

### GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
				Review date:	6/28/05
GEF ID:	530		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)	
Project Name:	Implementation of the SAP of the Pacific Small Island Developing States	GEF financing:	\$12.0000		N/A
Country:	Regional: Cook Islands, Fiji, Niue, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Salomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu.	Co-financing:	\$8.1184		N/A
Operational Program:	OP9	Total Project Cost:	\$20.1184		N/A
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:		Work Program date		07/01/98	
		CEO Endorsement		01/18/2000	
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)			
		Closing Date	Proposed: 11/30/04	Actual: 1/05	
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and initial closing: 4 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: Same	Difference between initial and actual closing: 0	
Estimated duration: 5 years	Actual duration: 5 years	TE completion date: 3/2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 12/1/2004	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 9 months	

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	No rating	N/A	N/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	No rating	N/A	S
2.3 Project	N/A	No rating	N/A	MU

sustainability				
2.4. Monitoring and evaluation	<b>N/A</b>	No rating	<b>N/A</b>	U
2.5. Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? No. Some statements are not well substantiated with clear evidence and examples.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives / changes during implementation?**

To achieve global benefits by developing and implementing measures to conserve, sustainably manage and restore coastal and oceanic resources in the Pacific Region (ProDoc).

- **What are the Development Objectives / changes during implementation?**

There are four immediate objectives essential for the implementation of the SAP (Pro Doc):

- 1: To enhance transboundary management mechanisms.
- 2: To enable the conservation and sustainable use of coastal and watershed resources.
- 3: To enable the conservation and sustainable yield of ocean living resources.
- 4: To maximize regional benefits from lessons learned through community-based participation and to catalyze donor participation.

The TE indicated that the project went through a series of changes during implementation. The project manager at inception noted that the relationship between the activities, Immediate Objectives, Outputs and Activities, the UNDP Input Budget, the UNDP Output Budget and the Logical Framework was not clear. Therefore, the objectives had to be redefined and the new objectives were:

- 1: To establish effective project implementation support
- 2: To enhance trans-boundary management mechanisms
- 3: To conserve and sustainably use coastal and watershed resources
- 4: To support the establishment of new institutional arrangements for the conservation and management of trans-boundary fish stocks and associated national capacities
- 5: To maximize regional benefits of lessons learned from management of oceanic, coastal and watershed resources; and to catalyze donor support for conservation and sustainable oceanic, coastal and watershed management initiatives.

The TE report contains an assessment of objective 4 only, which is the Oceanic Fisheries management (OFM) objective

- **What were the key expected outcomes and impacts indicated in the project document?**

The Prodoc indicates that “At the end of the project, a series of pilot projects in the area of integrated coastal and watershed management will have demonstrated best practices and appropriate methodologies for sustainable management of freshwater resources, management of Marine Protected Areas, and sustainable management of coastal zone fisheries. Sustainability and replicability will be an important feature of these pilot projects, and they will provide an operational framework for targeted proposals prepared as part of the SAP process. The project will also ensure the sustainable harvesting of the oceanic fish stocks. The project will build capacity of the participating countries to develop and implement regional fisheries management programs and agreements (this includes legal issues). At the end of the project, its sustainability will be ensured by strengthening existing national and regional coordinating mechanisms, which are inter-ministerial in nature. The project will have assessed options for creating financial and institutional sustainability, undertaken consultations and held a donor conference to secure necessary further investments.”

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

According to the TE the project objective “to enable the conservation and sustainable yield of

ocean living resources”, was changed to “support the establishment of new institutional arrangements for the conservation and management of trans-boundary fish stocks and associated national capacities”. The TE indicated that the original objective could not have been expected to be achieved because it went beyond the boundaries of the project. On the other hand, the TE team believes that the new objective has been achieved. The TE indicated that the outputs targeted by the project included capacity building for the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), maximizing regional benefits from tuna and by-catch, improved fish monitoring capability, improved fisheries management capabilities, development of regional surveillance/enforcement activity and strengthened consultative processes for FFA countries.

#### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

<b>A Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: 5 (S)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>In retrospect, were the project’s objectives, its design, expected outcomes (original and/or modified) consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain</b></li> </ul>	
<p>Yes, the project is consistent with OP9 strategies for SIDS because the project objectives targeted coastal area management and biodiversity, sustainable management of regional fish stocks, and watersheds. There was no mention of the development of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) preceding the SAP, which may have been needed to better structure the SAP. The TE indicates that the Ocean Fisheries Management (OFM) Component contributed to the objective of OP#8.</p>	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: 5 (S)</b>
<b>I. To what extent did the project achieve the expected outcomes as described in the project document?</b>	<b>Rating: 5 (S)</b>
<p>The achievement of the expected outcomes was satisfactory. Regarding objective 4, UNDP indicated in their 2004 PIR overview report for IW, that the project contributed to the signing of the Convention on the Conservation and management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean in June 2004. The TE report was completed three months before (in March 2004) so this outcome was not reflected in the TE report. Regarding other expected outcomes in the project document related to objective 4, the TE indicates that the project contributed to enhance the capacity of Pacific Island States to participate effectively in the work of the Multilateral High Level Conference (to develop the Tuna Convention) and similar international negotiation events and to set up a strong monitoring and control regime within the Tuna Commission. The TE also indicates that the monitoring capacity was enhanced and some participating countries implemented national port sampling programs.</p>	
<b>II. Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? Explain</b>	<b>Rating: 4 (MS)</b>
<p>Partly. The project objectives had to be modified. The TE indicates that although the project addressed the root causes of the problems as determined in the LogFrame, namely “Lack of monitoring and enforcement of regulations” and “Lack of trained staff for surveillance”, these were not the main focus as the project centered predominantly on the preparation for and participation in the Multilateral High Level Conference (MHLC) and Preparatory Conference for the development of the Tuna Convention together with scientific research for management. As a result several activities under the revised objective 4 were not accomplished according to the TE. For example, the fishery management capacity of national fishery administrations in participating countries still remains the area of greatest need. The TE also indicates that the project did not implement demonstration projects that address issues associated with the long-term sustainability of coastal fisheries, nor did it develop criteria for the selection of these sites as was envisaged under the revised objective 4.</p>	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: 5 (S)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Was the project cost – effective? Include an assessment of outcomes in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times.</b></li> </ul>	

