

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4180	
GEF Agency project ID		4370	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management	
Country/Countries		Suriname	
Region		Latin America	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-1 / SP-1, SP-2	
Executing agencies involved		Nature Conservation Division of Suriname / Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management.	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 28, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		August 2014	
Actual date of project completion		June 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.034444	0.034444
	Co-financing	0.049	0.049
GEF Project Grant		0.965556	0.965556
Co-financing	IA own	0.1	0.136933
	Government	0.45	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	0.75	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	0.305045	NA
Total GEF funding		1	1
Total Co-financing		1.654045	0.185933
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.654045	1.185933
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 18, 2015	
Author of TE		Maria Onestini	
TER completion date		January 24, 2017	
TER prepared by		Mathias Einberger	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's goal is "to safeguard Suriname's globally significant coastal biodiversity." (TE p.12) Suriname's coastal zone is regionally unique, globally significant and important to international biodiversity conservation. The coastal system, with its intact mosaic of wetlands, mangrove forests, and mudflats, is a globally critical refuge for millions of migratory bird species that visit Suriname each year. Mangroves are one of the world's most endangered habitats and can be critical in climate change mitigation and adaptation. One hectare of mangroves can sequester up to 1.5 metric tons of carbon per year, while disturbed mangroves and coastal wetlands release high levels of stored carbon into the atmosphere. (Request for CEO endorsement p. 6, TE p.5)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's objective was to promote the conservation of biodiversity through improved management of protected areas along the western coast of Suriname, through two project components of 1) improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the management of coastal protected areas and 2) increasing and diversifying coastal protected area funding. (Request for CEO endorsement p. 1)

Suriname's mangrove forests, which cover 250,000 ha of the coast, help to maintain productive fish populations that are vitally important to a range of wildlife species. These also serve as subsistence and commerce for local communities, with as much as 85% of the country's population living along the coast. At the same time, Suriname's economy is highly dependent on the exploitation of natural resources, with oil production along the coast being the main driver of economic growth. The three "protected areas" along the country's western coast covered by the project are therefore actually designated as Multiple Use Management Areas (MUMAs), intended to both conserve biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services as the basis for sustainable livelihoods. (Request for CEO endorsement pp. 6-7, TE pp. 17-18)

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

The TE notes that there were no changes to either the project design or the project outputs throughout implementation. (TE p. 30)

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates the project as Relevant. The TER follows this assessment and rates the project's relevance as Satisfactory.

The TE notes that the project's scope was consistent with the GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1 of "catalyzing sustainability of protected area (PA) systems", especially Strategic Programs 1 and 2: the "sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level" and "Increasing representation of effectively managed marine PA areas in PA systems", at the time of its approval. (TE p. 38)

In terms of national priorities, the project is in line with Suriname's constitution, which asserts "the protection of nature and the maintenance of ecological balance." (TE p. 37) The country has further ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1996, developed a national Biodiversity Strategy in 2006, and was finalizing its National Biodiversity Action Plan when the project was approved. (Request for CEO endorsement p. 21)

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

The TE discusses effectiveness and efficiency of the project in one combined section and rates each as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

According to the TE, key stakeholders of the project acknowledged a design failure in the project – a substantial number of its outputs and products were too broad or too theoretical to result in adequate uptake of activities on the ground. (TE p. 25)

The project document states the project's goal to "safeguard Suriname's globally threatened coastal biodiversity," with the objective of "promoting the conservation of biodiversity through improved management of protected areas along the western coast of Suriname." This was to be achieved through two interrelated components, which are discussed below. (PRODOC p. 25)

Component 1: Improved management effectiveness and efficiency of coastal zone protected areas.

The expected outcomes under this component were a) a 25% increase in METT scores for 10 coastal protected areas, b) total mangrove forest cover remaining at least constant within coastal protected

areas at 200,000 ha, c) no negative change in population numbers of three key indicator species (Scarlet ibis, Jaguar, Tarpon) within coastal protected areas, and d) water quality improving or at least remaining constant at five monitoring stations within coastal protected areas. The TE does not assess outcome achievement directly, but rather looks at the indicators established in the project document for each component.

