# 1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **GEF project ID** | | 396 | |
| **GEF Agency project ID** | | 637 | |
| **GEF Replenishment Phase** | | Pilot Phase | |
| **Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)** | | UNDP | |
| **Project name** | | Prevention and Management of Marine Pollution in East Asian Seas | |
| **Country/Countries** | | Brunei, Cambodia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, People's Republic of China, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam | |
| **Region** | | Asia | |
| **Focal area** | | International Waters | |
| **Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives** | | 9 – Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program | |
| **Executing agencies involved** | | The International Maritime Organization (IMO) | |
| **NGOs/CBOs involvement** | | None identified. | |
| **Private sector involvement** | | Through consultations and their participation at the Public Sector-Private Sector Partnership Program. | |
| **CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)** | | NA | |
| **Effectiveness date / project start** | | January 1994 | |
| **Expected date of project completion (at start)** | | January 1999 | |
| **Actual date of project completion** | | September 30, 1999 | |
| **Project Financing** | | | |
| | | **At Endorsement (US $M)** | **At Completion (US $M)** |
| **Project Preparation Grant** | GEF funding | | |
| | Co-financing | | |
| **GEF Project Grant** | | $8 | $7.986 |
| **Co-financing** | IA own | | |
| | Government | | |
| | Other multi- /bi-laterals | | |
| | Private sector | | |
| | NGOs/CSOs | | |
| **Total GEF funding** | | $8 | $7.986 |
| **Total Co-financing** | | $3.4 | $3.4 |
| **Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)** | | $11.4 | $11.386 [final values obtained from PMIS system] |
| **Terminal evaluation/review information** | | | |
| **TE completion date** | | August 1998 | |
| **TE submission date** | | NA | |
| **Author of TE** | | Angela Alcala, Brian Davy and Olof Linden | |
| **TER completion date** | | February 2015 | |
| **TER prepared by** | | Erika Hernandez | |
| **TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)** | | Shanna Edberg | |

**2. Summary of Project Ratings**

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

# 3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of this project, as stated in the Project Document (PD), are "contribution to the protection of marine and coastal biodiversity on a global scale, and in the East Asian Seas region in particular, and development of replicable models for regional marine and coastal biodiversity protection within the context of sustainable development". It will accomplish this by focusing on the problem of marine pollution, which PD states is a significant and growing threat to regional marine biodiversity, due to increasing population and economic activities. As stated on the IW Learn site, "*Diversification and intensification of economic activities to meet growing demands for food, employment, and shelter have placed tremendous pressures on coastal and adjacent marine environments. As a result, the coastal waters of the region have become contaminated by untreated sewage, industrial effluents, oils, pesticides, and hazardous wastes from land- and sea-based activities*" (IW Learn, http://iwlearn.net/iw-projects/396). The principal constraints to addressing marine pollution problems in the East Asian Seas, and which the project seeks to address, include "insufficient political determination to implement and enforce existing regulations; lack of trained personnel at the policy, planning, and management levels; the absence of integration, coordination, and cooperation between agencies and governments; and insufficient funds or economic justification for investment in appropriate technologies and other feasible means to control pollution" [PD, pg 7].

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As Development Objectives, the PD identifies four Immediate Objectives that are outlined below. The PD states that the project will launch 2 integrated coastal management demonstration programs: one in Xiamen, China and another one in Batangas Bay, Philippines. It will also provide coastal management assistance to the littoral states of the Malacca Straits, and will focus on risk management, requiring the identification of vulnerable sources of pollution, the probability of accidental events and the identification of vulnerable resources [p. 11, PD]. The Immediate Objectives by which project goals will be achieved are:

1) ***Immediate Objective 1.*** *To strengthen the regional capability to manage marine pollution through demonstration of integrated coastal zone management and pollution risk management.*

By the end of the program, each participating country will have established a planning framework and a mechanism for marine pollution mitigation through the application of the integrated coastal planning and management approach. Some of the strategies include developing a coast environmental profile, relevant government policies, strategic management activities, monitoring programs to track changes in marine pollution management and training programs in marine pollution prevention. The project will work in the following demonstration sites:

- **Demonstration Site 1 - Xiamen. China. Demonstration Site 2 - Batangas, Philippines. Demonstration Site 3 – Malacca Strait.**

2) ***Immediate Objective 2.*** *To develop a regional marine pollution monitoring and information management network.*

3) ***Immediate Objective 3.*** *To strengthen the regional capability to implement international conventions relating to the protection of the marine environment.*

4) ***Immediate Objective 4.*** *To develop and initiate a menu of sustainable financing mechanisms for the successful completion of the long-term activities beyond the life of the program.*

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

As per the TE, Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives and other activities did not undergo changes. However, some specific activities experienced changes without affective immediate objectives.

