

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		465	
GEF Agency project ID		4235	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Development of Best Practices and Dissemination of Lessons Learned for Dealing with the Global Problem of Alien Invasive Species that Threaten Biological Diversity	
Country/Countries		All parties to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD)	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP1- Arid and semi arid zone ecosystems OP2- Coastal, Marine and Freshwater ecosystems OP3- Forest ecosystems OP4- Mountain ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Scientific Committee for the Protection of the Environment (SCOPE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		No involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		3/3/1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		4/4/1998	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		11/30/2002	
Actual date of project completion		12/1/2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing	0.29	0.87
GEF Project Grant		0.75	0.75
Co-financing	IA/EA own		0.12
	Government		0.09
	Other*	2.94	1.3
Total GEF funding		0.75	0.75
Total Co-financing		3.23	2.38
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.98	3.42
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		8/1/2003	
TE submission date		August 2003	
Author of TE		David R. Given	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Robert C. G. Varley	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Josh Brann	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		05/27/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	L	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/R	MU
M&E Implementation	N/A	S	N/R	MS
Quality of Implementation	N/A	S	N/R	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/R	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives as stated in the PD is to halt loss of biological diversity due to harmful alien invasive species (AIS) through the development of best practices and the dissemination of lessons learned worldwide. According to the TE, invasive species are probably the second greatest threat to biodiversity after habitat loss, and the threat is highest on oceanic islands.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is to determine what is currently being done on AIS and to recognize, evaluate and mitigate against AIS by dissemination of information on what practices have been most successful. The project is associated with the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), and its goal is to assist Governments, international organizations and other institutions in their efforts to minimize the spread and impact of alien invasive species.

The project outcomes are:

- (1) Globally accessible early warning systems on alien invasive species
- (2) Develop new tools and approaches, based on best practices, to deal with this problem, both locally and globally
- (3) Best practices and lessons learned in dealing with alien invasive species disseminated worldwide from case-study countries to those especially impacted by AIS.

The main project activities are:

- (1) Assessment of current knowledge base
- (2) Development of early warning systems
- (3) Development of a web page
- (4) Preparation of technical and scientific reports and reports for policy-makers and practitioners
- (5) Preparation of public awareness materials

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

No changes in objectives are reported in the TE or in the PIR.

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

According to the PD, alien invasive species are increasingly recognized as a global threat to biological diversity. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) recognizes the importance of this global issue and calls the Parties to “prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats and species” (Article 8(h)). To respond to this crisis, countries need effective legal instruments and incentives, early warning systems, means of assessing the status, nature and full costs of the impacts of invaders, information on control methods, and educational programmes on invasives. The Conference of the Parties to the CBD (COP) identified implementation of the Article 8 as a high priority. This meeting specifically encouraged the Scientific Committee for Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) and IUCN to develop a global strategy and action plan to deal with AIS. The project was developed through SCOPE to meet the COP recommendations.

According to the TE, between 1982 and 1988, SCOPE engaged scientists in an effort to document the problem of invasive alien species. This resulted in a number of publications. Following up, in 1997 a coalition of scientists, economists, lawyers, social scientists, conservationists and resource managers began working together to develop a new comprehensive strategy for addressing the growing problem of invasive alien species. This evolved into GISP, a proactive, outcome-oriented partnership and network of specialists concerned about the problem. Collaboration was initiated by SCOPE, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and CAB International (CABI). The overall mission of GISP is to assist Governments, international organizations and other institutions in their efforts to minimize the spread and impact of alien invasive species. The present project made a major contribution to GISP phase I, with consequences for the establishment of GISP phase II.

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

According to the TE, the outcomes were generally met; “A general consensus is that the products were mostly appropriate and their delivery was generally successful but could have been better” (TE, pg. 7). One problem may have been global availability and overall awareness of project products.

