

### GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	27 Sept 2005
GEF ID:	592		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Conservation And Sustainable Use of the Barrier Reef Complex	GEF financing:	US\$5.355M	US\$5.355M
Country:	Belize	Co-financing:	US\$2.015M	US\$2.015M
Operational Program:	2	Total Project Cost:	US\$7.370	US\$7.370
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute (CZMAI)	Work Program date		1997
		CEO Endorsement		1 Nov 1998
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		May 1 1999
		Closing Date 31 <sup>st</sup> July 2004	Proposed: 31 <sup>st</sup> July 2004	Actual: 31 <sup>st</sup> July 2004
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 5 years 3 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 5 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 3 months
Author of TE: L. Hildebrand et al		TE completion date: November 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: 6/21/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 8 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	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2.2 Project outcomes	<b>S</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MS</b>
2.3 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MU</b>
2.4. Monitoring and evaluation	<b>N/A</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MU</b>
2.5. Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>S</b>

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? Not applicable

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

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

To secure options and existence values embodied in the second largest barrier reef in the world. To enable effective conservation of coastal and marine resource through effective planning for the coastal zone and establishment of marine protected areas.

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

- **What are the Development Objectives?**

Same as above

- **Any changes during implementation?**

No

#### 3.2 Outcomes

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

1. Consolidate capacity to effectively integrate biodiversity conservation concerns into a Coastal Zone Policy Framework;
2. The Belize Barrier Reef Marine Protected Area Network is established and fully functional;
3. Caye development plans are integrated with marine biodiversity conservation concerns through a demonstration project;
4. A sustainable financing mechanism for marine biodiversity conservation is established and operational;
5. Legal and regulatory capacities for facilitating bioprospecting agreements are in place; and
6. Training, awareness-raising and information dissemination activities garner public support for biodiversity conservation through coastal zone management and the barrier reef protected area network.

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

Same as above.

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

#### 4.1 Outcomes

##### A Relevance

**Rating: MS**

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

The project was consistent with the objectives of OP2. National commitment to Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) was demonstrated in the previous project. Although with many competing priorities for the Government of Belize (GOB) it did not transmit clear signals on the shape and form of its support to the project / program.

TE states that the project objectives and implementation strategy were relevant and pertinent to the threats and opportunities identified in the project document. However, there were two exceptions:

- Options for achievement of sustainable financing for ICZM institutions – the Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute (CZMAI) were not given sufficient attention in the project design and constrained to a degree by the logical framework. Rather than focusing on building capacity of the CZMAI for sustainable finance the project sought to identify a 'single' funding mechanism;
- The choice of a Board of Directors (BOD) as the project steering committee was an error in project design that was not corrected during implementation. The BOD did not function effectively during implementation as the chair did not rotate and therefore did not instill ownership. Furthermore the requirement for a quorum meant that many issues constantly went unresolved.

##### B Effectiveness

**Rating: MS**

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

**Rating: MS**

The TE rates the overall project outcome performance as 'marginally satisfactory' –

Outcome 1: Consolidate capacity to effectively integrate biodiversity conservation concerns into a Coastal Zone Policy Framework

- Although during the project satisfactory progress was made with building capacity of the CZMAI, immediately follow closure of the project the CZMAI lost almost all of its capacity and was effectively closed down. The TE rated the outcome 'unsatisfactory'

Outcome 2: The Belize Barrier Reef Marine Protected Area Network is established and fully functional

- The project allowed many 'paper parks' to move toward functioning Protected Areas. Previous to the project only 2.3% of protected areas were functional – by the project end 51.5% were operational. This includes 7 new protected areas established under the project. The physical and human infrastructure is largely in place and in the post-project phase the challenge is now to maintain it. The Protected Areas had financing until April 2005, a fee collection system was being developed but the level of activity is uncertain. Marine PA Advisory Committees were established in 5 out of 7 Protected Areas supported by the project. The TE rated the outcome 'satisfactory'.

Outcome 3: Caye development plans are integrated with marine biodiversity conservation concerns through a demonstration project

- Caye development plans were developed and some communities were going ahead to implement them. However, the plans were never approved by the BOD of the CZMAI or the GOB. The TE rated this component 'satisfactory'

Outcome 4: A sustainable financing mechanism for marine biodiversity conservation is established and operational

- Options were developed for sustainable financing however, the project design greatly underestimated the resources needed to achieve sustainable finance. It focused on identifying a mechanism (or process) as opposed to implementing the ideas that seemed more feasible in a timely and efficient manner. There was an assumption the staff of the CZMAI would have the time to implement sustainable finance – this assumption proved to be erroneous. The project closed with no sustainable financing mechanism for Marine Protected Areas and CZMAI. This resulted in the mothballing of the CZMAI as it reduced staff from 27 to 7. It currently has no CEO or Director in place and the BOD has become completely inactive. The TE rated the outcome 'unsatisfactory'

Outcome 5: Legal and regulatory capacities for facilitating bio-prospecting agreements are in place

- Legislative and institutional arrangements are being finalized. A draft legal framework was shared with stakeholders. Recommendations for establishment of a bio-prospecting trust fund to provide benefits to communities is on hold. The Fisheries Department indicated it could not support bio-prospecting as the legislation that is proposed does not give it managerial authority. The drafts are awaiting approval on the inactive BOD of the mothballed CZMAI. The TE rated the component 'unsatisfactory'

Outcome 6: Training, awareness-raising and information dissemination activities garner public support for biodiversity conservation through coastal zone management and the barrier reef protected area network.

