

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:		597	Review date: Dec 27, 2007	
IA/EA Project ID:		2215	at endorsement (Million US\$)	
Project Name:		Building Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA)	GEF financing:	16.22
		IA/EA own:	3.15	16.22
Country:		Government:	3.31	23.85
(Cambodia, China, DPR Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Thailand and Vietnam)		Other*:	5.86	0.97
		Total Cofinancing	12.32	24.82
Operational Program:		Total Project Cost:	28.54	41.04
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	IMO International Maritime Organization	Work Program date		Nov 1, 1998
		CEO Endorsement		NA
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Oct 1, 1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: September 2004	Actual: December 2006
Prepared by: Alejandro Imbach	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 60 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 86 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 26 months
Author of TE:	Gunnar Kullenberg Cielito Habito Kem Lowry	TE completion date: April 2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: December 2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 8 months

* 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

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	HS	HS	N/A	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	HS	N/A	UA
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	HS	N/A	UA
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

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

No. The document presents good evidence to substantiate findings and some ratings. However, project sustainability was not adequately addressed. Similarly there were gaps in discussion on the M&E system and co-financing.

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

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the project appraisal document (PAD) the global environmental objective of the project is to enable the East Asian Seas Region to collectively protect and manage its coastal and marine environment through inter-governmental and intersectoral partnerships.

The TE presents a slightly different Objective: Building intergovernmental, interagency and intersectoral partnerships to strengthen environmental management capabilities at the local, national and regional levels, and develop the collective capacity to implement appropriate strategies and environmental action programmes on self-reliant basis

The differences are not substantive.

- **What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the PAD the development objective of the project was to protect the life support systems and enable the sustainable use and management of coastal and marine resources through intergovernmental, interagency and intersectoral partnerships, for the improved quality of life in the East Asian Seas (EAS) Region.

There were no changes during project implementation.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?**
- *Integrated Coastal Management Demonstration Sites.* Six demonstration ICM sites have been developed as planned. In addition 18 parallel sites in five countries have been developed using the PEMSEA ICM design, but without PEMSEA financial support. At the longest operating sites, such as Xiamen, there are measurable improvements in environmental and socio-economic conditions.
- *Risk Assessment.* In addition to the ICM sites, PEMSEA is addressing trans-boundary environmental issues in the Gulf of Thailand and pollution “hotspots” in Manila Bay and Bohai Sea.
- *Human Resource Development.* PEMSEA organized 72 trainings for more than 1,400 trainees—thus substantially exceeding its goals for the period.
- *Regional Networks/Regional Task Force.* PEMSEA has created networks of experts, of local governments and a Regional Task Force (RTF) of experts which, when taken together, firmly link the national ICM sites into a regional partnership. The creation of networks has helped establish a critical mass of expertise. A core base of practical experiences of ICM practices has been developed. Linkages and partnership agreements have been created with universities and other research institutions. Scientific communities are exposed to needs of management via these networks.
- *Investment Opportunities for Environmental Improvement.* PEMSEA has sought to generate potential public-private partnerships (PPP). In spite of major efforts by PEMSEA, PPPs are the weakest component of its efforts to generate diverse resources, although the results at Xiamen demonstrate that such partnerships for funding environmental infrastructure and resource protection can be created given time and enabling conditions.
- *Scientific Support for Improved Management.* The networking of universities and other research institutions facilitated by PEMSEA is one mechanism to strengthen research capabilities and encourage sharing of facilities and specialized skills at the regional level. Scientific expertise and skills are available in the region to support the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA). The Multidisciplinary Experts Group (MEG) has provided scientific insight and highlighted the importance of maintaining a balance between economic development and environmental capacity. Policy studies have generated increased understanding of the scientific dimensions and the complexities of key coastal and marine issues.

- *Integrated Information Management System (IIMS)*. PEMSEA supports the development of integrated information management systems (IIMS). An IIMS has been developed at each ICM site and PEMSEA continues to provide training, updated software and technical assistance to each site. The types of management support offered by IIMS vary among the sites, but the ultimate goal is a decision-support system. A regional network linking ICM sites and pollution hotspots is being developed.
- *Collaboration with NGOs and Others*. PEMSEA seeks to build support for management recognizing the importance of a supportive civil society. PEMSEA's strategy of establishing partnerships with NGOs, media, schools, church and religious groups is critical to its advocacy efforts.
- *Integrated Approaches to Coastal and Marine Policy*. A cornerstone of PEMSEA's strategy for sustainable coastal and ocean management is the recognition of the importance of integration among agencies, sectors, disciplines and levels of government. They have sought and are succeeding in creating integrative mechanisms at the regional, national and local level. The SDS-SEA, the Regional Network of Local Governments (RNLG), the Manila Bay, Bohai Sea and Gulf of Thailand projects, and the Project Coordinating Committees (PCC) at each ICM site are among the most visible manifestations of PEMSEA's efforts to create and maintain active integrated management efforts.
- *Sustainable Regional Mechanism*. PEMSEA has successfully completed the SDS-SEA in collaboration with 16 national, regional and international collaborators and had the regional strategy endorsed by the 12 participating governments through the Putrajaya Declaration of 2003. This is a milestone achievement as it is the first regional marine strategy with framework programmes consisting of 227 action plans covering local, national and global environmental and sustainable development issues ranging from fisheries to climate change.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

