

Terminal Evaluation Validation form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4770	
GEF Agency project ID		GCP/ECU/084/GFF	
GEF Replenishment Phase		5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Integrated management of marine and coastal areas of high value for biodiversity in continental Ecuador	
Country/Countries		Ecuador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		GEF-5 Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF 5 Biodiversity, conservation and sustainable use (BD-2), which addresses the sustainable use of production in terrestrial and marine sectors and landscapes, and in the improvement of the sustainability of protected area systems.	
Stand alone or under a programmatic framework		Standalone	
If applicable, parent program name and GEF ID			
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of the Environment and Water of Ecuador (MAE), Conservation International, HIVOS, FAO	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Conservation International Lead executing agency; HIVOS secondary executing agency; NGO Nazca as subcontractor of CI, local fishery associations as beneficiaries; none through consultation	
Private sector involvement (including micro, small and medium enterprises) ¹		Local fishery associations as beneficiaries, private shrimp farms as object of monitoring in mangrove concessions	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval (MSP) date		14/10/2015	
Effectiveness date / project start date		16 February 2016	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		15 February 2020	
Actual date of project completion		31 August 2021	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.070	0.070
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4. 259	4. 259
Co-financing	IA own	0.251	0.236
	Government	10.088	5.509
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.577	0.386
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CBOs	2.532	0.244
	Other	2.325	1.111

¹ Defined as all micro, small, and medium-scale profit-oriented entities, including individuals and informal entities, that earn income through the sale of goods and services rather than a salary. ([GEF IEO 2022](#))

Total GEF funding	4.329	4.329	
Total Co-financing	19.407	7.486	
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	23.666	11.815	
Terminal evaluation validation information			
TE completion date	31 October 2020		
Author of TE	Teresita Romero Torres (Team Leader) and David Parra Puente.		
TER completion date	25 October 2022		
TER prepared by	Ines Freier		
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Neeraj Negi		

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review ²	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MU	MU	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		MU	MU	ML
M&E Design		S	S	S
M&E Implementation		MS	MS	MU
Quality of Implementation		MU	MU	MU
Quality of Execution		MU	MU	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report				MS

3. Project Objectives and theory of change

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The **Global Environment Objective** is to develop an integrated management approach for the use and conservation of coastal and marine areas of high biodiversity value, by establishing conservation areas, strengthening mangrove concessions and integrating biodiversity conservation in fisheries management within conservation areas. (PIR 2020, p. 5)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is “To improve and sustain the livelihoods of the people who depend on collecting black ark clams and red crab in the Gulf of Guayaquil and the Cayapas-Mataje estuary”(TE, p 4).

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or project activities during implementation? What are the reasons given for the change(s)?

There were changes in the global environmental objective of the project after its midterm review (TE, p 57). A supplementary request for changes was submitted to the GEF CEO and approved by. The midterm review (annex 6) proposed a change of the global environmental objective and the respective indicators. The project objective and outcomes were not updated in the PIR documents. Outputs and project activities were adapted to the needs and capacity of the Ministry of Environment and the local environmental administration and the local communities as proposed in the midterm review. This change in activities and outputs is reflected in the limited achievement of project objective and outcomes see sections on outcome.

An important change was that the GEF 5 Indicator – creation of marine protected areas – was dropped and replaced by a GEF 7 Indicator - area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (hectares; excluding protected areas). Several outputs were also adapted. For example, project originally planned to establish 4 new Marine Protected Areas covering 15,000. This was subsequently changed to biodiversity mainstreamed into ecologically sensitive zones covering 15,000 ha equal to 100 km of beach.

² The terminal evaluation was commissioned by the FAO’s Office of Evaluation. Therefore, the ratings provided in the terminal evaluation are repeated in this column.

3.4 Briefly summarize project's theory of change – describe the inputs and causal relationships through which the project will achieve its long-term impacts, key links, and key assumptions.

The main causal chain is the following:

The project supports co-management agreements at the local level between the local environmental administration and associations of fishermen to voluntarily restrict capturing of red clams below 4 cm in mangrove concession areas granted to communities. This is done under a programme for co-management for mangroves called socio manglar (in the TE referred to Agreements for Mangrove Ecosystem Sustainable Use and Custody AMESUC) which in addition supports the associations of fishermen with training and technology. The fishermen establish their own monitoring systems. The project supports the training of fishermen and the negotiations between the local authorities in the protected area and the associations how to establish a monitoring system that no red clam below 4 cm is harvested. This leads to working local institutions which might be expanded to cover marine protected areas or species of high conservation value (Impact).

