

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		403	
GEF Agency project ID		635 - RAS/91/G31	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Program (SPBCP)	
Country/Countries		Regional: Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Samoa	
Region		ASIA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP2 Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater ecosystems (including wetlands)	
Executing agencies involved		South Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 1991 (date of approval by agency: April 1993)	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 1993	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 1996	
Actual date of project completion		December 2001	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		6.4	6.3
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.15	0.15
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	3.6	3.8
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	0.55	0.55
Total GEF funding		6.4	6.3
Total Co-financing		4.3	4.5
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		10.7 (N.B, numbers vary across documents)	10.8 (N.B., numbers vary across documents)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date			
TE submission date		June 2002	
Author of TE		Graham Baines (et al)	
TER completion date		September 2014	
TER prepared by		Daniel Nogueira-Budny	
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	S	N/R	N/R	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	MS	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the project's Global Environmental Objective (GEO) is to develop strategies for the conservation of biodiversity that incorporate sustainable use of biological resources by the people of the South Pacific. The limited land and coastal marine areas of Pacific Island countries are under pressure from growing populations with rising material expectations. Furthermore, the limited renewable natural resource base, which is already under pressure, is sensitive to ecological disturbance and easily degraded. Given the reliance on locals of biological resources, coupled with the fact that most of this land is held in customary ownership by indigenous peoples, there is the need to establish and manage a series of conservation area projects, not nature reserves, in the area (PD, pp 2-3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective (DO) is to facilitate the identification, establishment, and initial management of a series of in-country conservation area projects. According to the PD, the project has five immediate objectives:

1. To facilitate establishment and initial management, by local communities, NGO's and government agencies, of a series of Conservation Areas (CAs) that demonstrate protection of biodiversity, ecologically sustainable use of natural resource, and community economic development
2. To protect terrestrial and marine species that are threatened or endangered in the Pacific region
3. To identify new areas that are important for the conservation of biological diversity, and are potential CAs in the participating countries
4. To improve awareness in Pacific Island countries of the importance and means of conserving biological diversity
5. To improve capacities of and cooperation in the conservation of the biological diversity of the Pacific Islands

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

There were **no** changes in the GEO or DO during implementation. Major budgetary revisions were made to accompany the project extensions in 1996 and 998; however, the PD itself was never revised.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project was relevant both to GEF and National priorities of the various countries involved at time of approval. Consistent with OP2 – the conservation of biodiversity in coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems (including wetlands), the project aims to establish and manage a number of CA projects. In terms of National priorities, the people of the South Pacific rely heavily on natural resources for subsistence and their social and cultural well-being. The project thus seeks to improve prosperity and quality of life derived from sustainable development activities in and around the islands’ coastal areas, where the vast majority of residents live. In terms of GEF priorities, the tropical insular South Pacific region has particularly high species diversity and endemism: the Pacific Islands may contain the world’s highest proportion of endemic species per unit of land area or per human inhabitant. Furthermore, the biological diversity of islands is among the most critically threatened in the world and Oceania has more threated species (110) than any other. Furthermore, there are also a relatively large number of endangered (and extinct) species in a region where scientific and financial resources are very limited to begin with, making the South Pacific a high priority for biodiversity conservation (PD, pp 3-4).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	--

The project did not adequately achieve its objectives, earning it an effectiveness rating of moderately unsatisfactory. TE’s breakdown of the achievement of project’s immediate objectives as lackluster (cf. pp 66-72): many of the five objectives’ activities were accomplished, but not in an adequate manner. In the TE’s words, “The SPBCP was unsuccessful in its main goal of devising and proving ways of supporting local community efforts to conserve biodiversity in the social and economic circumstances of Pacific Island countries. The fundamental problem lay in the difficulty that Program management had in

interpreting the concept outlined in the Project Document, and in its failure to cultivate ownership of the conservation initiative at national and local community levels. These difficulties were exacerbated by an inflexible approach to project delivery and a failure to innovate, adapt ideas, collaborate, experiment, and evaluate over the course of the Program” (p 43). The project did not achieve its objectives in large part due to fundamental flaws in design and implementation (TE, p 1); furthermore, the multi-level financial and administrative reporting system used for project management was a major hindrance to effective action, particularly at the community level (cf. p 2). By the end of the problem, only five of 14 CAs were said to have ensured that the area’s targeted biodiversity values were well protected and under effective management (pp 29-30).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------	-------------------------------

