

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
				Review date:	Oct., 23, 2006
GEF Project ID:	584		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$) <sup>1</sup>	
IA/EA Project ID:	UNEP-59	<b>GEF financing:</b>	<b>6.785</b>	<b>6.785</b>	
Project Name:	Global International waters Assessment (GIWA)	IA/EA own:		0.85	
Country:	Global	Government:			
		Other*:		9.2	
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	<b>7.334</b>	<b>10.05</b>	
Operational Program:	10	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	<b>14.119</b>	<b>16.835</b>	
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	University of Kalmar (Sweden)	Work Program date		11/01/1997	
		CEO Endorsement		02/01/1999	
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		April/1999	
		Closing Date	Proposed: 07/03/2003	Actual: June/2005	
Prepared by: André Aquino	Reviewed by: Antonio del Monaco and Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: <b>4 years and 3 months</b>	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: <b>6 years and 2 months</b>	Difference between original and actual closing: <b>1 year and 11 months</b>	
Author of TE: Jeffrey Alan Thornton		TE completion date: <b>June, 2006</b>	TE submission date to GEF OME: <b>07/05/2006</b>	Difference between TE completion and submission date: <b>1 month</b>	

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO 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). GEF EO 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 (UNEP EOU)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	S	MS	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	HS	S	MU

<sup>1</sup> These figures come from the TE, paragraph 56, where co-financing is discussed. The TE, however, does not present the actual project costs.

2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	U/A	S	S	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	MS	MS

**Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice?**

No. Even though the TE complies with GEF EO policies and is well-organized and well-written, the ratings seemed to be too generous, if based on the evidence presented by the TE itself. The outcomes should also been presented in a single section, for easy reference and not throughout the document. The Evaluation could also have benefited from more consultation with project's participants (not only in Sweden, but also at the regional and national level). Moreover, M&E issues should have been addressed with more detail, specifically how the monitoring of the project was conducted by the University of Kalmar.

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

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

**3.1 Project Objectives**

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

"To develop a comprehensive strategic assessment that may be used by GEF and its partners to identify priorities for remedial and mitigatory actions in international waters, designed to achieve significant environmental benefits, at national, regional and global levels."

Note that in the logframe, the objective was restated in a broader fashion, leading to questions of whether the outcomes of the project were expected to influence only the GEF decision-making or to serve as a tool for national governments to prioritize their interventions in IW, as observed by the TE.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?** To produce a fully comprehensive and integrated Global International Waters Assessment, encompassing the ecological status of and causes of environmental problems of transboundary freshwater basins and their associated coastal and ocean systems. The GIWA will undertake this from the perspectives of: water quality and quantity; associated biodiversity and habitats; their use by society; the societal causes of the regionally identified issues and problems; and scenarios of future conditions based on projections of demographic, economic and social changes associated with the process of human development.

Please note that the second formulation of the objective is broader than the first one. While the former focused on the GEF's use of the strategic assessment, the latter seems to be more ambitious and to aim at to influence decisions also the national and regional levels. The TE highlights that this variation in the way the objective is stated in different parts of the prodoc led to "tensions and disconnects in the project and its subsequent execution" (Paragraph 7).

**3.2 Outcomes and Impacts**

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

The main outcome is the result the reports produced by the project have had in terms of guiding GEF allocation priorities in IW. The causal chain analyses methodology has been adopted by the GEF at the IW programmatic level and two GEF interventions in IW in Latin America had their development and implementation guided by the GIWA studies Latin America, namely the Amazon Basin and La Plata River Basin projects. The global network created among IW experts is another outcome of the project.

Whereas the TE asserts that "the data compilations and syntheses can be utilized by countries to refine and define national research and management programs", The TE presents no evidence of

whether the methodology and knowledge created by the project are used at the national level for prioritizing IW interventions.

Since this is a study and research project, the main output is the production and dissemination of the reports. The main GIWA report is the *Challenges to International Waters: Regional Assessments in a Global Perspective*. According to the TE, from the 66 expected regional and subregional reports, only 27 were published (printed or in electronic format). One thematic paper has also been published. The reports not yet published are at different stages of preparation.

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

##### 4.1 Outcomes

###### A Relevance

Rating: MS

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

According to the TE, this project was very relevant to give better direction to GEF interventions, to prioritize and promote a common understanding among relevant parties about the issues at stake and how to go about them.

###### B Effectiveness

Rating: MS

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

Yes, to a certain extent. According to the TE, the project has been able to influence GEF programming in IW by introducing the chain cause methodology and guiding the development and implementation of two GEF IW projects (Amazon Basin and La Plata River Basin). However, it is not clear whether the project has been able to influence decision-making at the national level and in GEF's partner institutions, UNCSD and ACC Sub-committees on Ocean and Water Resources. The dissemination of most of the outputs has not been done. A great deal of the regional/sub-regional and thematic paper also still needs to be finalized.