## 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 TE does not give a rating for this section. The project is relevant to both the GEF and to participating countries, as well as for the International Maritime Organization (IMO). As a result, this TER rates Relevance as *satisfactory*. For China, the project complements activities seeking to promote the maintenance of good water quality and improvement in the near shore and specific deteriorating areas, given the many pollution problems related to domestic sewage and solid wastes [Annex V, PD]. The local

government has undertaken environmental management initiatives to reduce the marine pollution program, such as the development of a database containing projections of population growth and pollution until 2015. For the Philippines, relevance is seen in the need of preventing pollution threats given its high population growth rate as well as expansion of oil refineries. Specifically, the project hopes to demonstrate that effective management of environmental problems can leverage significant co-financing and that GEF strategies can be replicated, considerably contribute to the global reduction of pollution. This program is relevant for the IMO in that international conventions relating to maritime safety and marine pollution prevention are initiated and monitored by this organization. Relevance for IMO is noted in its active participation in the development of all UNEP Regional Seas Programs, such as the East Asian Seas [p. 15, PD]. For the GEF, the project's objectives are consistent with GEF Operational Program 9 – Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program, consisting in the reduction of environmental stresses on coastal and offshore waters shared by two or more countries. A key emphasis of the GEF is demonstration of innovative, cost-efficient, and effective approaches. With an effective management of environmental problems, this project seeks to lever large co-financing amounts so that the strategic approaches funded by the GEF can be replicated elsewhere [p. 2, PD].

| 4.2 **Effectiveness** | Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory** |
|---|---|

The TE does not rate the project's effectiveness. This TER assesses a rating of *moderately satisfactory* based on information presented in the TE narrative. Although some activities pertaining to the demonstration sites were modified, the Mid-Term Review shows that the activities underwent minor changes. This TER found that most of the activities were achieved. Although marine pollution monitoring and information management was carried out, high quality data is not yet available nor is regional data sharing present. As per Immediate Objective 4, all financial activities are targeted to end in 1998 but the establishment private-public sector partnerships is being challenged due to the 1997 financial crisis. The TE states the extent to which expected project activities were completed, [p. 14-16, TE] as well as completed outputs per demonstration project [p. 17-18, TE].

Progress along each of the Immediate Objectives defined in the PD is detailed further below:

***Immediate Objective 1.*** *To strengthen the regional capability to manage marine pollution through demonstration of integrated coastal zone management and pollution risk management.* ***(Moderately Satisfactory)***

(a) Demonstration Site 1 - Xiamen, China. According to the TE, three out of four activities have been completed. Monitoring and assessment is not yet finished but it is due in January 1999. The TE mentions that activities like the establishment of a planning and coordination mechanism and the institutionalization of a planning and coordination office are also expected to be finished by January 1999. Thus, suggesting that this last activity has advanced but its amount of completion is unknown [p. 17, TE].

***(b)*** Demonstration Site 2 – Batangas Bay, Philippines. This demonstration comprises four activities. PG-ENRO has been established and should begin to implement the monitoring program through using outputs already attained such as the Environmental Management Atlas of Batangas Region, the new control "laboratory" and the trained local people. As per the TE, participation of community organizations had not yet happened [p. 17, TE].

***(c)*** Demonstration Site 3 – Malacca Straits. This demonstration comprises six activities. Outputs in the form of CDs and reports are expected to be completed before December 1998. Some of them consist on economic valuation of resources, cost-benefit analysis of marine pollution management intervention, environmental atlas and strategies for marine pollution management [p. 17, TE]. (The TE considers that the date of accomplishment for this tier is reasonable given the amount of coordination required.)