The project’s efficiency was rated unsatisfactory for a number of factors, including, but not limited to, design failures, poor management skills, and bureaucratic hurdles. In short, “a large amount of unnecessary expense was required to keep the project going” (TE, p 2). In terms of project design, the regional approach led to much inefficiency, given the vast distances involved in travel between island countries. The project was faulted for SPREP’s failure to delegate responsibility for expenditure, the limited capacity for project management in-country, the absence of a participatory management planning process, the spread of CA projects over a large number of countries, the clumsy financial management system, and heavy expenditure on centralized management (cf. TE, p 15). Furthermore, there was no accounting for the SPREP’s USD 546,000 input in staff time and office costs, nor for the USD 150,000 estimated for in-kind country contributions (TE, p 16). Another issue was that bureaucratic hurdles led to extreme inefficiencies and much money lost: “the result of the plethora of reporting and budgeting requirements was that a large amount of unnecessary expense in money and time was required to keep the project going. There was a constant tension between the “Secretariat” and CA Projects over lack of suitable reports and cash flow problems...the basic problem was a dysfunctional system” (TE, p 17). An example of the project’s cost inefficiency can be seen in administration costs. Initially, 30 percent of budget was to be spent on project administration (and some technical support). This number then rose to 40 percent (in part, due to project delays and extensions), necessitating a reduction of 20 percent in overall CA Project expenditure. By the end of the project, over 52 percent of the budget was spent on personnel, mission costs, official travel, and consultancies (cf. TE, pp 17-18).

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

- a) *Environmental sustainability (U/A)* – TE provides insufficient information to provide a rating on environmental risks to sustainability.

- b) *Financial sustainability (MU)* – Project’s financial sustainability was rated as moderately unlikely. None of the 17 CA Projects can be considered self-sustaining and exit strategies were not considered until very late. The so-called “Transition Strategies” for CAs seemed more like “‘wish lists’, with the wish for more funding as the first item. They were not based on real issues of sustainability” (TE, p 47). “After ten years no CA Project met the Program’s own transition strategy test for sustainability” (TE, p 16). The project depended overwhelmingly on donor support for its operations, creating the very real risk that SPREP “will not have the finances to support the conservation area activities beyond the five-year life of the SPBCP, even though it is intended that the conservation area projects will not depend on overseas support after the initial establishment period” (PD, p 38).
- c) *Institutional sustainability (MU)* – Project’s institutional sustainability was likewise rated as moderately unlikely. Conservation Area Coordinating Committees (CACCs) were supposed the stakeholder-based management authority for each local conservation project. CACCs were then supposed to employ a Conservation Area Support Officer (CASO); however, none of the CACCs was constituted and resourced sufficiently to assume the role envisaged, leaving it to CASOs to become the linchpins of the project. CASOs generally did a great job; however, TE points out that the problem was that, in CASOs’ shadows, “neither CACCs nor other local management roles could develop. Accordingly, as the SPBCP came to a close and CASOs began to search for other employment the sustainability of all CA Projects was compromised” (p 14).
- d) *Socio-Political sustainability (U/A)* – TE provides insufficient information to provide a rating on socio-political risks to sustainability, particularly given the large number of CA Projects in different countries that compose this project.

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, particularly from the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) was considered crucial to the achievement of GEF objectives, to the extent that they were achieved. Discrepancies between financing and co-financing in the PD vs. TE seems to be the result of confusion, not the result of any change in support.

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?

Designed for five years, the project was extended twice, first for two more years and then for three more. The twice-changing timeframe did have long term consequences, as it created two separate periods of uncertainty followed by a changed planning horizon, according to the TE. The delay affected the project’s outcome, as the two extensions came without additional funds for administration, causing its proportion to increase from 30 to 52 percent of the budget (TE, p 2). TE does not explain direct

reasons for need for extensions, apart from the fact that most activities were delayed. Indeed, delays seemed to afflict the project at every stage of development. The initiation of CA Projects was predicated by the development of a comprehensive Project Preparation Document (PPD), which were, on average, 92 pages in length and highly technical. Furthermore, it was not until nearly halfway through the (extended) project that most were even produced and approved (TE, p 23).

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:

Individual country ownership of a project comprising 14 individual countries and territories is difficult to assess and TE does not attempt to do so. However, project does build off of regional strategy of enhanced cooperation for the sake of biodiversity conservation. Indeed, the project’s executing agency, the SPREP, was created in 1982 by South Pacific Island states, in part, to provide the framework for an environmentally sound management plan for the region. That being said, TE notes that some governments were ambivalent about continuing support for CA projects, given their own weak state capacity and given other, seemingly more pressing concerns (p 15).