The expected outputs were 1) the development of an operative management agreement for Multiple Use Management Areas (MUMAs), 2) the establishment of Consultation Commissions, 3) three updated management plans in place for coastal protected areas, 4) a monitoring and evaluation system for coastal protected areas in place, and 5) the establishment of a training program for selected coastal protected area staff. (Request for CEO endorsement p. 1) The TE notes that the project was able to partially deliver some of its expected achievements on the output level, through the development of monitoring and evaluation plans for the protected areas (output 4) and management plans for the three MUMAs (output 3). The TE also criticizes however, that while the respective documents and plans were created, there was no evidence of appropriation, effective implementation, or concrete impacts at the time the TE was completed. (TE p. 35-36)

The indicators established by the project document for component 1 were i) the number of coastal protected areas with clearly designated protected area management authority, ii) the number of coastal protected areas implementing contemporary management plans, iii) the number of coastal protected areas with comprehensive biodiversity conservation monitoring systems informing decision-making, and iv) the increase in coastal and terrestrial protected area management effectiveness as measured by METT scores. (PRODOC p. 33) The TE concludes that the expected outcomes have not been achieved for indicators i) to iii). (TE pp. 36-37) The METT scores in five protected areas, for which baseline- and final-scores were reported in the TE, declined instead of improving over the course of the project's implementation, from 2010 to 2015. (TE p. 44) These scores served not only as indicator iv) under component 1, but also as one of the overall indicators for the project objective, to promote the conservation of biodiversity through improved management of protected areas along the western coast of Suriname. (PRODOC p. 33)

Component 2: Increased and diversified coastal protected area funding.

The expected outcomes under this component were a) an increase in annual government funding for coastal protected area conservation from \$833,000 to \$1,500,000, b) an increase in funding received from private sources for coastal protected area conservation from \$592,000 to \$740,000, c) three coastal protected areas to implement business plans reflecting National System of Protected Areas standards, and d) and increase in the Financial Scorecard from 13% to 38%. The TE does not assess outcome achievement directly, but rather looks at the indicators established in the project document for each component.

The expected outputs were 1) three business plans for coastal protected areas, 2) the completion of economic valuations of three coastal protected areas, 3) a model biodiversity offset agreement for one coastal protected area, and 4) a mechanism to manage and administer coastal protected area funding.

(Request for CEO endorsement pp. 1-2) The TE notes that the project was able to partially deliver some of its expected achievements on the output level, through the development of economic valuation documents (output 2). The TE criticizes however, that while such documents were created, there was no evidence of appropriation, effective implementation, or concrete impacts at the time the TE was completed. (TE p. 35-36)

The indicators established by the project document for component 2 were i) the increase in section 3 of Financial Scorecard part II, ii) the increase in annual government funding for coastal protected area conservation, iii) the increase in annual private sector investments in coastal protected area conservation, iv) the percentage of coastal protected areas implementing business plans reflecting NSPA standards, and v) the decrease in coastal protected area funding gaps. (PRODOC p. 33) The TE concludes that the expected outcomes have not been achieved for any of the five indicators under component 2. (TE pp. 36-37)

As for the rest of the indicators specified in the project document for achievement of the overall project objective (increase in coastal protected area capacity as measured by the Financial Sustainability Scorecard, mangrove forest cover within coastal protected areas, population of three key indicator species within coastal protected areas, and water quality at five monitoring stations within coastal protected areas), the TE notes that they are missing, but does not appear to factor this severe shortcoming into its assessment of the project’s effectiveness. (PRODOC p. 33; TE p. 24)

In sum, when measured by attainment of the objective, outcomes, outputs, and indicators specified in the project document, the TER rates the project’s effectiveness as Unsatisfactory.

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

The TE discusses effectiveness and efficiency of the project in one combined section and rates each as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

In addition to the project’s shortcomings in terms of effectiveness, the TE also notes shortcomings regarding efficiency, since for the most part the products and outputs obtained under the project have delivered very little concrete results.

The TE also notes that a high turnover within the executing agency, the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management, have severely impacted implementation. The TE notes varying degrees of project ownership during these rotations, with three Ministers throughout the project’s lifetime, and two project directors, with a gap without an appointed director in between and virtually no other staff in the PMU. Furthermore, communication problems between the project management, board, and steering committee, as well as inadequate governance structures for a cross-cutting project among different areas of government, are cited by the TE. Finally, it notes that the project was inadequate in its connection with local governments, stakeholders and realities, relying overly on consultants to generate plans and documents perceived as abstract and theoretical, which severely undermined implementation and sustainability of the project. (TE pp. 38-39)

It should further be noted, that other than UNDP’s contribution, no materialized co-financing, either from the government or other sources, was reported according to the TE. Co-financing of the implementing agency UNDP was with \$136,933 almost 37% higher than planned, but this could not make up for the apparent lack of other co-financing worth \$1,505,045, or roughly 150% of GEF funding or nearly 57% of original project funding expected at CEO endorsement. (TE p. 31)

In assessing the project’s overall output/input ratio, although it had to make due with less than half of its original funding, the fact that the GEF grant remained unchanged clearly indicates that it achieved far less than anticipated. The TER therefore rates the project’s efficiency as Unsatisfactory.