ToC in TE (par 44, p9)

- i. Creation of four legally established MPAs, with integrated and effective management (direct result) would consolidate the management of the MPA in Ecuador (intermediate outcome). Effective management of the MPA (final outcome), would, in turn, stabilize or increase the number of species in the ecosystem, some of which are endangered, such as the hawksbill turtle, lobster, Pacific bearded brotula and octopus (Global Environmental benefits).
- ii. Co-management agreement socio manglar: The series of outputs expected from the project, such as the training plans implemented, the preparation of management plans, the equipment provided, the recuperated socio manglar, the preparation of internal regulations and the generation of new information, would lead to the concession of additional mangrove areas and management and control plans to improve their management and protection (direct outcomes). These direct outputs and outcomes consolidate the management of the socio manglar (intermediate outcome). the training of the concessionaires and of the new beneficiaries of the "Socio Manglar" (Mangrove Partner) programme would make it possible to establish a financial mechanism that would support the implementation of the sustainability actions in the areas with AMESUC and, consequently, would contribute to the consolidation of the management of the AMESUC (intermediate outcome). If this intermediate outcome is achieved, it might help to stabilize or increase the number of species in the mangroves (final outcome). This final outcome would equally favor the conservation of high value marine and coastal biodiversity.
- iii. Regulatory frameworks: This pathway decisively contributes to achieving the expected impact of the project by means of the updated AMESUC regulation; the adoption of the regulation of fisheries in the MPA by the Ministry of Environment; the preparation of five coastal management regulations that the new MPAs coordinate with the local and national governments; and the adoption of the National strategy for Integrated Coastal Management (outputs). These instruments would contribute to the incorporation of the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity and, consequently, to the preparation of regulatory frameworks that support effective management of the MPA, consolidated management of the socio-manglar and rights-based fishery management in MPA and mangroves, for which a concession was granted.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

The outcome ratings (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and overall outcome rating) are on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory. The sustainability rating is on a four point scale: Likely to Unlikely.

Please justify the ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance and Coherence	Rating: S
------------------------------------	-----------

The relevance and the coherence of the project are satisfactory. The project is aligned with the GEF-5 priorities, i.e. Biodiversity, conservation and sustainable use (BD-2), which addresses the sustainable use of production in terrestrial and marine sectors and landscapes, and in the improvement of the sustainability of protected area systems. (TE Appendix 1 p 66) The changes in project activities and outputs reflect changes in GEF priorities: From GEF 5 Indicator “Marine Protected Areas in ha” to GEF 7 indicator “Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)”.

The project is coherent with other GEF projects in the coastal areas of Ecuador focusing on ecosystem services and role of communities and with other technical co-operation projects like GIZ.³

The project is in line with the current policies of the Ministry for the Environment and the Government of Ecuador. Due to lower prices for petrol on international markets, the Ministry for the Environment faced budget cuts and decided to halt the establishment of new Marine Protected Areas and could not grant new mangrove concessions. The project supported those changes with project activities like promotion of income generating activities for fisher to compensate for payments from the mangrove concession (Midterm Review p, 2).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: MU
--------------------------	------------

Overall, the outcome achievement is moderately unsatisfactory because the level of achievement is substantially below expectations, i.e. achievement of project targets is below 50 percent. Level of achievement of many results could not be assessed by the TE because of lack of information on these results and shortcomings in the results framework. (TE p66)

The capacities of the fisheries organizations to sustainably manage fishery resources in the Marine Protection Areas and in the mangroves by means of the mangrove concessions, were strengthened (TE p49).

³ TE reviewers own research for relevant projects.

The project contributed to establishing a sound regulatory basis for the marine and coastal area, by developing Book V of the Environmental Code Regulation. (TE p 49)

The project strengthened some of the fishery organizations and increased awareness of the communities regarding the conservation of beaches, the sustainable use of fishery resources and the conservation of turtle nests (TE p 51).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: MU
-----------------------	------------

This review concurs with the moderately satisfactory rating given by the terminal evaluation for outcome efficiency of the project. The project was completed 1.5 years after its expected completion date at entry and materialization of co-financing was lower than expected.

