

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:	461		Review date: <u>at endorsement (Million US\$)</u>	10/13/06 <u>at completion (Million US\$)</u>
IA/EA Project ID:	82	GEF financing:	6.06	No information
Project Name:	Determination of the Priority Actions for the Further Elaboration and Implementation of the Strategic Action Program for the Mediterranean Sea	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Regional: Albania, Algeria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Libya, Lebanon, Morocco, Slovenia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey	Government:	3.00	3.00
		Other*:	2.925	3.728
		Total Cofinancing	5.925	6.728
Operational Program:	8	Total Project Cost:	11.985	Unable to assess
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		03/30/1998
		CEO Endorsement		04/14/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		12/15/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 18 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 58 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 40 months
Author of TE:		TE completion date: 6/06	TE submission date to GEF OME: 07/05/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 month

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	HS	S	S	MS

2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	MU	MS	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	No rating	HS	S	MS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No. Please refer to section 4.6.2. Particularly the assessment of the project M&E systems was deficient
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? None mentioned
3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation? According to the project brief, the overall project objective was to improve the quality of the marine environment in the Mediterranean Region by better shared-management of land-based pollution through improved international co-operation in the management of land-based pollution of transboundary and regional significance. No changes during implementation. The objectives of the SAP MED were to facilitate the implementation of the LBS Protocol to the Barcelona Convention by the Contracting Parties and to contribute to the maintenance and where appropriate, restoration of the productive capacity and biodiversity of the marine environment, ensuring the protection of human health, as well as promoting the conservation and sustainable use of marine living resources.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation? According to the TE, the specific objectives of this project are to implement the following components of the SAP MED to address pollution from land-based sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complete an analysis of the transboundary importance of the 103 hot spots identified in the TDA MED and SAP MED and finalise the priority list for intervention and investments ("Investment portfolio") (pre-investment studies will be conducted only in GEF eligible countries); • formulate and adopt principles, approaches, measures, timetables and priorities for action, that address each major land-based source of pollution and assist countries in the implementation of such actions; • conduct pre-investment analysis of expected baseline and additional actions needed to address the selected hot spots, and secure recipient country agreement to baseline investments; • prepare and adopt at the regional level, detailed, operational guidelines for the formulation of National Action Plans (NAPs) for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities; • assist countries to prepare, adopt at the highest level, and implement, country specific National Action Plans based on the regionally prepared and adopted guidelines; • identify roles for, and ensure effective participation of non-governmental organisations in the implementation of components of the SAP MED, and where appropriate incorporate these into the National Action Plans; and to address other transboundary issues • finalize and adopt a comprehensive and holistic Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis; and, • develop and adopt a strategic action plan for biodiversity in the Mediterranean in conformity with the provisions of the protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Biodiversity.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE? According to the TE, the main successes of the project were: i) the up-dating of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) (originally prepared in 1997); ii) the preparation of the National Action Plans (NPAs) to address pollution from land-based sources; and iii) the preparation and adoption by the Conference of the Parties to the Barcelona Convention of the Strategic Action Plan for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean Region (SAP/BIO). The TE indicates that the TDA and SAP/BIO provide very solid basis for undertaking the required actions towards the long term conservation of the Mediterranean and the sustainable use of its resources. The NPAs all meet the minimum required quality standard, but a number of them would require more work to make them really effective.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT	
4.1 Outcomes	
A Relevance	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain 	

The project addresses the transboundary environmental concerns of the Mediterranean Sea and as such

contributes directly to the Waterbody-based Operational Programme of the GEF Operational Strategy, and to assisting countries in meeting their obligations under: the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (Article 2071); the Convention on Biological Diversity (Annex I of Decision 11/10 of the Contracting Parties²); Agenda 21 (Chapter 173); the Convention for the Protection of the Marine environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona Convention); the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-based Sources and Activities (LBS Protocol); the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (SPA Protocol); and the Action Plan for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Sustainable Development of the Coastal Areas of the Mediterranean (MAP).

B Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	The TE indicates that the project seems to have operated quite well at the 'super-structural' level (project management and executing agencies) but not so well at the country level, where it should have really mattered; in a few countries in fact it operated poorly.
<p>The TE indicates that participating countries have high expectations about the implementation of the recommendations, projects, NAPs, and SAP/BIO elaborated as part of the project. However, to date there has been minimal implementation, and there is a risk of continuing with a 'paper producing process', without clear concrete implementation. Furthermore, the TE indicates that it is important to start a process to generate investments from the national budgets and by the international financing institutions, which unfortunately were not kept sufficiently abreast of the project development and implementation.</p> <p>The TE also indicates that the project was conducted mainly in collaboration with the ministries of the environment which are not among the key decision makers in the concerned countries. It was demand driven by those ministries and offered as grants to conduct studies and produce plans. It does not seem that these studies and plans have been endorsed or approved by ministries of finance and ministries of development/national planning. The project appears to have increased the awareness of the decision-makers but this may certainly not lead to 'ownership', funding or operations/activities to jointly decrease the threats to the Mediterranean Sea.</p>	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness? 	The TE indicates that concerning the efficiency of the project, the amount of outputs, the quality of most of them, the number of participating countries, and the number of institutions and individuals involved, indicate that the project has been cost effective. The TE indicates that there was a sound management of funds, in spite of the complexities of the project Administration. Savings and innovation permitted more work, at least in some of the sub-projects, in particular in relation to training and publications in local languages.

D Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?

None actual environmental impacts mentioned

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: L
The TE indicates that it is quite likely that financial resources, at least to a limited extent, could be provided by the eligible countries, specially the other Parties (non-GEF eligible) to the Barcelona Convention. But this will require bringing the tools generated by the project, in particular those related to economic instruments,	

¹ Article 207 requires states to adopt laws and regulations to prevent, reduce and control pollution of the marine environment from land-based sources: to take measures as may be necessary to prevent, reduce and control such pollution: and to endeavour to harmonise their policies in this connection at the appropriate regional level.

² Annex I of Decision 11/10 of this Convention specifically relates to land-based activities.

³ Chapter 17 identifies prevention, reduction and control of degradation of the marine environment from land-based activities as the main management related activity contributing to the goal of sustainable development of coastal and marine areas.

to the attention of the appropriate decision-makers. It is not sure that those involved in the project will have the necessary political clout and/or the sufficient scientific and technical know-how to do this. The TE also indicated that it conducted a survey with key stakeholders and their responses to this dimension of sustainability was that the approval of the National Action Plans (NAP) by the Higher Council for Environmental Protection means that there is a kind of commitment by all concerned ministries to allocate a special budget for the achievement of the results of the project. However, the implementation of NAPs will not be sustainable without further GEF assistance according to the TE. Respondents to the survey indicated that most environmental protection projects are financed/co-financed by foreign sources. The second phase of the GEF project increases the financial sustainability of the project as co-financing from other sources has been successful.

B Socio political	Rating: ML
The TE indicates that stakeholder ownership of the outcomes of the project did not seem to be widespread beyond the environmental agencies when the first phase was complete. The TE indicates that further capacity building was needed to increase the likelihood of socio political sustainability based on the comments from those surveyed. Stakeholders also indicated that the outcomes of the project indeed represent some priorities for all stakeholders. However, more stakeholder awareness was needed as of project end to increase ownership and commitment to project objectives. The follow up phase is focusing on this issues and thus increasing socio political sustainability.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
The TE indicates that the continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends is not assured. The key factor that is likely to contribute to the persistence of benefits after the end of the project will be the ability of the MAP system ⁴ to: a) provide and/or catalyze the political, technical and financial support needed in 11 of the eligible countries to make an effective use of the tools generated by the project (Slovenia, as an EU-member country is now in a different situation). The TE indicates that the new GEF project being prepared by MAP does not seem to contribute to this type of follow-up. In addition, the TE concludes that at least in the immediate future, MAP does not have the technical and financial capacity do provide this catalytic support. MAP may be working in the direction of developing such capacity, but that it will be up to the UNEP/GEF to pay attention to this matter, if the Facility does not want to see its resources (and reputation) wasted. To this end, it could be useful if the GEF establishes a 'Projects follow-up service / Project watch-dog service /'; b) ensure that the transboundary nature of most of the issues dealt with by the GEF project is fully addressed, ensuring that all the Parties to the Barcelona Convention are on board.	
D Environmental	Rating: ML
Given the sustainability shortcomings mentioned above, environmental sustainability is also compromised if the actions identified in the MAP are not implemented.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

A Financial resources	Rating: MU
B Socio political	Rating: MU
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: MU
D Environmental	Rating: MU

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good
2. Demonstration
3. Replication
The TE indicates that some components of the GEF project have had a positive impact in generating other projects and also for increasing local capacities for environmental management and improving environmental legislation. For example, some research and development projects are being prepared in line with the GEF project.
4. Scaling up

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

⁴ By the 'Map system' is meant the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, including all the Parties to these instruments (among which is the European Community), MED POL, the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development, and the six MAP Regional Activity Centres.