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

Although discussing financial, sociopolitical, institutional and governance, and environmental risks the TE refrains from providing a rating of sustainability, because the project has not yet materialized any results beyond the above discussed intermediate output products. Based on the information available at the time of the project’s completion, this TER rates the project’s sustainability as Unlikely.

The TE notes that although containing an important financial sustainability element in its second component, increased and diversified coastal protected area funding, the project failed to achieve evident results.

As has been discussed above, there has been an apparent high turnover and erratic ownership of the project within the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management, which in addition to a generally weak ownership of environmental issues in Suriname noted by the TE, and a weak level of stakeholder ownership, especially locally, casts doubt on the project’s sociopolitical sustainability.

In terms of the institutional framework and governance, the TE notes weak institutional capacities to implement the project’s products, as well as governance risks in terms of the legal framework, policies, and governance structures and processes, especially when it comes to the linkages between the national and the local levels.

Environmental risk to sustainability is identified as mainly stemming from climate change by the TE, but no further assessment is provided. (TE pp. 41-42)

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?

The TE notes that, other than the contribution of the implementing agency, no materialized co-financing, either from the government or other sources, was reported. Co-financing of the implementing agency was with \$136,933, almost 37% higher than planned, but this could not make up for the evident lack of other co-financing worth \$ 1,505,045, or roughly 150% of GEF funding. (TE p. 31) The TE does not

contain information about the reasons for the non-materialization of co-financing and does not specifically discuss its impact on the project's results. It is therefore difficult to disentangle the causal connections between the non-materialization of co-financing, the project's eventual underperformance, and other potential contributing factors such as the above mentioned erratic ownership within the executing agency and by extension the government.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was extended by one year. This was because it was without a project manager from December 2013 until April 2014, as the old one left and a new one had to be found. Activities assigned to external parties were therefore not optimally performed during that time. (PIR 2014, pp. 13, 16)

The TE mentions that this has led to an extension of the planned project duration of three years to a total duration of four years, but does not elaborate if and how the extension has exactly impacted the project's outcomes and sustainability. (TE p. 16) It is difficult to assess whether this problem was a symptom or cause of the project's overall struggles.

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:

As has been discussed before, the project suffered from a high turnover within the executing agency, the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management, with varying degrees of project ownership during rotations, three different Ministers throughout the project's lifetime, and two project directors, with a gap without an appointed director in between and virtually no other staff in the PMU. (TE p. 39)

The TE further notes that on the one hand, country ownership has generally been low, as evident from the appropriation of project processes, products and results by local and district level institutions, and a lack of new strategies or increased management funding for coastal protected area management on the national level. On the other hand however, stakeholders involved in the project steering committee have shown high levels of expectation and ownership. (TE pp. 40-41)

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 discusses M&E design at entry and M&E implementation in one combined section and rates the former as Satisfactory.

The TE notes that the project’s M&E design at entry followed standard guidelines, laying out plans for an inception workshop and a corresponding inception report, quarterly progress monitoring through UNDP’s Enhanced Results Based Management Platform, annual PIRs, periodic monitoring through site visits, a mid-term review, and a terminal evaluation. The TE also highlights that although a project board and a project steering committee were established, only the project board’s monitoring duties were laid out in the project document, but the project steering committee’s responsibilities in this regard were not. (TE p. 32; PRODOC pp. 55-56)

In light of the above, the TE sees only minor shortcomings (i.e. Satisfactory rating) in M&E design at entry of the project. However, despite the specification of a range of indicators, outputs, and outcomes, the project’s overall results framework appears poorly specified, overly complex, and confusing. For instance, METT and Financial Scorecard scores are used both as outcomes and as indicators for both project components and the overall project objective. Furthermore, the M&E plan seems inadequate, because it merely specifies the types of M&E mechanisms to be used, rather than laying out some of the actual procedures to collect, monitor, and evaluate these various indicators in the results framework.