- Public information and education component of the project was widely acclaimed by target groups such as fishermen, local communities and tourism stakeholders. The general knowledge of biodiversity, ICZM and need for environmental action has increased. User groups are now better able to make informed decisions on the use of coastal resources to ensure sustainable livelihoods. The project also built a GIS and data center to inform management planning, CZMAI was involved in EIA, construction planning and coastal development application. Two major sectors saw improvement as a result of training and awareness building – tourism and fisheries. Key deficiencies were lack of awareness raising among GOB officials for addressing long-term ICZM issues. Furthermore, much of training and capacity building invested in the CZMAI has now been lost due to the lack of post-project funding sustainability. The TE rated the component 'satisfactory'.

Overall the project was rated U in 3 outcomes and S in 3 outcomes. Therefore, a rating of Marginally Satisfactory is appropriate.

**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: S**

The TE rated the project outcomes as 'marginally satisfactory'. The rating is commensurable with the problems the project intended to address and the findings specified in (I) above.

**C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)** **Rating: MU**

- 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**

<b>delayed or affected in other ways the implementation of the project?</b>
The TE stated: Although the annual project reports indicated that there were problems with timely disbursements at the beginning of the project, all project funds were expended by project's end. Co-financing commitments have been largely honored. Yet, the situation encountered at the time of evaluation indicates that the cost-effectiveness of the project investment has been low (equivalent to MU rating above). The CZMAI is a non-functional institution at present, and the technical capacity and experience developed during the project is now largely gone from the Agency, but not necessarily from Belize. Some project benefits remain, including public awareness, species research, the library collection, the system of functioning marine protected areas, the coastal zone management strategy, and draft guidelines for coastal development.

**4.2 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: U</b>
<p>The project failed to establish sustainable (sources) of finance for both the CZMAI and the Marine Protected Area system. Therefore the short to medium term financial sustainability is 'unlikely'. This is in line with the U rating given to outcome 4 (see I above). However, in the longer term the main sources of sustainable financing – tourism and fisheries have a potential to provide finance through user fees system (yet to be effectively developed).</p> <p>The TE stated: the risks to institutional and financial sustainability were apparent mid-way through the project and UNDP should have intervened more firmly with respect to obliging the Government of Belize to resolve these issues. While recognizing the inherent sensitivities in working closely with a partner government and acknowledging UNDP's repeated efforts to make its views known to the Government of Belize, its approach was perhaps too conservative. There should have been in place a firm process of handing over responsibility from the donor to the Government with clear checks and accountability measures along the way. As a partner in development, UNDP's role needs to be both the provider of incentives (e.g., financial support and professional business management) and the agent of accountability (for results and country ownership and ability to withhold or re-direct funds).</p> <p>The main conclusion to be drawn is that UNDP could (and should) have been more proactive in its capacity as Implementing Agency, to address the shortcomings within GOB and the CZMAI.</p>	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>The project carried out a significant amount of training within the GOB and other stakeholder and raised the awareness of biodiversity and coastal and marine resource management issues. Stakeholder participation was also rated 'highly satisfactory'. The CZMAI invested significant time in building alliances with coastal communities, other GOB departments as well as negotiating with private sector investors and conducting research. The Belize civil society such as Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT), Belize Audubon were all involved with ICZM planning processes. The communities were involved through Community Advisory Committees (CACs) which created a conduit for community involvement in ICZM planning and implementation which did not exist before. However, with the collapse of CZMAI much of the alliance building stands to be lost. Furthermore, senior GOB officials are not as aware of the ICZM as they could be. Hence, the rating of moderately likely is appropriate.</p>	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<p>Despite the significant project investment in institutional capacity building, the CZMAI has proved to be unsustainable and was mothballed immediately after the project ended. This is a familiar project 'disease' – Much of the institutional capacity has been lost, but as the TE points out – it has not been lost from Belize. Hence, there is an opportunity to re-gain the institutional capacity if sustainable financing can be secured. The project assisted the GOB produce draft Caye development policy (2003) and draft coastal development guidelines (2003) as well as setting and standardizing a Marine Protected Area entrance fee. The Cayes development policy and coastal development guidelines remain to be approved by the CZMAI BOD – which is currently not functioning. At the local level the project provided support to the CACs which have enabled communities to become involved in the governance of marine Protected Areas. However, overall because of the lack finance and financing mechanisms the institutional frameworks enabled by the project are currently not on a sustainable footing. Therefore, the rating is presently 'moderately unlikely'.</p>	
<b>D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>The project has improved the protection of the marine and coastal resources through the creation of 7 new marine Protected Areas. Furthermore, 51.5% of all Marine Protected Areas are now operational and</p>	

patrolled. Stakeholders such as fishermen and tour operators are more aware of the need to conserve and manage resources. The TE reported that there have been improvements in management and reduction in illegal fishing and poor tourism practices. Hence, the ecological sustainability is rated moderately likely. This would have been rated 'likely' but concerns over the institutional and financial sustainability prevents this and in the long term these problems will have to be resolved in order to improve the ecological sustainability.