Overall, the project achievements are:

- (1) a remarkably large and varied array of printed and electronic products, mostly of high quality, was produced and a well-coordinated series of workshops and conferences were followed through to written proceedings;
- (2) the "Toolkit of Best Prevention and Management Practices" and a book written for the general public, are widely used, and the website is a primary search and reference tool on the subject of AIS;
- (3) there is a competent body that can provide technical support;
- (4) significant new initiatives were taken by the Nordic countries and Africa as a result of participation and learning;
- (5) a strategy document produced under the project has had a major impact on GISPII, with the project's core capabilities now embedded in the GISP II secretariat;
- (6) the overall array of outputs covered a wide range of audiences from specialist academics through professional practitioners to the general public and sector decision-makers.

The full list of project outputs is given in the Annex 2 of the TE.

However, despite those achievements, the project also had some shortcomings.

The database was underfunded and developed with insufficient guidelines, going beyond what was intended within the MSP time frame. Some outputs fell by the wayside or have been late in delivery, and coordination of partners and knowledge dissemination has not yet been achieved by GISP, according to the TE. The distribution system could have been better and the global availability and overall awareness of project products wider. There was an early bias to theory rather than evaluation and feedback. Both GISP and the project were heavily dependent on undercompensated volunteers. Finally, there was limited involvement of regional conservation organizations or trade interests.

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

According to the TE, this project has been an “extraordinarily cost-effective project, considering its scope and the wide range of its outputs” (TE pg.19). This cost effectiveness can be seen with the secondary products that were not part of the original scenario but which were catalyzed by the MSP, for instance workshop outputs during the transition phase and following the Cape Town synthesis workshop and the Nordic initiatives. The TE raised a question whether the cost effectiveness was dependent on

the goodwill of both organizations and individuals and whether the project would have been better served by more paid staff being involved. Moreover, the financial tracking system did not permit accurate reporting of non-GEF funded expenditures.

On the other, some of the outputs, including publications on "vectors output" and "legal issues" have been late in delivery. However, according to the TE, it is unrealistic to expect that all products will be on time.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Financial Sustainability: Moderately Likely

According to the TE, the project was highly cost-effective and the impacts are “potentially enormous”. However, the staff of major organizations rose their own funding and their organizations subsidized the project by covering their employees’ costs and time. Therefore, to ensure sustainability, the financial resources will have to be secured.

Socio-political Sustainability: Likely

Planning for GISPII has provided continuity and wider participation from less-developed countries, consultation was done well and good networks were set up. Additionally, project support for the CBD's work has helped to create a favorable future environment for project activities.

On the other hand, much of the ownership initially seems to have been with developed economy parties, especially in North America and Western Europe, and a greater initial participation by developing country parties is desirable.

Institutional Sustainability: Moderately Likely

The insistence by CBD that the emerging programme become the main technical agency for AIS (GISP) indicates that the project worked well and is expected to sustain momentum. The establishment of Global Invasive Species Secretariat is a major step toward institutional sustainability. According to the TE, the project did not supplant existing science, but showed it was integral to the program (GISP) and can be turned into tools for parties to the CBD. However, the focus was on "icon species" and "the worst 100 AIS " omitting many significant problems, particularly of diseases and marine species. There is an urgent need to populate the database representatively, perhaps through mapping linkages to existing national and regional AIS systems.

There is no information provided in the TE and in the PIRs that allow analyzing and rating environmental sustainability.

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 general level of financial management, including initial estimates and tracking of expenditure through a six-monthly reporting process, , was excellent according to the TE, and the project was completed very close to budget. Detailed records were maintained of funds handled by SCOPE. However, the TE mentions that co-financing has been difficult to identify in total as some cash grants did not pass through the SCOPE books and were given directly to, and administered by, other institutions. The detailed co-financing figures are given in Annex 3 of the TE. Also, some agencies provided successive or simultaneous grants. It is apparent, according to the TE, that securing the MSP grant was vital to obtaining a considerable proportion of the co-financing.

Overall the co-financing was lower than expected, but the TE and the PIRs do not give any explanation.

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?