Given that the project contributed to the signing of the Convention on the Conservation and management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, it could be said that the outcome for objective 4 has been cost effective. The TE provides information on the use of funds for objective. To implement the activities under this objective, \$3.5 million were used (\$1.915 for the Forum Fisheries Agency and \$1.526 for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and, according to the TOR for the terminal evaluation, \$6.3 million of cofinancing from these two agencies).

**4.4 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: 3 (MU)</b>
The TE indicates that inadequate resources are being made available by Governments to develop fisheries management and research capacity. Instead, there is a tendency to rely extensively on regional assistance programs, mainly from the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) who are themselves constrained in their efforts to meet the numerous requests for assistance from member countries. This reliance on external funding support is untenable in the long term since the fisheries sector is a major revenue earner for the Governments and it makes sense to reinvest some of this revenue in the administration and management of the sector to ensure its control and sustainability.	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: 3 (MU)</b>
The TE indicates that stakeholder involvement in the project has been fairly weak in most aspects and both the FFA and the SPC acknowledge the low level of stakeholder involvement and the almost total absence of participation by the public, NGOs and the private sector. Therefore, the socio political dimension of sustainability is compromised.	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: 4 (MS)</b>
The signing of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean provides some institutional and governance sustainability. The TE indicates that capacity building has been the most significant benefit of the project, however sustainability is not assured since it may not be easy to retain the trained, skilled personnel in government. The TE indicates that the need for a follow-up project is almost an indication that the project results are unlikely to be sustained without the further intervention.	
<b>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
N/A	
<b>E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
The TE indicates that the the OFM component “is a unique intervention in the Pacific region and there is neither the potential nor the need to replicate it in the region. SPREP [South Pacific Regional Environment Programme] agrees that the extent of replicability in the region is minimal”.	

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

<b>A. Effective M&amp;E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&amp;E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?</b>	<b>Rating: 2 (U)</b>
The TE indicates that the was an excellent baseline study however, the majority of the performance indicators adopted for the OFM Component were not verifiable objectively and they were not much help either to those implementing the project or to those performing the TE.	
<b>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?</b>	<b>Rating: 1 (HU)</b>
The TE indicates that monitoring and evaluation have not been used effectively as a management tool to obtain accountability or measure progress or to direct the implementation. Furthermore, the TE indicates that “Audits, regular reports and other results of monitoring by FFA and SPC did not elicit any formal reactions from either SPREP or UNDP, therefore no adjustments were thought to be needed.”	

#### 4.6 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

Strengths	Weaknesses
	Most of the lessons in the report were obvious lessons, such as for example: The ProDoc must identify both potential risks and measures to be taken to minimize or manage these risks. “for monitoring to be useful and effective, it must be two-way, there must be feedback.”
<b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered best practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TE found that there is a need for better understanding of GEF processes and objectives, among current and prospective stakeholders as most of those consulted were totally unaware of the GEF focus on global environmental benefits. A GEF Workshop, perhaps conducted back-to-back with some other regional event, could be very beneficial for future projects.</li> </ul>	

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

	Ratings
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Partially. The report contains an assessment of the Ocean Fisheries Management component but lacked more evidence to substantiate the assessments as discussed below .	4 (MS)
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> No. Evidence is not complete to substantiate the TE statements and there are no ratings. For example, did not provide concrete examples of how the capacity of Pacific Island States has been enhanced to participate effectively in the Multilateral High level Conference, specific outcomes of the enhanced monitoring and national port sampling programs, or enhanced financial benefits for participating countries from foreign and domestic fishing fleet management (aside from Vanuatu).	3 (MU)
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> Yes. Refer to 4.4	5 (S)
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> No. Please refer to section 4.6 above. The TE missed an opportunity to provide more meaningful lessons based on the project failures to avoid similar situations from happening in the future.	2 (U)
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Only for the fisheries component related activities but the requirement from the TOR for the TE only required an assessment of this component.	5 (S)
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> Yes	5 (S)
<b>Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>	
In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with	

**any comments about the project.**

It is important to mention that the TE was dated (as per the cover page) March 2004, and it was conducted during the first quarter of 2004, before the entry into force of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean on June 19, 2004. The 2004 PIR IW overview report from UNDP indicates that Tuna Management Plans have been drafted and adopted by the majority of participating countries and that monitoring capacity of fisheries continues to be strengthened and national and regional benefits from the fishery continue to improve as well as data management capacity at the Forum Fisheries Agency. UNDP's 2004 PIR overview report indicates that the project activities contributed to all these outcomes and results but this attributions has not been verified independently.

**4.8 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

**Yes:**

**No: X**

Explain:

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No