***Immediate Objective 2.*** *Develop a regional marine pollution monitoring and information management network* ***(Moderately Satisfactory)***

Marine Pollution Monitoring and Information Management. The TE mentions that monitoring of marine pollution and information management are to be carried out locally and regionally. Locally, monitoring teams should be trained and awareness on monitoring for management marine pollution should be carried out. Regionally, there should be a regional marine pollution information exchange, networking and intercalibration of methods [p. 17, TE]. The TE states that pollution monitoring was operational and used for making management decisions in the project's demonstration sites. In addition, "The database development and intercalibration activities both nationally and regionally have made important progress in improving the quantity and partly the quality of the available data. However, more effort is required to produce cost-effective high quality data sets focused on specific management goals" [p.5, TE]. There is progress on regional pollution monitoring, "but regional sharing of data is still somewhat problematic for some participating countries" [p.5, TE]. The TE does not provide details for these claims.

***Immediate Objective 3.*** *To strengthen the regional capability to implement international conventions relating to the protection of the marine environment.* ***(Satisfactory)***

International Conventions. This section focuses on creating guidelines for a model coastal policy and a model national coastal management act, while facilitating national legislation for implementation of international conventions, and training personnel to implement legislation. The TE states that "several countries have now ratified an increasing number of conventions based on the guidance of the programme…In addition, the programme has played an important role in assisting legal staff in the participating countries in the process of national legislation review including preparation of national guidelines on model legislation" [p. 5, TE]. Marine pollution related International Conventions in the East Asian Seas have been ratified by 64 countries in 1997, which is almost double the number of ratifications in 1994 [p. 23, TE].

***Immediate Objective 4.*** *To develop and initiate a menu of sustainable financing mechanisms for the successful completion of the long-term activities beyond the life of the program.* ***(Moderately Satisfactory)***

Sustainable Financing. Some of the activities here include mobilizing in-country and external financial resources for marine pollution management. This has been done through establishing partnerships with between the private and public sector. The TE reports problems related to the financial crisis and hopes that, in spite of this, institutions will still grand support. These activities are expected to be completed by the end of 1998 [p. 18, TE].

| 4.3 **Efficiency** | Rating: **Satisfactory** |
|---|---|

The TE does not give a rating for the program's effectiveness. This TER rates its efficiency as *Satisfactory* based on the fact that many activities are still ongoing and are expected to be finished four months after the submission of the Terminal Evaluation. (The completion of most activities are expected by the end of December 1998.) However, an extension was requested during the Technical Session of the Fourth Program Steering Committee[1] (PSC) Meeting in December of 1997. The purpose was to enable the conduct of an international conference, to be able to complete technical reports and to disseminate the results from the program [p. 10, TE]. The original deadline was January 1999 and a six-month extension was granted (June 30, 1999). Activities specified to be completed in 1998 seem to be on schedule [p. 6, TE]. The financial delivery also has been disbursed timely as total financial delivery as of June, 1998 was 80% [p. 6, TE]. The TE considers that the date of accomplishment of the demonstration sites is reasonable given the amount of coordination required [p. 17, TE]. Xiamen and Batangas sites have taken advantage of local human resources and the participation of stakeholders has contributed in improving the cost-effectiveness of the program (expenses have been reduced by minimizing the hiring of consultants) [p. 19, TE]. According to the TE, the program has been effective in using financial resources by keeping staffing lean, constituting 20.5% of the budget while 79.5% is attributed to operations. The program has also worked in leveraging financial resources from other in-country and external contributors for specific projects and activities [p. 22, TE]. Moreover, perhaps as a result of keeping costs low, the TE observed that "almost all of the project staff were overloaded and overworked" [p. 34, TE].

| 4.4 **Sustainability** | Rating: **Moderately Unlikely** |
|---|---|

The TE does not provide a rating for sustainability of project outcomes. This TER assesses a rating of *Unlikely*. The TE identifies threats to sustainability in the dimensions of financial resources, sociopolitical sustainability and institutional framework and governance, but no evidence is provided on environmental sustainability. Principle risks to sustainability include the Asian financial crisis, uncertainty over future financial revenues, and uncertainty over future political support.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following four dimensions:

- **Financial Resources. (Moderately Unlikely)** TE states that financial sustainability could be feasible given that public-private sector partnerships can help in garnishing revenues for marine pollution control and management [p. 26, TE]. However, given the financial crisis this is most likely not to happen because businesses are likely to be more concerned with weathering the financial crisis than in allocating funds to supplementary projects. TE states that the financial support for continuing activities at the Batangas site is uncertain. Support from the local government in the future will probably not be enough, as per the TE [p. 4, TE]. In addition, as the monitoring program has not yet been implemented here, additional funds are likely to be required. For the Malacca demonstration project, sustainability is more likely given that investment opportunities are being identified as well as public-private sector partnerships and local government economic instruments [p. 21, TE].