There were no delays or extensions reported in the TE, apart from some minor delays in the publication of some of the outputs.

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:

Decisions on alien invasive species made by the CBD Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting generated considerable Party interest and attention, for example among the Scandinavian and African countries; according to the TE, it is significant that many of the present and future stakeholders in the MSP, and GISP overall, attended the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Regional workshops and meetings, including some inspired by the MSP, helped developing and transition economy Parties to become involved by mobilizing discussion, thereby helping to formulate practical recommendations. Initially, much of the ownership seems to have been with developed economy Parties, especially in North America and Western Europe.

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 Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	--

Very little information is presented in the PD about the M&E design. The PD only mentions that the M&E will be coordinated by UNEP and SCOPE, that some quarterly reports should be prepared by SCOPE, and that a Terminal Evaluation should be done at the end of the project.

According to the TE, resources allocated to M&E were minimal and hence insufficient for formal surveys to measure changes in public awareness, migration of AIS, and stakeholder perceptions, the indicators provided only a partial measure the effectiveness of the outcome, and the stakeholders did not always distinguish the project from GISP and hence there was no clear boundary between activities and outputs that belonged to the project and to GISP (Global Invasive Species Program.). Finally, there was no formal logical framework for the project and the monitored activities were reported by the GEF expenditures, leaving 2/3 of the project cost unallocated to the activities.

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

According to the TE, very comprehensive progress reports were regularly submitted to UNEP and funding agencies, which rated progress in terms of publications, workshops, information dispersal and risks incurred through such things as delays in outcomes. There was a clear system linking outputs, and preliminary assessment of outcomes to the original achievement indicators.

However, it appears that some project components did not have milestones sensitive enough to pick up problems and trends at an early stage (TE, pg 21). Additionally, use of the monitoring data for management was limited as GISP, which had the greatest stake, showed little interest in monitoring outcomes. Moreover, not all funding, especially co-funding, was tracked by the implementing or executing agency and summarized in progress reports. According to the TE, "it is noted that the role of the implementing agency is to ensure not only that a proposal is realistic, but also that during its execution it will not be derailed". Therefore there is a monitoring role for the implementing agency.

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: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

According to the TE, the support from UNEP was good. UNEP provided a great deal of input to the MSP, including a great deal of strategic advice during its implementation. A staff member was assigned to serve as the task manager for the MSP to ensure this added value. UNEP played a key role in the issue of invasive alien species being part of the action plan of the Environment Initiative of the New Partnership for Africa's Development and UNEP, with the Government of South Africa, hosted a workshop on invasive alien species to develop an invasive alien species action plan for Africa, which was approved by AMCEN (TE, pg.16).

The TE states that "it is acknowledged by the project's champions that the MSP probably took longer than expected to get up and running and that outputs did not turn out exactly as expected. Securing co-funding was a problem but ICSU and UNEP initiated the project with seed money to get things moving prior to securing GEF resources. Commitment and endorsement from the science community was vital". However there is no other information or evidences to show that in the TE.

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

The executing agency had a good initial structure with expert representation. According to the TE, there was a general consensus that the executive structure was relatively under-resourced for what emerged as a very complex and global project. In addition, the project's success built on voluntary in-kind contributions from both individuals and organizations that at times were difficult to maintain. A feature of this project is its managerial complexity, but overall project outcomes were achieved within the time-frame set.

On the whole, the organization of the MSP seems to have been reasonably successful. Good communication seems to have occurred between project leaders through teleconferences, the Internet and intranets and face-to-face meetings, when the latter could be organized. The steering committee comprised a good mix of members, although according to the TE, some interviewed felt that donors and funders should have been more involved.

One full-time staff person had an overall coordinating role and SCOPE, based in Paris, handled financial reporting. As it was, the project depended heavily on volunteers. Staff of major organizations raised their own funding and their organizations subsidized the project by covering employee costs and time.

Overall, the quality of execution is satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

According to the TE, it is too early to assess the outcomes fully or measure the impact of the project, which has limited scope and whose ultimate impact is dependent on complementary activities on a global scale.