**E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability** **Rating: ML**

The TE stated:  
The Sibun watershed education project is an excellent example of community-based stakeholder participation as well as the effective merging of technical assistance and public education components of the CZMAI. It could be replicated in other communities.

The 'SHARK' (SHARing Reef Knowledge) Network developed and supported by UNDP-GEF for coral reef projects it supports has the potential to be a valuable forum for projects to learn from each other. This will minimize 're-inventing of wheels' and disseminate best practice and conditions for success.

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

**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: MU**

The TE rated the M&E system as 'satisfactory' and stated:

The development and maintenance of a truly useful and comprehensive monitoring program for the Belize coastal zone and Barrier Reef would represent a huge cost for any one agency or program. The project has taken several steps to build the capacity for baseline and ongoing monitoring, research and data management. These are essential elements for informed management decisions. Many Belizean agencies looked to the Institute for technical and scientific information and analysis. CZMAI is one of only two GIS-equipped offices within Government and the data centre had great capacity for assisting partners with planning, assessment and educational activities. It was also a potentially strong revenue generator. The CZMAI, once reconstituted, should continue to develop its excellent data management and GIS systems and also evaluate and conduct a market feasibility study / needs assessment to determine the potential of an enhanced GIS capacity as a revenue-generating component of the program.

The positive partnership with the Institute of Marine Studies (IMS) at the University of Belize should also be encouraged to enhance its applied research component especially as the academic faculty and degree program are moved into the IMS.

A rating of 'moderately unsatisfactory' is given here because the monitoring system set up by the CZMAI is currently moribund and will remain so unless funding is secured to revitalize the CZMAI. Capacity for monitoring the reef was built by the project and sustained while the project was under implementation – however, this is all meaningless if it collapses after the project finishes.

**B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?** **Rating: U**

The fact that issues surrounding sustainable financing were known from the outset and little was done to actively address the issue indicates that adaptive management was not practiced effectively. If it had been it is likely the project would have tried to instigate some solution to the financial and institutional sustainability issues – it did not.

**Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No**

#### 4.4 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
The project lessons are detailed and relate strongly to the findings. Many can be used to develop more effective approaches	It is surprising that a key lesson on the 'project mode' of delivery was not developed. The experience seems to fundamentally question the 'project' as a method for delivering sustainable environmental and development benefits.
<b>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?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial sustainability - with specific, verifiable indicators at defined points in the project life - must be the priority focus of any such project, acknowledging the magnitude of the effort that will be required and assigning adequate resources for its fulfillment.</li> <li>• Good governance and stewardship of the institution is a must, and the inclusion and effective mobilization of civil society is essential to achieving this.</li> <li>• The approach to ICZM that Belize has adopted through the establishment of the CZM Authority and Institute which focuses on coordination, planning and policy development, advising, collaborating and monitoring, rather than on regulatory or permitting functions, is a sound approach that should be emulated.</li> <li>• The high point of the CZM Strategy adopted in Belize is that it details a participatory process for decision making over the use of the coastal resources to ensure that the economic benefits are closely linked with equitable allocation and sustainable use. This approach is an important model for other countries in the region and other related projects.</li> <li>• The importance of scientific knowledge and actionable data as essential inputs for guiding the adaptive management of natural resources and biodiversity conservation.</li> <li>• Projects that look at financing options for biodiversity conservation must be designed with a specific advocacy component to address not only the user or stakeholders, but also importantly the policy and decision makers (governments).</li> <li>• In future UNDP/GEF-supported projects, a much clearer and firmer contractual obligation should be in place with recipient countries, to ensure that transition from donor-supported project, to government-supported program is ensured. A series of successive indicators of financial sustainability during the life of the project would help to track the situation.</li> <li>• While a solid logical framework is crucial to organizing and structuring the project and for creating accountability, it can also become an obstacle to creative analysis and thinking. Thus, specific activities need to be planned to encourage staff to think outside the box, question logic, and develop intuition. These are essential skills for adaptive management, especially when a project is creating an institution.</li> </ul>	

**4.5 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.

<b>4.5.1 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.
NA

<b>4.5.2 ratings</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	5

B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	5
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	5
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	2
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	5

**4.6 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.?

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

GEF (2003) Belize: Local Benefits Case Study. GEFOME. Washington DC.