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 design of the project’s monitoring and evaluation system was rated moderately satisfactory as PD included output targets, but no timeframe to ensure that activities are proceeding as scheduled; a requirement for various progress reports (see below) was also set forth. PD provided detailed list of expected outcomes (pp 15-16), as well as a run-down of objectives alongside their expected outputs (pp 28-34). While precise indicators would have been preferred, outputs were deemed appropriate to be used in ensuring that project was on goal to achieve its objectives. PD also called for a multipartite review (MPR) from the UNDP, SPREP, and participating member countries that would provide direction for the implementation of the project. Prior to the annual MPR meetings, the project manager is expected to prepare and submit a Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER). Additionally, an independent external review, arranged by the UNDP and in consultation with the SPREP, was called for approximately halfway through the project’s scheduled lifetime. Also, a terminal project report was to be prepared for consideration at the terminal review, which was to be held during the project’s final

year. Finally, also set forth in the PD was a Technical and Management Advisory Group (TMAG), which was to meet on an ad hoc basis to review the project’s progress and work plans, as well as to advise the project manager, SPREP, and UNDP on conservation area projects; related research; and the technical, administrative, and management aspects of SPBCP. The TMAG was to be the principal party responsible for engaging in the monitoring and evaluation of the conservation area projects under implementation.

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

The implementation of the project’s monitoring and evaluation system was rated moderately unsatisfactory due to inappropriately designed indicators, delays in implementation, and failure to translate recommendations into action. A moderately robust monitoring and evaluating system was produced after the project began. However, while its technical content was of high quality, its indicators, as well as the manner in which information was proposed to be captured and interpreted, was deemed by the TE as inappropriate for the project, given its inaccessibility to community members and groups: “indicators...have not contributed to the overall project. It is doubtful if there was any benefit for the CA Projects in which monitoring was initiated” (p 35). Additionally, the need for monitoring came too late in the project life, such that the findings were unable to be put to good use. Furthermore, the body set up to engage in monitoring and evaluation were given poor marks by the TE: the TMAG was ineffective. Even though it did notice, and express concern about, a significant drift from the approach espoused in the PD, TMAG made little effort to make the matter known or force action on the topic. Members of the TMAG saw their role as “merely advisory”, preferring a more hands-off role and thus limiting the effectiveness of their evaluations and recommendations (cf. p 11). Finally, TE did rate the mid-term evaluation (MTE), which took place in 1996, more highly. However, it noted that the MTE did not effect much change since the actors involved took an “overly defensive” stance to the worthwhile changes it proposed; in this way, the project lost an opportunity to make a number of decisive changes that would help get the project back on track (p 12).

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 quality of project design, as well as quality of supervision and assistance provided by UNDP, was moderately unsatisfactory. The project failed to assess adequately the difficulties inherent in a regional project with CAs spread out among islands very far apart from one another. Furthermore, the form of and need for Project Preparation Documents (PPDs), basically project designs and management plans for the CA Projects, were not adequately thought through. The PPDs ended up being very counter-productive: “the PPD requirement set up one of the most formidable barriers to project success, consuming considerable time and money in the process” (TE, p 24). They were so detailed and technical, that outside consultants were needed to create them (it was initially expected that CACCs would design them). This undermined the intended plan of having community-based initiatives; indeed, none of the PPDs were translated into a local language. In terms of management, there is no mention in the TE that the UNDP stepped up to offer assistance or supervision to help address the SPREP’s poor management skills, which ended up negatively affecting the project’s ability to achieve its objectives. The organization of project management, oversight, and delivery – from the UNDP down to lead agencies and all the project-specific bodies – was “cumbersome and confused” (TE, p 44).

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

The quality of project execution was deemed moderately unsatisfactory, as there is no evidence that the SPREP was effective in performing its roles and responsibilities. According to the TE, at the SPREP (much like all other other agencies involved), “Project roles and responsibilities were unclear or undeveloped, decision-making and directions were imprecise, reporting requirements (or interpretations of them) were excessive and inefficiently structured, and there was a constant pre-occupation with delivering to a tight timetable” (TE, p 44). SPREP had a limited core capacity and its staff was regularly diverted into other duties. It made little use of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as partners and the manner in which it design the project’s work plans apparently “stifled forward thinking” (TE, p 44).

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 the conservation of biodiversity is a long-range objective, project was not designed to create immediate environmental changes. However, some modest examples of environmental threat reductions were mentioned in the TE. For instance, at Koroyanitu's CA, uncontrolled burning of grassland was reduced, leading to the regrowth of native scrubs and forest, the prevention of damage to planted pine forests, the appearance of more wild yams, and the improvement of soil organic matter (TE, p 31). Additionally, in the Pohnpei Watershed CA, a "grow low" campaign resulted in cropping being transferred from high forest areas to lowland slopes so as to avoid upland forest destruction.

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.