<p>A. In retrospection, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)</p> <p>Rating: MU</p>
The TE does not elaborate on the project M&E system beyond indicating that the project monitoring and evaluation was done through the regular meetings of the different project committees and the progress reports and external Mid-Term Report. All records of meetings have been well kept and are public, and the progress reports were presented on time and reflected the true picture of the project implementation. However, an examination of the logical framework matrix in annex II of the project brief including specific activities (and their indicators) contributing to the expected results (as described in the project brief) indicates that a more elaborate M&E system was needed and an assessment of this was not done in the TE. The TE indicates that it is regrettable that the documents published in the Technical Report Series do not provide information on the expert review process used for each of the guidelines and on their formal status vis-à-vis the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols, further pointing out a weakness in the project M&E system regarding an area as important as these guidelines.
<p>B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</p> <p>Rating: MS</p>
The TE indicates that the initiatives taken by the project management and the executing agencies to respond to unforeseen institutional and technical weaknesses in a number of participating countries for producing expected outputs (e.g. hiring regional consultants), indicate that there was an effective 'adaptive management' approach, which helped to address some of those weaknesses. More supportive evidence along the lines of what is mentioned in 4.4 A was needed.
<p>C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</p> <p>Rating: UA</p>
No information in the TE
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No, for reasons stated above.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</p>
The TE indicates that more care should be taken with the project design, not becoming more cumbersome, but rather the design should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) differentiate clearly between 'objectives' and 'outputs' and be more rigorous in their description in order to avoid creating false expectations. b) be more attentive to the 'real world' situation of the eligible countries, and not to assume that a GEF project will be able to change some strongly-rooted social and institutional realities. Also, a more rigorous assessment is needed of the institutional and technical capacity to implement the project in each eligible country (e.g. not assume that they are all at the same level) and the findings should be incorporated in the project design. c) identify and involve key stakeholders. For example, the eligible countries should be more actively involved in the project design, so that they can assist in making the project more attune to their needs and capacities; and they should be prompted to start considering the required implementation mechanisms in their countries before the start of the project. This can enhance implementation speed once the project is approved. (One key problem of the project under review was that the key in-country mechanism was established very late in most countries, and in some it was never established.). In addition, it is very important to formally involve all countries, including those that are not GEF-eligible, in the design and implementation of the project to improve the project outcomes. d) Ensuring meaningful and effective coordination mechanism imbedded in the project design allows countries to share experiences and develop the sense of 'shared issues'; and e) The duration of a project should be such as to ensure that the necessary key results are achieved. The alternative would be to foresee the immediate follow-up that will be required to ensure that the project outputs are put to good use. (The TE indicates that the duration of the project did not allow time for carrying out required processes to obtain high-level government approval of the key outputs, and no follow up was foreseen to do this at the time of completion of the TE. As a result, the long term impact of the project is uncertain.)

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings		
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.		
N/A		

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	UNEP EO ratings	GEF EO Ratings
A. 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 some outcomes and impacts but in some cases a more in depth analysis was needed to assess the quality of key outputs of the project such as the regional guidelines. In this case, the TE describes the guidelines and their contents but a more in depth assessment of their quality and usefulness was needed.	5 (S)	MS
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? As described above some evidence was not complete and often the ratings were not substantiated as shown in the ratings table in section 2 of this TER and explained in the respective sections on outcomes and M&E.	6 (HS)	MS
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes the report provides a good assessment of sustainability.	5 (S)	S
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons are supported by the evidence but they are more recommendations than lessons.	5 (S)	MS
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? There was no accounting for the use of GEF funds. The 2005 PIR indicates that the total disbursement as of June 30, 2005 was \$5,737,980.00. This is inconsistent with the co financing disbursements as presented in section 1 above (also taken from the TE).	4 (MS)	U
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Very generic and not supported by evidence.	5 (S)	U

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	No:
Explain: It would be interesting to assess after the completion of any follow up phases whether this project had actual and measurable environmental impacts in the region. This could be done within a broader technical assessment a few years after the completion of several IW projects.		

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

2005 PIR, and project brief