The TER therefore rates M&E design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory.

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

The TE discusses M&E design at entry and M&E implementation in one combined section and rates the latter as Unsatisfactory and the TER follows this assessment.

The TE notes that the M&E implementation of the project had serious weaknesses and did not closely follow the initial M&E design. The logical framework developed was not being used as a M&E tool, follow-up and adaptive management actions were not fully taken in response to M&E reports, and there was no mid-term review undertaken despite mandated by the M&E design.

The TE further notes that the project also experienced problems with governance structures for M&E. The project board did not in fact oversee the project’s development as specified at entry, the project steering committee, as a body made up of diverse stakeholders, never lived up to its potential in monitoring the project’s proper implementation, due to the above mentioned lack of M&E responsibilities specified for it at entry, and there were communication issues and a lack of feedback between the project board and the project steering committee. Furthermore, the project suffered from a lack of oversight, with standard monitoring tools not being applied properly by either the executing or the implementing agencies, monitoring tasks being neither clearly defined nor understood by the relevant parties, and no clear and conscientious reporting taking place on critical technical, administrative and results-based issues. (TE pp. 32-33)

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 TE discusses quality of implementation and quality of execution in one combined section and rates them both as Moderately Satisfactory. It identifies the main problem of the project in terms of outcome achievement as an inappropriate focus on only some products or intermediate outputs rather than on results-based outcomes, a shortcoming which it ascribes to both the implementing and the executing agency. TE sees a lack of active operational and technical supervision from all managing parties.

As has been mentioned above, standard monitoring tools were not being applied properly by either the executing or the implementing agency in overseeing the project, according to the TE. Furthermore, the TE sees the lack of close monitoring of activities from UNDP as having led to deadlines being missed as well as other issues, such as the non-execution of a mid-term review. This also may have contributed to the late achievement of products, at the very end of the project, inhibiting their prospects for proper implementation and for unfolding their results. (TE p. 33)

Furthermore, the TE notes that key stakeholders of the project acknowledged a failure in the project's design – a substantial number of its outputs and products were too broad or too theoretical to result in adequate uptake of activities on the ground. (TE p. 25)

Given the evidence presented in the TE, it is difficult to clearly disentangle the quality of implementation from the quality of execution of the project. However, in light of these shortcomings, the TER rates the quality of implementation as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

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

The TE discusses quality of implementation and quality of execution in one combined section and rates the both as Moderately Satisfactory. It identifies the main problem of the project in terms of outcome achievement as an inappropriate focus on only some products or intermediate outputs rather than on results-based outcomes, a shortcoming that it ascribes to both the implementing and the executing agency. The TE sees a lack of active operational and technical supervision from all managing parties.

The TE notes that the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management, the executing agency of the project, could not properly carry out its supervision, oversight, and operational actions. Its lack of capacity was apparently not taken into account, because capacity assessment at the inception stage of

the project only looked at its financial management capacity in managing projects, but neglected its limitations in terms of funding and staffing.

Another issue raised by the TE is the executing agency's limited ability to take actions regarding coastal management and so-called Multiple Use Management Areas (MUMAs), because although it is Suriname's lead agency in dealing with MUMAs, many other institutions have direct or indirect competence over related issues, but were not systemically included in the project's implementation. (TE pp. 33-34)

Given the evidence presented in the TE, it is difficult to clearly disentangle the quality of implementation from the quality of execution of the project. However, in light of these shortcomings, the TER rates the quality of execution as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

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.

No information on notable environmental change is provided in the TE or other relevant documents.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No information on notable socioeconomic change is provided in the TE or other relevant documents.

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

There is some indication in the TE, that some aspects of the project have the potential to play catalytic demonstration and replication roles. Suriname's REDD projects will incorporate this project's economic valuations as baseline data into some of their studies in determining the value of mangroves, while it is expected that the management plans developed for the three coastal protected areas can serve as starting point for engagement with local and national actors in their sustainable management and have a catalytic role for the Suriname Global Climate Change Alliance Project. (TE p. 41)

b) Governance

No information on notable governance change is provided in the TE or other relevant documents.

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 information on notable unintended impacts is provided in the TE or other relevant documents.

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 adoption of project related initiatives at scale has been noted by the TE or other relevant documents.

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.