The lack of experience of FAO Ecuador in implementing projects under the Operational Partners Implementation Modality and in close technical monitoring led to delayed disbursements, friction among partners, and a delayed change in the framework of outcomes. (TE p 23) (TE Appendix 1. GEF criteria ratings table, p 66).

4.4 Outcome	Rating: MU
--------------------	------------

This review assesses the overall outcome achievements of the project as moderately unsatisfactory because the level of achievement of the project targets was generally below expectations. Further, a high number of targets could not be measured due to the lack of information and shortcomings in the framework of outcomes. (TE p 66). The TE was not able to assess the achievement of results related to some of the outcomes related to Integrated management of coastal areas of high value for biodiversity (outcome 1), biodiversity conservation in the management of fisheries (outcome 2), and the Consolidation of the regulatory framework (outcome 3) because the TE did not have access to the produced documents and could not observe implementation of the guidelines during a field visit (the TE was conducted as a virtual evaluation due to COVID 19).

4.5 Sustainability	Rating: ML
---------------------------	------------

The sustainability of the results is moderately likely because risks to continuation of benefits are moderate and project is aligned with the priorities of the Ministry for the Environment and the needs of the beneficiaries.

The policy related outcomes were limited but of priority of the Ministry for the Environment so their sustainability is moderately likely. The unquestionable success of the project was to include a regulation development component to consolidate the institutional and social sustainability of the actions

implemented. However, only one of the five proposals submitted was approved during project time (TE, 49). However, given the instability in the Ministry of Environment, the implementation of the results will take time. The political and financial risk stemming from the political environment to the project results are moderate because the project activities and outcomes were adapted to those risks.

The local organisations working under the mangrove concessions will continue to comply with the agreements so the sustainability of this outcome is very likely (own observation during midterm review of a different GEF project in 2018). The consolidation of the capacities of the fishery organizations contributes to the sustainability of the actions to manage fisheries resources in the MPA and in the mangrove concession areas. The fisher organizations are more aware and prepared to collaborate with the local environmental authorities. The socio-economic risk to the project results is moderate because the project has anticipated those risks changing its aspired results.

Upscaling or replicating the project activities is not likely due to the political and financial risks. Given the limited resources of the Ministry of Environment and its important role in supporting and monitoring these organizations it is not known whether these processes would be maintained and make progress towards the sustainable and comprehensive fishery management after the project is over. (TE, p 48)

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, 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 co-financing was essential for implementing the activities. The Government of Ecuador and the National Environmental Fund of Ecuador contributed less in cash than expected due to budget cuts. In-Kind and cash Co-Financing from environmental concessions was essential for project funding. The budget cuts led to substantial changes in project outcomes as described in Efficiency section of the report.

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?

Delays in project execution were mainly due to the project design. FAO had to set up the project structures and disburse funds to the NGOs. It took time to set up the project and adapt it to the changing external conditions, so that the extensions were necessary to achieve the aspired results.

Reasons for delays were the following:

Lack of clarity in the administrative and financial processes and delayed disbursements. FAO Ecuador in the implementation of projects under the Operational Partners Implementation Modality was limited to a single project with a public body, and it had not previously worked with non-governmental organizations (NGOs). CI Ecuador and Hivos had never collaborated with a United Nations Organization – in this case FAO – and they had not participated in a project with GEF financing under the Operational Partners Implementation

Modality. In the case of the Ministry of Environment, it was the second project worked on with GEF funds and implemented under the Operational Partners Implementation Modality.

There was not enough time to adjust and calibrate the administrative and financial processes of CI and Hivos. Given that the fiduciary evaluations carried out on CI Ecuador and Hivos identified a substantial risk in their internal administrative processes, both organizations were obliged to implement risk mitigation measures, alongside the execution of the project. (TE, p 25).