Certain CAs established Income-Generating Activities (IGAs), largely in the form of eco-tourism measures; however, the continued viability of many of these activities has been called into question. In general, however, TE does not provide sufficient information to gauge extent of socio-economic change. One modest socioeconomic change was recorded for Uafato, however. There, the penning of domestic pigs has reduced human health hazards, minimized food garden disturbance, and allowed for the regeneration of trees used for carving and Pandanus used for mat weaving.

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 - An SPBCP Ecotourism Manual and resource Kit was produced at the conclusion of the project. Containing short cases studies from CA projects, this resource should help future eco-tourism ventures in the region (TE, p 28). Community organizing was strengthened where CACCs operated; local NGOs learned how to deal with conflict management.

b) Governance – No governance-related changes were mentioned in TE.

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.

TE does not mention any unintended impacts resulting from project.

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

TE does not mention any instances in which project-related initiatives have been mainstreamed.

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.

1. The protection of ecosystems and of their native species in the Pacific islands region can be achieved only through an "applied" approach that addresses natural resource management in its widest sense and that adequately encompasses the social basis for resource management
2. The need for proven approaches to community based biodiversity conservation (meaning use and protection of biological resources and of associated biodiversity) remains, and has become more pressing as Pacific Islander populations have grown and their natural resources have degraded
3. It is vitally important to define what "community" is in any given context. It is not likely to be a simple, homogeneous or harmonious unit, and a "lineage community" may be the unit of resource management rather than the "village community" commonly assumed to be so
4. Project designs for biodiversity conservation at a community level must adequately address community approaches and participation, prescribe realistic social parameters for activities, and provide for some project personnel to have expertise in these areas; without this emphasis too much is left to "interpretation" and there is a high risk of failure
5. It is difficult to redress the imbalance in "power" between governments, development assistance agencies and NGOs providing support for community based conservation, and the communities themselves; greater attention is needed in project design and execution to effective transfer of some of that "power", through more meaningful participation, capacity building and management responsibility – and over a lengthy period, not in a final flurry of "hand-over"
6. External support should be through a framework approach that provides for the community to design its own project, and in the context that it views as important; Pacific Islander communities do not see a biodiversity context in itself as sufficiently important to engage and sustain their interest
7. A comprehensive analysis of a community's social structure and decision making procedures and the relationship of these to other levels of administration (village, local government, national

government) should be an essential pre-requisite to finalization of a community level project design

8. An appreciation of the importance of biodiversity and of its management requirements cannot be achieved by simplistic biodiversity-focused "awareness raising"; education on these matters must be placed in a "livelihoods" context and, to be truly effective, must be undertaken as a partnership, with outsider experts exchanging knowledge with insider experts
9. Community based conservation initiatives, even where firmly based on recognized customary tenure, cannot be sustained in the absence of supporting national policy and legislation; projects should make provision for support activities for policy and legislation development where needed, and should also provide for support for communities to engage in the process of gaining legal sanction for their biodiversity management initiatives
10. "Conservation and development" projects at a small community scale cannot be successfully implemented across several levels of government; regional or sub-regional projects need to be split into a series of devolved projects
11. A preparatory phase, as provided for in the SPBCP Project Document, was good practice, but to make use of this opportunity to fine-tune the approach and the project design the project management needed much more specific guidance
12. Training needs assessment is an essential precursor to the identification of training needs, and the nature of the training need must determine the context in which it is provided; on-site training, supported by long-term mentoring is more effective than the regionally aggregated classroom mode of training adopted for some SPBCP training
13. It is critical, at the outset, to establish a system for collecting, recording, analyzing, storing, and sharing information acquired
14. Collaboration between organizations with shared interests and experience in biodiversity use and protection is essential – to bring the best knowledge to bear on community support interventions, and so that Pacific Islanders can get the best results from the institutions set up to serve their needs

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. The inventory and archiving of SPBCP documentation held by the "Secretariat", and other relevant materials, such as photographs and video material, should be completed and handed over to SPREP for storage in a form that can be easily accessed in the future
2. SPBCP Program Manager should ask each CA Project Lead Agency to inventory and archive all SPBCP-CA Project information they hold, in a way that safeguards and makes records accessible for the future
3. UNDP and SPREP should apply the lessons emerging from the Terminal Evaluation of SPBCP to the emerging SPREP-executed International Waters Program

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?	TE contains a basic assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project. Straightforward analysis on the extent to which project achieved the objectives it set out to achieve comes only at the end of the report.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE is internally consistent and often substantiates claims with anecdotal evidence. As noted above, however, objective, straightforward ratings are far and few between.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE very perfunctorily assesses project sustainability and project exit strategy.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are both supported by evidence and comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Report includes actual project costs and actual co-financing used	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE adequately evaluates the project's M&E systems.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating: $0.3 * (4+5) + 0.1 * (3+5+5+4) = 4.4$

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