[1] The PSC was composed of participating country representatives, the UNDP and the IMO.

- **Sociopolitical sustainability. (Likely)** The TE states that long-term sustainability should be possible in the future given that the Xiamen and Batangas project demonstration sites received a strong political support by the local government leaders, which should ensure their long-term sustainability [p. 4, TE]. Political support for Malacca Straits is not mentioned. Several collaborative relationships that have been set should help in the sociopolitical sustainability. Some of these relationships are with: the Coastal Management Center (CMC), WAST on integrated waste management program in Batangas, World Conservation Monitoring Centers (WCMC) on Malacca Straits database, International Petroleum Industry Conservation Association (IPIECA) on linkage with oil industry and preparation of a document on impacts of oil on fisheries, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) on sustainable financing, Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) and the Philippine Business for the Environment (PBE) on issues such as waste exchange programs [p. 31, TE].
- **Institutional framework and governance. (Moderately Likely)** Institutional sustainability is likely given that there have been more than 30 ratifications of Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) and Memoranda of Agreements (MoAs) to "implement specific projects or activities with short duration" (their specific topics are not defined) [p. 34, TE]. As a follow-on phase to MoA, creating the proposed Regional Mechanism would make governments commit to implement provisions in the international conventions ratified by them [p. 33, TE]. Marine pollution related International Conventions in the East Asian Seas have been ratified by 64 countries in 1997, which is almost double the number of ratifications in 1994 [p. 23, TE]. Other mechanisms that could support institutional sustainability are the establishment of the marine management and coordination office at Xiamen and Batangas as well as the linkages with educational institutions [p. 26, TE]. However, the ongoing financial crisis may divert attention to this environmental program towards other more immediate institutional priorities.
- **Environmental sustainability. (Unable to Assess)** In Batangas, Philippines, the private sector in has made great efforts in developing promising "modular initiatives" for treatment of some of its waste. A public-private partnership is present in Xiamen, China where waste treatment programs have been established [p. 6, TE]. However, environmental risks are not identified in the TE.

# 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?

Co-financing seems to have played a crucial role in the achievement of GEF objectives. A final budget breakdown with the amount of GEF funds and co-financing funds is not provided. However, this TER was able to establish the budget breakdown throughout the PMIS system and the PDF document. Co-financing was important for has been important to achieve the project outcomes as it has represented nearly 30% of the total funds. However, the TE does not mention whether they changed.

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?

Yes, the program had a six-month extension. It was scheduled to finish at the end of December, 1998 and then its deadline was extended to June 30, 1999, whose request was made during the Technical Session of the Fourth Program Steering Committee[2] (PSC) Meeting in December of 1997. Extending the deadline allowed the project to: conduct of an international conference, conclude technical reports and disseminate the results from the program [p. 10, TE]. No information about the effect of delays on project sustainability is given.

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:

Country ownership positively affected the conduction of the projects in the demonstration sites of Xiamen and Batangas. No information on the quality of country ownership is given for the demonstration of the Malacca Straits. In Xiamen, an interagency management committee to coordinate marine uses has been set up. The municipal government formed its marine management and coordination office as the operational arm of interagency committee [p. 23, TE]. In Batangas, an Integrated Coastal Management Council composed by representatives of national government agencies, coastal municipalities, industries and NGOs was created to coordinate and provide guidance on coastal development policies and for implementing the strategic environmental plan. The Provincial Government Environment and Natural Resource Office (PG ENRO) functions as the secretariat and operating arm of the council [p. 23, TE]. As for the Malacca Straits, three governments were involved and were seen as the direct beneficiaries. These were Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia. According to the TE, the three countries have cooperate in producing environmental information system for the Malacca Straits involving 33 scientific staff in three universities belonging to the littoral states [p. 32, TE]. However, the amount and quality of cooperation by these three countries is not documented.