Due to this, procurement processes were too bureaucratic and took time (own observation during midterm review in 2018) and imposed un-necessary burden on implementing stuff. Shortcomings in the project execution. Part of the modifications of the framework of outcomes included a new output focused on the promotion of productive projects. For its execution, an open call was made to the fishery organizations of the targeted zones for the submission of productive project proposals. From the selected proposals, several associations of fishermen did not fulfill formal requirements like licenses. (TE p, 25) So it took more time than expected to implement this new activity.

Delayed start of the project. The project officially began on 16 February 2016. However, the first manager and the three technical specialists were not hired until May and August 2016 respectively (TE p 25).

Delays occurred due to unexperienced project managers which could not oversee such a large project. (TE p 25)

Insufficient technical team and shortcomings in the project management. CI executed different projects in the same area with a small number of staff. (own observation during midterm review in 2018)

Delayed formal positioning of the Ministry of Environment regarding the creation of new protected areas.

Conflicts in a project site in the North of Ecuador which was influenced by drug trafficking to Colombia (TE p 25).

COVID-19 in the last year of the project affected the completion of tasks because movement in the country was restricted.

5.3 Stakeholder ownership. Assess the extent to which stakeholder ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

- Low ownership of Ministry of Agriculture, Forest and Fishery: the Ministry did not participate in project execution as planned, co-financing was not provided.
- Participation of relevant stakeholders in the preparation of plans for the management of beaches and adjacent areas have facilitated a common understanding on existing problems and, in most cases, a consensus on their zoning. In addition, it extended the use of the information generated to other government initiatives and created partnerships with other non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to replicate the development of management plans in other municipalities (TE p. 66)
- Ownership of the program socio manglar is high in some areas which guarantees the outcomes and sustainability of the project

- The Ministry of the Environment is committed to co-finance the socio manglar agreements but lacks budget for the agreements so it tries to find funding of international projects. (own observation)

5.4 Other factors: In case the terminal evaluation discusses other key factors that affected project outcomes, discuss those factors and outline how they affected outcomes, whether positively or negatively.

- External environment: COVID-19 in the last year of the project affected the delivery of outcomes negatively.
- Changes in Government policy: the decision not to implement MPA and cut financing of mangrove concessions due budget cuts hampered the achievement of the planned project objective.
- The structural weakness and instability of the Ministry of Environment substantially limits the sustainability of the project achievements. (TE 49)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: S
------------------------------------	-----------

The M&E design at entry is satisfactory because it met the minimum requirements for a GEF proposal. The project's design has an appropriate strategy for monitoring and supervision, the same that was detailed after starting the project. (midterm review p3).

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

The M&E implementation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory because it did not document and verify all information necessary to assess the achievement of results. The M&E implementation was inadequate because of shortcomings in the annual PIR, the use of an outdated monitoring tool, the dispersion of the information generated between different actors.

After reorganization of the project management, FAO hired an M&E specialist. Therefore, from 2019, a new monitoring approach built around an Excel workbook composed of 15 sheets known as matrices was followed. The matrices on gender and general monitoring of the Ministry of Environment were empty. With regards to gender, the project did not define a plan of action or establish any target. With regards to the monitoring of the Ministry of Environment, this took place by means of an independent matrix and subsequently suspended at the request of the partner.

The matrices that monitor the fulfilment of the project objectives, outcomes and outputs were not updated to align with the modifications made to the results framework. The risks matrix does not include all the risks identified in the PRODOC (TE p 39).

The TE could not verify results due to lack of access to outputs and field data. (TE p. 4)

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation rating is based on the assessment of the performance of GEF Agency(s). Quality of Execution rating is based on performance of the executing agency(s). 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: MU
--	------------

FAO as an implementing agency was not prepared to manage a consortium of executing agencies with NGOs – under Operational Partners Implementation Modality - and conduct a risk assessment as well as establish monitoring structures. (TE p 29). The volume of the project was too big to be executed by NGOs and even FAO country office.

