastructure, and creating a monitoring system, among other activities.

The project is also consistent with country and regional priorities. According to the PD, each of the countries participating in the project has taken action to address related environmental issues and has action plans or regulations in place on pollution and biodiversity, although the project document does not list specifics.

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

Most of the project’s outputs were addressed either fully or partially, while some targets were surpassed.

Objective 1 was to strengthen the region’s institutional capacities to ameliorate pollution and habitat degradation in the Gulf of Guinea. To that end, a survey of human resources and equipment needs was made, and the recommended equipment was installed in the target institutions (except in Cameroon, which had trouble providing the running costs of the equipment). Forty-one workshops were held with 416 individuals trained from amongst a diverse group of stakeholders and on a variety of topics. This exceeded the target of 17 workshops. Government personnel were trained in environmental assessment and management techniques, particularly pollution control and resource management. A network of 30 NGOs was trained to conduct public awareness campaigns, monitor project execution, and track policy changes in the project countries. Also, “improved intra- and inter-country exchanges and collaboration [was] achieved,” although the TE does not explain how this was accomplished or measured (TE, page 21).

Objective 2 intended to develop a support system for information management and decision making. For this, a “basic” GIS database was assembled and set up in Cote d’Ivoire, Benin, Nigeria and Ghana, although the manager’s version was not developed (TE, page 23). A regional network of GIS experts was created and further trained.

Objective 3 was to establish a monitoring program for the health and productivity of the Gulf of Guinea. The project created standardized methods for pollution monitoring and disseminated them in a manual, conducted and distributed a mangrove survey, and implemented pilot projects for mangrove rehabilitation in five countries. The project also executed a pollution monitoring program, a living marine resources survey, and a plankton survey, although the TE states that these activities were completed only partially “due to unforeseen problems related to the availability of a research vessel” as well as “limitations of project budget and existing national and regional (financial and human resources) capacities” (TE, page 25). Reports on the state of the marine environment were prepared for all project countries as well as the region as a whole.

Objective 4 intended to prevent and control land-based pollution sources. An assessment of industrial pollution was conducted in all of the project countries, and a feasibility study was conducted on the establishment of a Waste Stock Exchange Management System. Demonstration projects were executed “on the use of mangroves as natural purifiers of urban and industrial effluents” (TE, page 27). Waste management options were analyzed, but the planned economic evaluations were cancelled because of budget limits. The project held stock-taking workshops, and regional standards for effluents were defined. In addition, the project organized marine debris monitoring and awareness campaigns, drafted regional policy recommendations and a Protocol to the Abidjan Convention, and executed oil spill contingency planning workshops.

Objective 5 was to develop national and regional policies for the long term management of the Gulf of Guinea. Coastal profiles and national plans for coastal management were developed, and national workshops with 426 participants were implemented. However, “regional ICAM [integrated coastal area management] planning has not been developed” (TE, page 30). A study on long-term financial mechanisms for the continuation of project activities was conducted, but the report on funding requirements and action plan was not completed. Mechanisms for regional policy formulation and implementation were established, and the Accra Declaration on water and sustainable development was signed by the project governments.

This project is rated moderately satisfactory for its accomplishments in capacity building and regional coordination, tempered by the lack of completion of several of the project activities, such as the regional coastal management planning and manager’s GIS.

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

Although the project was completed within the expected timeframe, the TE reports that “the timeliness of certain outputs were delayed,” although the TE does not explain why (TE, page 19). Other efficiency issues include an “understaffed” Regional Coordination Center and that “funds allocated to activities did not correspond to the expectations,” for unexplained reasons (TE, page 14). Another problem mentioned was a high rate of turnover in both governments and project staff, and there was a lack of funding for publishing and disseminating reports. Funding limitations also caused the monitoring studies to be incomplete due to the inability to hire enough research vessels. Overall “the funding made available to the project...was not enough to enable the implementation as envisaged or full functioning of some activities” (TE, page 35). The reasons behind the funding gaps were not explained in the TE.

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

Financial: Moderately unlikely; there is no evidence for continuing financial support from either donor agencies or participating countries, and even “committed funds from the participating countries are not enough to sustain the project” (TE, page 34). Even for the project’s already-existing outputs, such as the

equipment that was provided, the TE reported a lack of funding for the maintenance and continued operation of the equipment.

Sociopolitical: Likely; the TE reports enthusiasm and commitment to the project's goals at the ministerial level. The drafting of the Accra Declaration showed "the strong political will and commitments of the participating countries on a ministerial level" (TE, page 33). However, the TE states that cooperation among the private sector and civil society need to be strengthened further.

Institutional: Moderately likely; the project was able to increase institutional capacity with needed equipment, personnel training, and the establishment of networks of national experts. The national coastal management plans that were developed by the project are another avenue for project sustainability, provided that the plans are implemented. Furthermore, the TE reports that the external expertise provided to the project was gradually replaced by local experts, which demonstrates that a strong foundation for in-house capacity was built.