## 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 TE does not give a rating to this section. This TER rated M&E design as *moderately satisfactory*. Some of its strengths are the establishment of indicators and targets per immediate objective, and desired output. The M&E design is well organized, as every immediate objective contains activities, subactivities

[2] The PSC was composed of participating country representatives, the UNDP and the IMO.

as well as success criteria. The design provides a time table for the expected rate of completion (in months) for reviews, reports and evaluation, although it does not contain their specific date for attainment. Another strength is offering a table with budgetary allocations per objective, as well as for monitoring and evaluation [see p. 45, Annex IX: Work Plan and Output Budget, TE]. Using the GEF SMART acronym (*specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely*) as a guide for best practices, the indicators (or success criteria) in the TE's odd pages were *specific* and *achievable* but not always *specific, realistic* or *timely*. For example, Output 1.13 states that oil pollution preparedness and strategies for the Malacca Straits will be formulated. This output is missing specific indicators and does not specify how "effective" preparedness would be met.

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

The TE also does not give a rating to this section. This TER rated M&E implementation as *unable to assess* given that very little information on tracking the project's progress was provided. First, the project offered monitoring training. The TE mentions that training workshops and intercalibration exercises have been used to improve pollution monitoring quality, such as the 2nd Technical Workshop of the Regional Network for Marine Pollution [p. 5, 15, TE]. Workshops / conferences on marine pollution monitoring were provided to participants from Cambodia, China, South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, North Korea, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam [p. 25, TE]. Second, as part of the monitoring a Mid-Term Review took place but no PIRs were found in the PMIS system. No further information on the amount of participants at monitoring trainings was provided by the TE.

## 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: **Unable to Assess** |
|---|---|

The TE does not rate the Quality of Project Implementation. The TER rates this section as *unable to assess* because the TE does not provide enough evidence on project implementation quality and has no information about UNDP's participation (the project implementer). Some of the lines with basic information that the TE provides are the following. It considers that the time for project implementation was reasonable given the amount of coordination required, considering the participation of different countries [p. 17, TE], making outcome attainment efficient. For the TE, the program was efficiently

implemented, had clear successes [p. 19, TE] and had built a strong foundation for the activities in the follow-on Phase based on the "working model, strategies, approaches, methodologies and lessons learned" [p. 34, TE]. However, no information about project supervision was provided.

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

The TE does not rate the Quality of Project Execution. The TER rates this section as *satisfactory* because most of the outcomes appear to have been managed efficiently given that the program required coordinating numerous stakeholders at different sites. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) was the project's executing agency. At IMO, the Program Development Management Office (PMDO) was created in order to coordinate the program's activities. Accordingly, the PMDO has managed a large amount of projects, whose work is regarded as efficient and is attributed to the project leadership. The TE states that one of the key successes of the PMDO has been its operational flexibility responding to situational changes [p. 22, TE]. In addition to the IMO, the local governments of Xiamen, China and Batangas, Philippines are considered to have provided considerable support through taking ownership over project activities [p. 4, TE].

## 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.

As per the TE, the data that the evaluation collected shows that efforts in pollution control have been effective [p. 20, TE], but quantitative or qualitative evidence is not provided nor its amount of impact.

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.

Although no specific socioeconomic changes are reported, the TE states that there exists potential for socioeconomic impact. This could be through the manual of economic instruments that is being developed by governments in the demonstration sites and along with marine pollution programs, which could help increase the economic incentives for sustainability [p. 32, TE].

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 capacities of local implementers were enhanced, making long-term change feasible. Capacity building activities in the form of internships, technical training, in-service training, staff exchanges and study tours were provided to national professionals who were involved in the implementation of over 90% of project activities. As a potential for replicability outside the region, training to participants outside the region was also offered through the support of donor agencies form Sweden and Canada. The TE states that a total of 1,000 participants were trained, assisted to workshops and conferences [p. 24-25, TE].

b) Governance

As a structure of control and management of water pollution, the establishment of the ICM (demonstration sites) approach at Xiamen and Batanga will contribute in making long-lasting changes in the regional system of environmental governance. The program has provided legal assistance to local country staff in the process of national legislation review, such as in preparing national guidelines on model legislation [p. 6, TE]. Progress has been made in the ratification of International Conventions on marine pollution in the East Asian Seas region given that they have increased to 64 ratifications in 1997. This has almost doubled the number in 1995 and is a result of awareness raising through workshops, a database set up, the organization of a regional legal network of practitioners and the development of technical capabilities to implement the conventions [p. 23, TE]. These ratifications will help to ensure that governments, in the future, continue making efforts in working towards implementing systems for pollution control.