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

The quality of project execution is moderately unsatisfactory due to the lack of experience from all organizations. As a result of a lack of experience, from all the organizations involved, with the management model and the institutional arrangement applied, certain administrative challenges arose from the outset, which have not been handled efficiently. This meant that during the whole project, the inter-institutional relationship has not been very constructive, inhibiting efficient operation and fluid communication. This situation directly affected decision-making in the project, efficiency in the implementation of the actions and the generation of outputs. After two years of implementation and having observed substantial under-execution, the Ministry of the Environment, as president of the Project Steering Committee, requested changes in the project management model. In response to this request more human resources have been assigned to the Project Technical Team and an additional role has been entrusted to FAO in relation to the management of funds. These changes improved the efficiency and effectiveness of the MCP but did not help to strengthen the inter-institutional environment. (midterm review p2)

Suitable execution structures like a temporary office of CI in Guayaquil were in place but not with sufficient staff. The NGO Nazca undertook local activities but had no permanent staff in the villages.⁴

Procurement processes of CI took a long time; use of funds and equipment like cars was restricted to the project which caused tensions and additional bureaucratic efforts to implement different GEF-projects in the same area (not in TE own observation during midterm review in 2018).

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 stressors and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project.

The TE describes the changes in environmental status as follows:

The new objective supports the conservation and use of biodiversity by preparing proposals for the creation of ecologically sensitive zones rather than conservation areas, as stated in the PRODOC. The ecologically sensitive zones are not conservation instruments, rather zoning included in the plans for the management of beaches and adjacent areas, which are planning tools (Parr. 197 page 54)

The project refrained from contributing to a comprehensive conservation of biodiversity that would include commercial and endangered species. (Parr. 197 page 54) The socio-manglar agreements / mangrove concessions were supposed to stabilize or increase the number of commercial species (red crab, black ark clam) and endangered species, focusing particularly on the hawksbill sea turtle and the American crocodile. With the modification of the logframe, this outcome was reduced to the conservation of biodiversity in the management of mangroves by means of the sustainable management of red crab and black ark clam resources. (Parr 203 page 55)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community cohesion, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project.

There is limited information in the TE on socio-economic benefits. The TE does report that three of the nine beneficiary organizations interviewed mentioned an increase in their income from the sale of their products. (TE Parra. 202 page 55)

The socio-economic impact was probably underestimated by the TE due to lacking field access. During my midterm review of the GEF Blue Forest project in 2018 in the project region El Morro effects like better

⁴ Observations by this reviewer of the terminal evaluation during midterm review in 2018 of another project (GEF Blue Forest Project).

community organization, better health, women undertaking fishing activities, leadership of young professionals in protecting catchment of commercial species were observed but not documented.

The number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment as not reported in the TE.

8.3 Enabling conditions. Describe notable achievements in the following areas: Policy, Legal & Institutional Development; Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building; Knowledge Exchange & Learning; and, Multistakeholder Interactions. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these achievements, as well as how contextual factors have influenced progress.

The crisis of public budgeting lead to a slower uptake of the socio-manglar (co-management of mangroves agreements) than planned (TE page 56). The project reviewed the respective legislation (TE p 21).

The project intended to prepare a proposal on a national strategy for integrated coastal management. The project was initially working on this proposal. However, due to coordination problems – resulting from structural changes in the project and in Government – Planifica Ecuador (a central government planning entity) had at the same time prepared a Marine and Coastal Space Management Plan, approved by the Interinstitutional Sea Committee. Given that the content and scope of this Plan coincides with the Strategy, the decision was made to suspend the work completed by the project to avoid duplication. It was agreed that instead of preparing a Strategy proposal, the project would invest resources in implementing the Plan, after having completed a joint review of such with the participation of its technicians. The development of the Plan is considered part of the Ministry of Environment contributions to the project, and as such the level of achievement of this output is 100 percent. (TE p 22).

The main contribution of the project in the regulatory field was the inclusion of an integrated coastal management approach into the environmental code, which includes plans for the management of beaches and adjacent areas as management instruments for the municipal decentralized autonomous governments. A proposal for a dredging regulation was made (TE p 22).

No description of changing behavior can be found in the TE however it occurred (observation during an midterm review in 2018 in the region)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects.

Not reported.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, practices, approaches, or any of the enabling conditions identified above) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end.

This was not reported in the TE. However presentation of socio-manglar agreements took place in a global GEF project on ecosystem services in mangroves (GEF Blue Forest) , the fishermen associations visit each other on exchange and learning visits to see how to implement the agreements and a regional GEF project

exchanged experiences between different countries in the Pacific (not in TE own observation during midterm review in 2018)

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they could have application for other GEF projects. Lessons must be based on project experience.