###### C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MU

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts 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? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?**

According to the TE, the project resorted to existing knowledge and data and to the voluntary work of IW experts. It has been able to leverage over U\$10Mi in co-financing, both cash and in-kind funds were used to offset the costs of meetings, rather than contracting the services. These savings, however, may also have led to a decrease in the potential quality of the outputs and to problems in implementation of the project. For example, the self-selected (voluntary) nature of work of many contributors to the project led to delays and to some pieces of data's being overlooked. The implementation problems at the beginning also had financial consequences: the 'false start' due to the unfeasibility of the methodology proposed at first (which the TE does not discuss) resulted in overall delays in the projects and in some outputs' not being achieved. This methodology could have been better refined with the \$0.29 million provided for the PDF B phase to reduce the possibility of "false start" situations.

The cost-effectiveness is also reduced by the fact that less than half of the regional and sub-regional reports and thematic papers have not yet been finalized, despite an overall cost of the project of \$16.8 million (including the \$6.785 million GEF grant) and the project duration of over six years (2 years over the initial expected duration).

##### Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

No direct environmental impacts in terms of water quality, fish stocks or other water biodiversity impacts are expected from this project as it is mostly a research project.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
GEFSEC is likely to continue using the methodology proposed by GIWA, which involves no financial input. However, it is not clear whether the unfinished outputs will be finalized and disseminated and who would bear those costs.	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
N/A	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
The TE indicates that it is not clear whether the information compiled by GIWA is going to be updated and who would be responsible for that.	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
N/A	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>1. Production of a public good</b>	The reports are available to the public domain and could inform interventions in IW, both by the GEF itself and by GEF partners and national governments.
<b>2. Demonstration</b>	N/A
<b>3. Replication</b>	N/A
<b>4. Scaling up</b>	N/A

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

<b>A. In retrospection, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
The indicators identified in the logframe were practicable and the TE used them to make its assessment. The TE also inferred other indicators (process indicators, stress reduction indicators and environmental indicators) from the prodoc, noting that the implementation of GIWA "predates the GEF requirement for the identification of monitoring and evaluation indicators. The TE does not make it clear, however, how the day-to-day of the M&E was done at the University of Kalmar.	
<b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
According to the TE, the highly critical mid-term evaluation led to 'serious and critical changes' the direction of the project, leading to improved results. The TE, however, does not identify what these changes were. It contends that "The criticisms offered during this process appeared to be influential in shifting the emphasis of the GIWA project, and guiding the project to a successful	

conclusion. This review provided an important mid-course correction that allowed the project to successfully complete its objectives. Consequently, in terms of the final products generated by the GIWA project, the monitoring and evaluation process provided valuable guidance in achieving this outcome, albeit following at least one "false start."

**C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?**

**Rating: U/A.** TE does not provide information on the M&E budget.

**Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? U/A**

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

**What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?**

- The "lag time" involved in assembling the project team should be built into the project timeline, especially in cases where new staff are being sought for the conduct of a project.
- While using voluntary work is a cost-effective way of achieving outputs, there is a trade-off with project timeliness and quality. The scope of participation is limited to those individuals who have the time, interest and ambition to participate, who may not have the skills needed to provide the required quality reports on time.
- In a research project, the methodology to be pursued should be developed before project starts or the project should be divided in two phases: one for the development of the methodology and the other for its implementation. That is a way to avoid the delays that may result from the absence of an agreed-upon research methodology.

**4.6 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.

**4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings**

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.

N/A

**4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report**

**Ratings**

**A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?**

MS

The project does present the main outcomes and outputs. However, it does not present sufficient evidence of whether GIWA outputs have influenced decision-making at the local level and in GEF's partner institutions, UNCSD and ACC Sub-committees on Ocean and Water Resources.

**B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?**

MS

Evidences of main assertions are given (such as the two examples of GEF projects developed and implemented with the guidance of GIWA). However, the ratings do not seem to reflect this evidence, being at time too generous. For instance, it rates the attainment of outputs and activities as satisfactory, even

though a great deal out the output has not been achieved.	
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> Sustainability is explored, mainly vis-à-vis GEFSec. However, TE should have presented more evidence of how GEF partner institutions view the project and its possible continuation (including the finalization of the reports and dissemination of outputs).	MU
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Yes, lessons learned were presented and substantiated.	S
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Co-financing is discussed, but not project costs and expenditures.	MU
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The report indicates the positive result of the Mid-term evaluation in terms of changing the direction of the project. The M&E system, however, is not discussed. This was particularly important since most regional and sub-regional reports were not completed by project closure.	MU

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

<b>Yes:</b>	<b>No:</b>
X	

Explain: It would not cost a lot to analyze whether GEFSEC programming in IW has indeed changed following the GIWA. It would also be interesting to see whether the allocation in IW have followed the priority areas highlighted by the GIWA. If budget allows, it would also be interesting to see whether national governments have used GIWA's inputs to program their IW interventions.

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

Terminal Evaluation of the "Global International Waters Assessment"; UNEP EOU Assessment of project ratings and performance using the TE report for the Global International Waters Assessment project; GIWA project Document, GIWA 2004 PIR.