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 addressed in the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The integrated management structures in the demonstration sites or ICM concept is already being replicated in China at Hainan, Guangdong and Guanxi. The TE states that it will soon be replicated in the Philippines at Masinloc Bay, Luxon; Ormoc Bay, Visayas; and Macajalar Bay, Mindanao [p. 4, TE]. One possible mechanism for replication is the model legislation "Framework for national legislation for marine pollution," which is a useful for countries that desire to improve their legislative environmental management framework [p. 27-28, TE]. Potential for replication is also possible through having published ICM practices in 10 different languages. The TE recognizes that since each demonstration site has particular socio-economic, political, cultural and language aspects, there exists the need for future testing the ICM models beyond the region to provide adequate coverage [p. 34, TE].

# 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.

No lessons learned were provided by the TE.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides recommendations for targeted groups as it follows [p. 6-8, TE]:

***(a) To the participating governments***

We recommend that the participating countries adopt ICM approaches for marine pollution prevention and management and replicate the working models by establishing national and parallel sites and take advantage of the legal network and technical expertise in the project for ratification and implementation

of the marine-related international conventions. In addition, countries should actively participate in the activities of the regional networks developed or being developed by the project, especially the regional network on environmental monitoring and its related database development.

***(b) To GEF and UNDP***

There is a clear need for the development of adequate national and regional capability for effective management of the coastal areas. We agree that this capability needs to build on the existing governmental and non-governmental organizations but in a new mode of intersectoral partnerships. This is the ICM approach, the foundation for which has been effectively laid by the present project.

GEF and UNDP are urged to approve and to provide financial support for the implementation of the follow on project "Building Partnerships for Environmental Protection and Management of the East Asian Seas" which has already been endorsed by the participating nations of the region.

***(c) To IMO***

(…) We recommend that the executing agency allow more operational flexibility to the PDMO especially in terms of increasing the maximal limits for contracts, subcontracts, other service contracts and purchase orders. In addition, we recommend that IMO provide timely administrative support to ensure smooth operation of the programme until its completion in June, 1999. Finally we suggest that IMO review the present personnel compensation scheme for both international and local hired staff to determine whether a competitive package is being offered to meet the needs of all staff.

*(d) To Host Government/Institution*

(…) In meetings with the Secretary of Department of Environment and Natural Resources, full support was promised for a follow on program. We recommend that the host government/institution confirm in writing its intention to continue this support at an expanded level in the follow on project. We note the planned three-fold expansion of project activities, staff and budget of the follow on project.

***(e) To PDMO***

(…) We wish to highlight:

1. The need to put in place a continued support program for demonstration sites moving from support to national operation. This support should include continued capacity building as well as access to back-up technical support such as conference/workshop attendance, consultant guidance, publications, etc;
2. As the programme moves from a focus on marine pollution to a wider series of critical issues impacting on coastal and marine development, a more broadly based approach will be needed and planning for this should start soon. This shift should include the development of a comprehensive staffing plan with emphasis on hiring certain staff with backgrounds in the social sciences;
3. We recommend a detailed review of the impacts (and problems) of the capacity building support (that has been provided), subject to the availability of funding. Suggested components could include tracer studies, trainee-trainor and awareness building components.

## 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 project contains a very good assessment of project outcomes but lacks a deeper analysis of the program's impacts.* | **S** |
| **To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?** | *The report is consistent overall. Most of the assessment is based on evidence, through a breakdown of objectives. It is mostly complete and convincing. No ratings were provided.* | **MS** |
| **To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?** | *The TE adequately reports the program's sustainability in most of the required tiers, except in regards to environmental sustainability.* | **S** |
| **To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?** | *The TE does not identify lessons learned.* | **U** |
| **Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?** | *The report does include actual project costs per activity but does not provide figures for the actual co-financing.* | **MS** |
| **Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:** | *The TE did not indicate whether monitoring systems were set up that allowed the tracking of project outcomes. No PIRs were found at the PMIS system but a Mid-Term Review and a TE were conducted.* | **U** |
| **Overall TE Rating** | | **MS** |

**Overall TE rating: (0.3*(5+4)) + (0.1 * (5+2+4+2)) = 2.7 + 1.3 = 4.0 = MS**

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

*TE, PD, Mid-Term Evaluation and PDF A were used for the production of this TER.*