

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	7/28/05
GEF ID:	533		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Western Indian Ocean Islands Oil Spill Contingency Planning	GEF financing:	\$3.152	\$3.152
Country:	Regional – Comoros, Seychelles, Madagascar, Mauritius	Co-financing:	\$1.485	\$1.07
Operational Program:	OP10	Total Project Cost:	\$4.637	\$4.222
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	International Maritime Organization (IMO); International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA); South Africa; France (Reunion); private sector	Work Program date		7/01/98
		CEO Endorsement		11/24/1998
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		03/30/1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2003	Actual: 6/30/2004
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 4 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 5 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 year
Estimated duration:	Actual duration:	TE completion date: December 15, 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 3/22/2004	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 3 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			N/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	S	S	S
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	Likely	Likely	Likely
2.4. Monitoring and evaluation	N/A			S
2.5. Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? Yes. It was
--

comprehensive and covered to a satisfactory level all quality criteria. Particularly, the Project M&E systems can be considered good practice.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

From the Project Document: To limit the contamination of international waters and conserve globally significant marine and coastal biodiversity by:

- a) addressing the threat of oil spills in the West Indian Ocean;
- b) involving the private sector in utilizing technological advances to resolve transboundary concerns associated with such a threat; and
- c) developing a financing mechanism to sustain the national and regional capacity that the project will create to deal with oil spills.

These objectives were not revised during the course of project implementation.

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

From the Project Document: Specific project objectives were to:

- a) establish appropriate legal and institutional frameworks to ensure compliance with relevant international conventions;
- b) develop national and regional contingency planning processes;
- c) set up appropriate national and regional oil spill response capacity; and
- d) establish sustainable financial and institutional agreements and synergy through regional cooperation agreements (including South Africa and Reunion).

These objectives were not revised during the course of project implementation.

3.2 Outcomes

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

None included in the Project Document.

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE? From OED Evaluation Summary:**

"The most significant outcomes of the project were:

- ratification of key international conventions and their translation into national legislation;
- establishment of national capacity to respond to oil spills;
- generation of widespread public awareness of the risks of oil spills and the means to address them;
- fuel taxes to cover operating costs of project equipment;
- establishment of a regional cooperation mechanism; and
- successful handling of two small oil spills during project implementation.

Overall, project objectives were achieved at the national level and partially achieved at the regional level."

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

A Relevance

Rating: 5 (S)

- **In retrospect, were the project's objectives, its design, expected outcomes (original and/or modified) consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

Yes, the project is consistent with OP 10 Contaminant-based operational program multifocal area strategies.

B Effectiveness

Rating: 5 (S)

- I. **To what extent did the project achieve the expected outcomes as described in the project document?**

Rating:

No outcomes were included in the project document

- 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	Rating: 5(S)
Yes for the most part. Some issues still remained to be resolved such as long term financing for the regional center (short term has been resolved), and the disposal of oil collected from spills. Given the project overall outcomes a satisfactory rating can be justified.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: 5 (S)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an assessment of outcomes in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Where there any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems that delayed or affected in other ways the implementation of the project? 	
The OED review indicates that addressing the threat of oil spills has been achieved to the extent possible within the time frame and budget available i.e. efficiency was substantial.	

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

A Financial resources	Rating: 5 (S)
The ICR indicates that all countries have appointed permanent units within their ministries of environment focused on oil spill response. All have adopted a mechanism to finance the operation of these units, renew equipment, carry out regular exercises, etc. The government of Madagascar has pledged to finance the regional coordination mechanisms and the French Cooperation is providing funding to establish and operate the center for its first few years. Long term funding for this center still remains to be defined. OED's review indicates that the expectation of a financial arrangement between the countries (presumably to include the cost of the regional center) still remains to be realized.	
B Socio political	Rating: 5 (S)
Due to the nature of the project, the key stakeholders are the national and regional agencies associated with oil transportation and ocean resources management, and the private sector. OED's review indicates that oil and shipping industries played a role in developing and testing national and regional contingency plans and in training staff through IPIECA, however, it indicates that the sustainable institutional and financial arrangements between countries and the oil industry as expected at appraisal are not clear yet. The project generated widespread public awareness of the risks of oil spills and the means to address them assuring public support for taxes to maintain capacity.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 5 (S)
The ICR indicates that all the countries have ratified the relevant conventions, which provide strong incentives to maintain oil spill response capacity and have translated the provisions of the conventions into national legislation and regulations. As signatories to the International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation (OPRC) convention, the beneficiary countries are required to establish measures for dealing with pollution incidents, either nationally or in cooperation with other countries. In addition, participating countries are required to provide assistance to other countries in spills and have the right to be compensated from damage arising from oil spills, but compensation is dependent on the extent to which the country has maintained adequate capacity and equipment to respond to spills. This creates an additional incentive to maintain adequate capacity. All countries have appointed permanent units within their ministries of environment focused on oil spill response. All have adopted a mechanism to finance the operation of these units, renew equipment, carry out regular exercises, and the like. The ICR also indicates that the skills and commitment that have been developed at the Indian Ocean Commission (IOC) as project implementing agency are likely to be sustained because its operational units, carried out key functions of project management such as financial management and it is likely that these operating units will continue to apply their skills in executing new projects.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating:
N/A	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: 5 (S)
The ICR indicates that a follow-on project, the Western Indian Ocean Marine Electronic Highway and Coastal and Marine Protection Project now under preparation with support of the GEF, will bring the East African coastal countries of Mozambique, Tanzania, and Kenya into the regional oil spill response arrangements, in addition to establishing a marine electronic highway intended to guide ships through sensitive areas and to monitor the movements and activities of fishing and other vessels within countries' territorial waters. Including the East African coastal states in the regional oil spill contingency plan will enable	