Environmental: Not applicable.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

Unable to assess. There is no financial information in the TE.

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 as a whole was neither delayed nor extended. The TE reports that some outputs were delayed, but does not explain why. There is no evidence that the output delays affected the project's outcomes.

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:

According to the TE, country ownership for this project is strong, as evidenced by the statements of commitment to and enthusiasm for the project's goals at the ministerial level, as well as the drafting of the Accra Declaration on water and sustainable development. Country ownership is necessary for the national coastal management plans that were developed by the project to be implemented throughout the region. Country ownership was also necessary for completing one of the project objectives: the funds provided by the project to create a GIS tool "were highly inadequate, and if it were not for the

strong country support received, this objective would not have reached a respectable level” (TE, page 42).

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 Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The M&E design in the project document planned biannual reviews and a schedule for evaluations. The TE considers the project targets to be verifiable, quantifiable, and realistic. However, there was no budget or baseline for M&E. There does not appear to be provisions for measuring the quality of training or the outcomes of capacity-building and awareness activities.

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

No problems in M&E implementation were reported in the TE. The TE reports that “the recommendations from the midterm evaluations were implemented as far as could be within the limitations of the project” (TE, page 16). The tripartite reviews also led to adaptive changes in the project, although the TE does not provide examples or any supporting evidence for this.

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 Unsatisfactory
--	--

The main project design issue discussed in the TE is a lack of sufficient funding. For example, there was a lack of funding for publishing and disseminating reports. Funding limitations also caused the monitoring studies to be incomplete due to the inability to hire enough research vessels. The funding allocated to creating a GIS tool “was a mere pittance” that hindered the creation of the GIS (TE, page 24). Overall “the funding made available to the project...was not enough to enable the implementation as envisaged or full functioning of some activities” (TE, page 35). In addition, the project’s objectives were considered too ambitious by the TE: “the objectives of the project embody a much longer term strategy which cannot be achieved, or finalized, in four years” (TE, page 40). The project design of 85 activities in 6 countries made it “a very difficult project to manage,” and a second phase of the project must be more focused and cohesive than the current project (TE, page 39).

Regarding supervision, the TE stated that “the response time [of UNDP] is far too slow,” which exacerbated the funding problem (TE, page 41).

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

There were minor problems reported with project execution. The project’s Regional Coordination Center was understaffed, and project staff turnover was high, which was an obstacle to execution. UNIDO attempted to address the lack of funding and personnel “by placing extra manpower from its own resources” into the project (TE, page 41).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

There were no changes reported.

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.

There were no changes reported.

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

This was a capacity-building project that trained 416 people in various topics related to coastal and waters management, set up a pollution monitoring program, and gathered information on the ecosystem through biodiversity surveys.

b) Governance

The project developed a GIS tool for the Gulf of Guinea and developed regional standards for effluents as well as standardized methods for pollution monitoring.

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.

There were none reported.

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.

No project initiatives were taken to scale by project's end. The author of the TE hoped for a second phase of the project that would expand on the current one, but the TE did not indicate whether such a plan was in progress.

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.

“Environmental and living resources management actions or interventions that are not community based are doomed to failure” (TE, page 41). There must be a consultation process with the public to engender a sense of ownership. NGOs are well-placed for such mobilization and outreach.

It is crucial that an intensive network of national institutions, NGOs, policymakers, and experts be involved and consulted at all stages and that this network is maintained.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE recommends a second phase of the project be developed as quickly as possible in order to build on the current project's successes. The second phase should be more cohesive and focused than the first, with more adequate finances. More emphasis should be placed on community participation and finances should be allocated to expand the network of NGOs. UNIDO should continue as the project's executing agency, and UNIDO should continue its support of waste management in the region.

Governments should maintain the institutional structures created by the project, use the GIS tool to strengthen management capacity, and establish coordination bodies on coastal management.

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?	The report's assessment is piecemeal. In most cases, it does not compare the project's outputs to the targets stated in the project design (or in the redesign—the TE also did not explain how the project was changed during implementation, although it stated that the project was changed 3 times.) Without either listing the project's achievements in comparison to its targets or knowing the changes made in the project's redesigns, it is impossible to determine whether the project met its targets.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE does not have ratings, although these were not required at the time. Some of the tables do not have labels explaining what the letters in the cells mean (e.g. page 17), preventing understanding of the table. The TE is not internally consistent: it states that "all project activities were addressed" when in fact a few failed to be implemented. The evidence presented was not complete and left out important details.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Adequate but lacking in details.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Most of the lessons learned described the situation and problems faced by the project without giving solutions.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No financial information is discussed in the TE. There are references to Annexes that presumably contain more information, but these Annexes were not attached to the TE.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE lists the number of meetings that took place for monitoring as well as the documents that were produced, and states that adaptive changes were made based on the monitoring system. But it does not provide evidence to back the latter statement up.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MU

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