- In order to seek results, a project like this needs to interweave management with a results-based approach from the very beginning and generate concrete strategic planning from its start.
- Projects need constant monitoring by all parties involved in order to achieve results.
- Rigorous M&E throughout the life of a project, accompanied by adaptive management, is imperative to achieve results.
- The capacity of the executing agency needs to be assessed from project inception / design onward, not only in its financial capacity to manage funds, but also in its capacity to achieve results and steer the project.

- Gender mainstreaming needs to be clearly imbedded from project design on.
- Governance structures and responsibilities of all entities within a project need to be clearly laid out from the very beginning in order to enable these structures to steer the project properly and to generate national ownership.
- Downstream results, effects and eventually impacts need to be generated with the proper inclusion, participation of, and relation with local and district level actors and institutions.
- Heavy reliance on consultancies to generate products is detrimental to institutional capacity building and ownership of a project's products and eventual results.
- Capacity building needs to be better defined than just by training or development of products.
- Project M&E needs to have clear tools and instruments that are to be applied by all involved parties. (TE pp. 47-48)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendations for SCPAM Project:

- Convene a workshop or final wrap up meeting to inform and communicate what has been achieved under the project and make information and products available to all stakeholders.
- In order to generate or drive catalytic effects from the products generated under the project, there should be an incentive for these to be appropriated by other projects or institutions that could make use of them in other programs or projects.

Recommendations for future programming at the design level:

- Beginning at the design stage, projects need have a clear strategic path for implementation, following a pattern of consultations, product development, piloting, and full implementation, with logical linkages between expected outputs/products and expected results.
- Progress indicators of implementation and effect should be incorporated at the design level, as a way to guide and gauge whether results are being achieved, and include a timetable.
- Projects should have, beginning at the design stage, a results-based outlook. It is not sufficient for a project to only promote the generation of products without realistic implementation.
- Projects need to be realistically designed, streamlined and focused in line with the pilot areas where interventions will take place, taking into account resources such as funds and time.
- Interventions of this type should have a clear objective of generating and strengthening national individual and institutional capacities, taking into account existing capacity as well as needs.

- Sustainable management projects need to generate arrangements to promote the implementation of outputs beyond the lifespan of the project to ensure sustainability of outputs and outcomes.

Recommendations for future programming at the monitoring and evaluation level

- Projects need to be closely monitored by all parties involved in order to ensure the meeting of expected outputs and products, employing monitoring tools that sustain and promote efforts.
- Governance structures within projects need to have clear and proactive roles set for them from the outset and be realistically designed in terms of their composition.
- Monitoring efforts should not only include administrative guidance, but also technical guidance for project implementation, keeping in mind to the intervention's ultimate goals.
- An analysis of evaluations of similar projects implemented in Suriname could be generated, in order to determine whether there is a pattern of issues arising in project implementation and what the strengths and weaknesses of the country office vis-à-vis projects dealing with environmental and development issues are. If such a pattern emerges, an exploration exercise could be carried out, in order to understand whether concerns that manifest themselves at the project level have a wider root cause.

Recommendations for future programming at the implementation level

- All relevant local and district level actors need to be involved from the start of a project, in decision making, data gathering, and throughout implementation, thoroughly taking into account local processes, participation, and inputs.
- Communication within a project is an important strength and should be promoted in order to improve implementation. Communication should entail interaction between the various governance structures of a project, the implementing agency and the executing agency, as well as with the project management unit. It should promote accountability, transparency and, as an ultimate goal, aid the pursuit of effects and outcomes.
- Knowledge management inputs and outputs should be promoted throughout the implementation stage of a project, encouraging learning not only from domestic experiences but also from regional experiences.
- Implementation should follow the initial design and adjust according to arising needs, identified gaps, or known execution issues as needed throughout a project's life.
- There should be a better definition of what capacity building is and what it generally entails within UNDP as well as within a particular country. In addition, processes regarding capacity building currently carried out should be upgraded to truly promote institutional strengthening. (TE pp. 49-51)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains an assessment of several relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and of the achievement of its overall objective.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is for the most part internally consistent, the evidence presented is mostly convincing but not always complete, and some ratings appear slightly inflated.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report discusses project sustainability but refrains from providing a clear rating. It does not explicitly discuss the project exit strategy but this discussion is implied.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned presented in the report are comprehensive and supported by the evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes the actual project costs and co-financing used, but no breakdown by activity.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assesses the project's M&E system by discussing both M&E design at entry and M&E implementation in one combined section, although it provides separate ratings. The assessment, overall, is mostly well substantiated but appears slightly inflated.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

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