

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		483	
GEF Agency project ID		57191	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Management of Avian Ecosystems	
Country/Countries		Seychelles	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		2 – Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Foreign Affairs, BirdLife Seychelles	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 1998	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		January 2002	
Actual date of project completion		June 2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.74	0.74
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.10	0.10
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	0.22	0.22
Total GEF funding		0.74	0.74
Total Co-financing		0.32	0.32
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.1	1.1
Terminal evaluation/review information			
ICR completion date		February 2003	
ICR submission date			
Author of ICR		Michel Simeon	
TER completion date		September 2014	
TER prepared by		Daniel Nogueira-Budny	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objective (GEO) of the project is to manage threatened ecosystems in the Seychelles to restore the Granitic Seychelles Endemic Bird Area and associated biodiversity. The ecological impact of human colonization on the Seychelles has been “catastrophic”, with the extinction of many endemic taxa and the endangerment of many more. Non-native plants, coupled with mammalian and avian predators, have wreaked havoc on the country’s native habitats.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the PD, the Development Objectives (DOs) of the project are:

1. To improve the conservation status of threatened endemic birds and associated biodiversity
2. to establish a program of habitat and island restoration

There are five expected project outcomes delineated in the PD:

1. improve the management and restoration of three ecosystems and their threatened endemic bird taxa; have a global impact on threatened endemic biodiversity
2. create a short list of potentially restorable islands; take initial action to restore at least one of these; preparations made for the successful translocation of a least one of the three endemic bird taxa
3. provide replicable management models for tropical island habitat and bird conservation
4. increase the capacity for field-based management of threatened ecosystems throughout the Western Indian Ocean via training and partnerships
5. measure, model, and use the socio-economic values of biodiversity to integrate conservation within future Government decisions on island development

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

There were **no** changes in the GEO or DOs during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project was relevant to both the GEF and National priorities at the time of approval. In terms of the former, the project is a key component of “Goal 1: General measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use” in the National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan for Seychelles (1997). In terms of the latter, the native avifauna of Seychelles is thought to be amongst the richest in the western Indian Ocean islands, as it shows both Asian and African ancestry. According to the PD, evolution in isolation has produced 15 species and 18 sub-species of birds unique to the country. The project focuses on the ecosystems of three of the four “critically endangered” taxa, all occupying important and threatened habitats (cf. pp 4-5).

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

The project received a satisfactory rating for effectiveness for having achieved its GEO, DOs, and project outcomes. According to the Implementation Completion Report (ICR), key information on globally threatened bird species and their ecosystems have been gathered and analyzed, leading to better management and information about necessary habitat improvement. The project developed a socio-economic assessment model to help rank islands for potential restoration and translocation of rare bird species; this model identified and analyzed institutional and economic criteria and identified financial mechanisms for sustainable conservation for the selected islands. Numerous cases of successful predator eradication programs and habitat restorations occurred, particularly on Frégate and Aride.

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

ICR did not engage in an analysis of the merits of the project vis-à-vis costs; however, the information provided was sufficient to determine that the project's efficient was satisfactory. Indeed, ICR notes that, "All original and additional project components were completed within the project budget and prior to the closing date" (5).

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

Sustainability is rated as likely, as there are no serious risks to the sustainability of the project outcomes. Sustainability is assessed along the following four dimensions:

- a) *Environmental sustainability (U/A)* – ICR does not provide sufficient information to provide a rating on environmental risks to sustainability.
- b) *Financial sustainability (L)* – According to ICR, project has identified financing from local NGO (BirdLife International) for continued monitoring, as well as enlisted support from the government and private island owners for habitat maintenance and other activities.
- c) *Institutional sustainability (L)* – Local NGO has committed itself to continue management of the translocated bird species, and other project outputs, for the benefits of local and international research communities (ICR, p 5).
- d) *Socio-Political sustainability (U/A)* – ICR does not provide sufficient information to rate the socio-political sustainability of the project.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Co-financing was provided both by the Seychelles Government and BirdLife Seychelles, a local NGO. There was no difference in the level of expected vs. actual co-financing. ICR does not mention whether or not co-financing was important to project's outcomes and/or sustainability. It does, however, state that it was "unlikely that BirdLife Seychelles [the local NGO] and Government would have been able to allocate any of their own scarce resources to finance any of the project components or to secure financing for this purpose without GEF assistance" (5).

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?