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

There is no socioeconomic impact reported in the TE or in the PIR.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project advanced the knowledge based on invasive alien species, according to the TE, numerous publications are now the standard reference work for IAS related issues (A full list of publications created by the project is given on Annex 2 of the TE).

A web site and alien invasive species database have been created. A "Toolkit of Best Prevention and Management Practices" has been produced in both hard copy and on the Internet. A number of state-of-the-art specialist books and workshop proceedings and a book written for the general public on the

issue of invasive alien species and ways forward to mitigate the problems they cause have been published.

Overall, according to the TE, the project workshops and products were very useful to developing country participants, as a source of information, education, awareness building and exchange of experience.

b) Governance

According to the last PIR, COP 6 Decision VI/23 on invasive alien species (IAS) has been approved due in large part to awareness raising and capacity building on IAS that was part of MSP. Guidelines on addressing IAS that are part of the decision are fully consistent with outputs generated by MSP.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts reported in the TE.

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

Several initiatives have been replicated and/or mainstreamed:

- (1) A GEF PDF B project was in progress at the time of TE to develop activities in several regions of Africa focused on alien plants, and the MSP certainly helped get this moving, according to the TE
- (2) A number of developing countries are interested in following up on the evidence and lessons of GISP and the Toolkit, which suggests that they are ready to recognize prioritize genuine problems.
- (3) Initiatives in the Nordic countries have been directly attributed to the work of GISP through the MSP. Regional workshops, mostly funded outside GEF, have played a significant role in this and parallel awareness processes.

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.

The following key lessons are given in the TE:

- (1) Sustainability requires not only academic and NGO support but more science/managerial professionals, key representatives of Parties to the CBD and greater developing country representation;
- (2) precise replicability is not needed due to the global nature of the project, but a regional model is needed to implement best practices and disseminate knowledge effectively;
- (3) diverse groups can be brought together to generate useful products, however academics may not be the best choice for implementing scientific findings, while practitioners may not appreciate the global significance of their experience;
- (4) many CBD parties cannot yet implement the AIS strategy due to lack of management mechanisms;
- (5) GISP as a whole will not come of age until it engages with trade issues and the World Trade Organization, ranching and hunting, forestry and agriculture, botanical gardens, horticulture and urban alien invasive species issues;
- (6) parties to the CBD that can readily co-fund pilot programmes by providing locations, tend to produce systems that work well in those countries, but they may be unsuitable for transfer to others with very limited resources;
- (7) particular countries, and key individuals within funding agencies, championed the project, which proved to be critical to success; this success depended heavily on the people, notwithstanding that key people worked within institutional frameworks.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following key recommendations are given in the TE:

- (1) outputs to stakeholders must be readily available in a variety of formats (hard copy, electronic, web-based, etc.) and translated at least into a core set of languages including Spanish, French, and Chinese. Other effective communication tools are list servers, question and answer forums, electronic chatting and other interactive systems;
- (2) good communication and a unified message should be high priorities for similar projects in the future;
- (3) implement a globally effective supply mechanism for outputs that can track distribution and use of products
- (4) find more effective ways to get the global issues down to the local level;
- (5) address the special problems of the least developed countries who lack the infrastructure and funding for effective dissemination.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The relevant outcomes and impacts were assessed in details in the TE. The M&E system framework used in the TE focused on outputs and the degree to which outcomes were achieved.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent but not all the ratings are available, and the scale used is different from the one used by the GEF.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability of the project is assessed, and the TE shows the interdependence of the project outcomes with the extension of GISP to a second phase.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	There are a comprehensive set of lessons learned that are well articulated. The recommendations given are also justified and well detailed.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not include a full report on actual costs per activity. Tracking of co-financing was not fully satisfactory during the project and not all such funds came through the SCOPE system, and therefore the TE did not have access to this information.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is assessed, and described with details with complete and convincing evidences. The discussion on M&E design could be more detailed.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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