Lessons refer to project management like conflicts between FAO as implementing agency and executing agency and co-executing agencies like CI for which an assessment as a partner including fiduciary risks needs to be implemented. There must be balance between co-executing agencies and capacity of project staff to manage a large project. A training needs assessment need to be conducted (TE p 59).

The lessons learnt of the TE do not refer to the co-management approach for mangroves (socio manglar) which is a unique and promising as a concept for local management of mangroves.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

- Change project outcomes in time when necessary like due to changes in governmental priorities,
- Present logframe with project results and not include results of previous projects if they are not further developed,
- Include livelihoods / SME component in conservation projects, obtain permits for economic activities in time,
- More project staff and M+E staff for execution and oversight, document repository of project,
- To national government: adopt legislation about co-management of mangroves, fishery in MAP bufferzones and dredging regulation and include them in spatial planning.(TE p. 52-64)

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)

[Select detailed ratings here and fill in higher-level ratings and explanation in next table]

Criteria/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation was carried out on schedule and its report submitted on time.	S
1.1 Terminal evaluation conducted within six months before or after project completion	Yes
1.2 Terminal evaluation report submitted at the GEF Portal within 12 months of project completion	Yes
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation.	S
2.1 Provides GEF project ID	Yes
2.2 Lists evaluators that conducted the terminal evaluation	Yes
2.3 Lists the executing agencies	Yes
2.4 Specifies key project milestones (start date, first disbursement date, completion date)	Yes
2.5 Lists GEF environmental objectives	Yes
3. Stakeholder involvement in evaluation: Participation of key stakeholders sought and their feedback addressed.	MU
3.1 Key stakeholders of the project were identified in the report	Yes
3.2 Feedback of key stakeholders was sought on the draft report	UA
3.3 Feedback of key stakeholders was incorporated in finalization of the evaluation report	UA
3.4 If national project, OFP Feedback was sought on the draft report of the evaluation	UA
3.5 If national project, OFP feedback was incorporated in finalization of the report	UA
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change.	MS
4.1 Discusses causal links/mechanisms to achieve intended impact	Yes

4.2 Presents the key assumptions of the theory of change	UA
4.3 Discusses whether the key assumptions remain valid	No
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology.	MS
5.1 Discusses information sources for the evaluation	Yes
5.2 Provides information on who was interviewed	Yes
5.3 Provides information on project sites/activities covered for verification	Yes
5.4 Tools and methods used for the evaluation are described	Yes
5.5 Identifies limitations of the evaluation	YES
6. Outcomes: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes.	MU
6.1 Assesses relevance to GEF priorities	Yes
6.2 Assesses relevance to country priorities	Yes
6.3 Assesses relevance of project design	No
6.4 Reports performance on all outcome targets	No
6.5 Discusses factors that affect outcome achievement at sufficient depth	No
6.6 Reports on timeliness of activities	Yes
6.7 Assesses efficiency in using project resources	Yes
6.8 Discusses factors that affected efficiency in use of resources	Yes
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability.	MU
7.1 Identifies risks that may affect sustainability	Yes
7.2 Indicates likelihood of key risks materializing	No
7.3 Indicates the likely effects if key risks materialize	No
7.4 Indicates overall likelihood of sustainability	Yes
8. Monitoring and Evaluation Presents sound assessment of the quality of the project M&E system.	S
8.1 Analyzes quality of M&E design at entry	Yes
8.2 Analyzes quality of M&E during implementation	Yes

8.3 Discusses use of information from the M&E system for project management	Yes
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing.	S
9.1 Reports on utilization of GEF resources	Yes
9.2 Provides data on materialized cofinancing	Yes
9.3 Provides data on sources of materialized cofinancing	No
9.4 Provides data on types of cofinancing (cash, in-kind; loan, grant, equity, etc)	Yes
9.5 Discusses reasons for excess or deficient materialization of co-financing	No
9.6 Discusses contributions of cofinancing to project results, including effects of excess or deficient materialization of co-financing	Yes
10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance.	S
10.1 Provides account of the GEF Agency performance	Yes
10.2 Provides account of the performance of executing agency	Yes
10.3 Discusses factors that affected implementation and execution	Yes
10.4 Discusses how implementation and execution related challenges were addressed	Yes
11. Environmental and Social Safeguards, and Gender: Discusses application of safeguards and gender analysis.	S
11.1 Reports on implementation of social and environmental safeguards	Yes
11.2 Reports on conduct of gender analysis	Yes
11.3 Reports on implementation of actions specified in gender analysis	Yes
12. Lessons and recommendations: based on project experience and relevant to future work.	MU
12.1 Presents lessons	Yes
12.2 Lessons are based on project experience	Yes
12.3 Discusses applicability of lessons	No
12.4 Presents recommendations	Yes
12.5 Recommendations specify clearly what needs to be done	Yes