all to fulfill their commitments under the Nairobi Convention to cooperate in responding to and preventing a pollution emergency. The project is expected to be presented to the Bank's Board during 2005.

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

<p>A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.? Rating: 5 (S)</p>
<p>The ICR indicates that monitoring indicators were well specified, but focused primarily on outputs rather than impacts. It indicated that this may have been appropriate, however, as information that could be used to measure the impact of a project whose aim was to reduce the damage from a low-frequency event does not exist. For example, data on key performance indicators that would measure the extent to which the project reduced threats to sensitive ecosystems—reduction in number of oil spills from ships, or reduction in the response time to a major oil spill accident—cannot be detected in a short time frame because major oil spills in the region have never occurred more frequently than every ten years or so.</p>
<p>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management? Rating: 5 (S)</p>
<p>The ICR indicated that the project underwent a few changes to adapt to new circumstances as this happened. This was the case for the reallocation of project funds to respond to new priorities. For example, the ICR indicates that funds were reallocated following the mid-term review to allow the purchase of seven additional sets of equipment to respond to an oil spill, two for Comoros to provide a set for each island, three for Madagascar (total of eight, one for each of five autonomous provinces, two for Tulear province, and one at the central level), and two for Mauritius, including one for Rodrigues. Funds were reallocated to allow purchase of communications equipment for Comoros and Madagascar, where communications proved to be a severe constraint hampering coordination among the various government departments expected to respond to oil spills. Funds were also reallocated for information campaigns to raise awareness among communities of the risks of oil spills and measures that could be taken to prevent them, and for studies. Finally, funds were provided to support the development of a specific oil spill contingency plan for Rodrigues, which planned to substantially increase its importation of oil to supply rapidly growing electricity production.</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered best practice?</p>

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
<p>In general useful lessons for other regional projects with asymmetrical capacities between countries</p>	<p>Some lessons made statements of the obvious and it would have been more useful for these lessons to focus instead on the how or what approaches worked best.</p>
<p>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered best practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</p>	
<p>From OED evaluation summary: "1. The ability of a regional body, the IOC, to coordinate project activities was a key factor in the relatively smooth implementation of a project spanning four countries at markedly different levels of development, as was the strong commitment of all four countries to the project objective. 2. The use of earmarked taxes for operating and maintaining project facilities gives reasonable assurance of project sustainability, which is often a weak point for GEF projects. 3. The project demonstrated that private sector support is desirable and possible for oil spill projects, though such support may have fallen short of appraisal expectations." From the ICR: 4. Pairing weaker countries with stronger ones in a regional project can help to quickly build the capacity of the weaker ones. For example, Mauritius and Seychelles, with much greater capacity, shared their knowledge and experience with Comoros and Madagascar.</p>	

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” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

4.7.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
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.

4.7.2 ratings	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Yes. OED indicates that the ICR presents a generally complete and balanced assessment of the project and its achievements.	5 (S)
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Yes, although the ICR does not discuss the issue of disposal of collected spilled oil.	5 (S)
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes	5 (S)
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes	5 (S)
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes	5 (S)
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	5 (S)

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: Yes	No:
Explain: It would be interesting to assess in a few years the sustainability of the outcomes vis a vis the current challenges to draw lessons on how they were resolved or not.		
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?		