Due to the delay of five months between signing of all legal documentation and the start of physical implementation, the closing date of the project was extended to June 2002 (presumably, from January

2002). However, the delay positively affected the project’s outcome: according to ICR, “by joining an additional project and with the extension of the project closing date, BirdLife Seychelles [the local NGO and lead executing agency] was able to exceed planned achievements in the components of Initial Island Restoration and translocation Preparation and undertook the following additional activities: 1) Restoration of an island through habitat management; 2) Translocation of endemic taxa to a restored island” (pp 1-2).

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:

According to the PD, the country has set over 40 percent of its territory aside under nature protection, thus demonstrating its strong commitment to conserving and protecting its biodiversity. This, coupled with the fact that the project is a key component of the National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan for Seychelles (NBSAP), suggests that country ownership was high. No explicit mention was made in ICR, however, as to extent of country ownership.

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

The project’s monitoring and evaluation design at entry was rated as satisfactory. Project delineates outcomes to be achieved, as well as activities needed to achieve outcomes; objectives, outcomes, and activities have easily measurable indicators (cf. PD, pp 8-9). Furthermore, the local NGO, with the oversight of the project steering committee, was assigned to undertake project monitoring, which includes data on performance indicators, a mid-term review, a description and analysis of stakeholder participation in the project design and implementation, as well as an explanation of how the monitoring and evaluation results will be used to adjust the implementation of the project, if required, and/or to replicate project results throughout the region (PD, p 14). ICR noted project’s strong monitoring plans with clear indicators.

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

The project’s monitoring and evaluation system was rated as satisfactory. ICR mentions in passing that monitoring and evaluation system, whose design was deemed satisfactory, was also successfully implemented as well. Seven action plans for several ecosystems in ten islands were successfully implemented with the help of experts in aviculture and veterinarians.

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: Unable to Assess
--	---------------------------------

The quality of the World Bank’s project implementation was not rated because ICR does not provide sufficient information to assess the quality of its supervision and assistance.

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

ICR rated the quality of project execution as satisfactory. The local NGO was judged by ICR to have performed its role and responsibilities well, directly contributing to the overall quality of the project. Local NGO was deemed exceptionally competent and effective.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented,

sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

ICR does not report any change in environmental stress and status that occurred by the end of the project. The reason for this is largely due to the nature of biodiversity conservation projects, which generally aim to effect long-term environmental change.

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.

ICR does not report any change in socioeconomic well-being that occurred due to the project.

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* – Local NGO developed a number of capacities thanks to project, including scientific and managerial skills, database management, scientific monitoring, and biodiversity assessment. Furthermore, Ministry of Environment and Transport, Marine Parks Authority, Ministry of Tourism, National history Museum, and Seychelles Broadcasting Corporation have all been trained in ecosystems assessment and bird translocation techniques (ICR, p 3).

b) *Governance* – ICR does not mention how project activities contributed to any governance changes.

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.

According to the ICR, there were no unintended impacts of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to

these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

ICR does not mention any GEF initiatives that have been scaled up following project completion.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

1. The importance of recruiting and maintaining an experienced project coordinator remains a keystone for successful project implementation and smooth co-operation
2. Though implementing organizations can build expertise through a project, they should have existing capacity and intrinsic institutional strengths with perhaps international links in order to support the project at various stages
3. Proper selection of lead consultants is critical; recruitment process should not be rushed
4. Assigning a local NGO as leading the implementation of a major conservation project supported by significant multi-lateral funding, with the government as “ facilitator” in environmental management, can be a highly ingenious and successful model for the future
5. Conservation and restoration of remote tropical islands is difficult and problematic, requiring intensive planning and follow up, particularly by experienced practitioners

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

No recommendations were given in the ICR.

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?	ICR contains a substantial assessment of relevant outcomes and achievements of project. However, it fails to mention immediate impacts of the project; ICR also fails to mention long-term impacts, but that is to be expected due to the nature of biodiversity conservation projects	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	ICR is internally consistent and convincing; however, it is not comprehensive in either its analysis of project efficiency or sustainability, as mentioned above	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	ICR does not adequately assess project sustainability; while it briefly mentions financial and institutional risks, it fails to mention at all environmental and socio-political sustainability risks	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive, but not always supported by evidence	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Report includes actual project costs – both total and per activity; however, it does not break down actual co-financing used	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	ICR only perfunctorily assesses project M&E systems	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating: $0.3 * (4+3) + 0.1 * (3+4+4+3) = 3.5$

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