12.6 Specifies action taker for recommendations	Yes
13. Performance Ratings: Ratings are well substantiated by evidence, and are realistic and credible.	MS
13.1 Ratings are supported with sufficient evidence	Yes
13.2 Evidence provided in support is credible	Yes
14. Report Presentation: The report was well written, logically organized, and consistent.	MU
14.1 Report is written in English (as required by the terminal evaluation guidelines)	Yes
14.2 Report is easy to read	No
14.3 Report is well-organized	No
14.4 Report is consistent	No
14.5 Report makes good use of tools that make information accessible (graphs/charts/tables)	Yes

[This is the table that will be made public]

Criteria/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	GEF IEO COMMENTS	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation report was carried out and submitted on time?	YES	S
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation as per the requirement?	The TE provides general information about the project however the PIF is missing in the beginning and detailed information about the evaluation like start and end date is difficult to find. It does not provide easy to find information about key indicators of GEF like area covered and number of people benefitted.	S
3. Stakeholder involvement: the report was prepared in consultation with –	There is no information how stakeholders were	MU

and with feedback from - key stakeholders?	involved in the planning and execution of the evaluation. The management response is presented in a separate document.	
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change?	<p>The theory of change is mainly reduced to the achievements of outcomes and provision of outputs. The ToC from the Mid-term review was used and not adapted to the revised outcomes after the midterm review. A revised ToC is presented in the impact section where the direct link between outputs and impact are discussed without presenting outcomes. Social and economic benefits are not specified and contribution to SDG is missing.</p> <p>The logframe is discussed in the findings section and not in the section of ToC.</p>	MS
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology?	<p>Provides information on data collection but not on methodology of evaluation and the limits of the evaluation</p> <p>Outcome harvesting could have been used as a methodology for collecting project results.</p>	MS
6. Outcome: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes?	<p>Provides a mechanistic view on outputs and outcomes like 68% of envisaged targets (not results) have been achieved</p>	MU

	but does not analyze the changes in behavior and institutions as results of project activities. The report does not grasp the relevance of some of the results. It could not access many of the products of the project and get access to the field due to travel restrictions under COVID-19.	
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability?	The outlook on the sustainability of the results is too “gloomy” because the TE did not analyse institutional changes and attitudes of fishery co-operatives and the long-term change process in the co-management of resources which was an important result.	<i>MU</i>
8. M&E: Presents sound assessment of the quality of the M&E system?	YES	S
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing?	YES	S
10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance?	YES Describes in detail the performance of each executing agency and the gaps in project implementation	S
11. Safeguards: Provides information on application of environmental and social	YES	S

safeguards, and conduct and use of gender analysis?	Safeguards and gender are presented as normative values	
12. Lessons and recommendations are supported by the project experience and are relevant to future programming?	YES, lessons are very short and limited to project management issues	MS
13. Ratings: Ratings are well-substantiated by evidence, realistic and convincing?	Yes Ratings are presented in a convincing way using well researched arguments	S
14. Report presentation: The report was well-written, logically organized, and consistent?	The report is not easy to read in all parts and it does not use the appropriate technical terms like results and indicators instead of targets, it provides in some parts too much details, in other parts details are lacking, a general analytic view is missing, it is rather descriptive (68 % of targets have been met) ratings are only found in the table in the annex and not in the texts, cross-cutting issues are presented as normative issues, The logframe is discussed in the findings section and not in the section of ToC.	MU
Overall quality of the report		MS

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

Own observation during midterm review of the GEF project Blue Forest GEF No 4452 in July 2018