A Relevance	Rating: S
Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?	
The Project Outcomes are consistent with the GEF OP priorities. They are also consistent with different international conventions signed by several countries participating in the Project. The project addresses historical lack of attention to coastal and marine environmental problems by the participating countries.	
B Effectiveness	Rating: S
Are the project outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address?	
According with the TE, Programme delivery has been in accordance with the schedule, in the range of 75–95 percent for all components in the second half of 2004, except as regards the regional mechanism which was at about 60 percent delivery at the time. This is very reasonable in view of this component was dependant upon the others. The terminal evaluation concludes that overall the project has been successful in achieving its expected outcomes.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: HS
Was the project cost – effective? How does project's cost/time versus outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?	
The TE found the Project to be highly satisfactory in terms of cost-effectiveness. PEMSEA has operated on core funding of US\$8 million for the first phase (1994-1999), and US\$16.2 million for the second phase (1999-2006), or US\$24.2 million over the last 12 years. This is equivalent to an average of US\$2 million a year, a relatively modest amount considering what has been achieved within each member country and region-wide. The socioeconomic benefits coming out of the PEMSEA initiatives come in numerous forms. These include the increased revenues in existing livelihoods and enterprises and generation of alternative livelihoods, which are documented in published reviews. It is also manifested through the improved environmental conditions, the enhanced efficiency in using natural resources, including through use of zoning schemes, and the adjustments of national legal systems and policy to include ecological and marine environmental concerns and management. The Programme has demonstrated that environmental degradation can be stopped and reversed while maintaining economic	

development. ICM has been firmly installed in the region, with adequate inter-sectoral and interagency mechanisms institutionalized, including reliable local counterparts to national and international partners, with partnership agreements and public-private enterprises.

Compared to what is being provided in other similar projects, the Programme has provided seed funding that is well within or comparable to the norm. The cost-sharing and co-financing strategy of PEMSEA has worked very well. The Programme has succeeded in raising more than the expected co-financing, counterpart provisions and in-kind support.

4.1.2 Impacts

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

The only area in which the Project aimed to have direct impacts was in the six demonstration sites for Integrated Coast Management. All other components will have indirect impacts, as they are focused on generating awareness, networks development, training, research coordination and promotion, policy influencing, etc.

The work at the demonstration sites seems successful considering the high level of replication (18 additional sites) achieved without funding from the Project.

There is good potential for the other results and outcomes of the project (networks, policy, training, etc.) to generate impacts after the completion of the 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. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources	Rating: UA
What is the likelihood that the financial resources will be available to continue the activities that results in the continuation of benefits?	
TE does not address this issue. It only addresses the high level of participation and commitment by the partners and Governments (socio-political aspects). At the same time, the TE makes a strong recommendation for additional Phases of PEMSEAS funded by GEF, but it is not clear what will be the consequences if this support does not take place.	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes?	
According to the TE this is one of the strongest points of PEMSEAS and it rates Project sustainability as very high.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits?	
Same arguments as in the previous case were presented by the TE.	
D Environmental	Rating: UA
Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?	
TE does not address this issue. As all coastal areas, the ones in East Asia will suffer the impacts of climate change, but it is very difficult to assess the level of risk and the term period of it	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good

Not specifically assessed in the TE. Several achieved results such as the demonstration sites, international agreements, networks, etc. are public goods achieved by the Project.

b. Demonstration

The Project successfully established 6 Demonstration Sites of Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) in different countries.

c. Replication

The ICM sites were replicated in 18 other sites in five different countries, without financial support from PEMSEA

d. Scaling up

The Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) in collaboration with 16 national, regional and international collaborators and had the regional strategy endorsed by the 12 participating governments through the Putrajaya Declaration of 2003. This is a milestone achievement as it is the first regional marine strategy with framework programmes consisting of 227 action plans at different levels (local to regional)

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

A. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): 5 Satisfactory
The project monitoring and evaluation plan in the Project Document includes milestones for each major activity to be completed within a specific timeframe. Project outputs and impacts by each component, and the project as a whole, will be evaluated in accordance with key performance indicators against each objective of the project. In addition, it informs that GEF's International Waters indicators will be established for each demonstration area. The Project LFA presents the key performance indicators. The Project document establishes that milestones and performance indicators will be evaluated each year through an annual Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting, but there is no mention to an M&E unit or function to be performed by specialists, something that is expected in a Project of this magnitude.	
B. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): UA
The TE rates the M&E implementation as Highly Satisfactory, as evidenced by the fulfillment of all reporting requirements and also by evidence of adaptive management and learning in different activities, such as the adjustments in training approaches, in negotiation of agreements, in management of different ICM demonstration sites, etc. The TE does not analyze the implementation of the M&E plan. Its assessment of the M&E is based on the fulfillment of reporting requirements and the adjustments made by the Project. There is no mention in any document of the operation of a specific M&E unit or person, something to be expected in a Project of this magnitude.	
C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?	
UA. There is no M&E line in the Project budget. There is only a line for Evaluation missions with a total budget of US\$ 120,000.- (0.7 % of the total GEF contribution of US\$ 16 million)	
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?	
UA. There is no mention about this aspect in the TE.	
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?	
Unable to Assess. As described the M&E system has the expected components and all reports were completed. Unfortunately it is not clear whether or not there was a specific M&E Unit or person, or if the preparation of the M&E Reports was left to the Project managers.	

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations 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?
<p>Lesson 1: <i>Success and sustainability hinges on the proper combination of key Programme ingredients.</i></p> <p>Key ingredients include (1) a clear shared vision, (2) inclusive, multi-level partnerships, (3) active stakeholder participation sustained through appropriate incentive mechanisms, (4) adequate funding streams marked with resource counterparting, (5) science-based management support, (6) purposive capacity-building and organizational strengthening, and (7) active communication and advocacy.</p> <p>Lesson 2: <i>Partnerships must be inclusive.</i></p> <p>Inclusive partnerships that harness efforts and resources from all relevant stakeholder groups at various levels and in all aspects of the work are critical to effectiveness and sustainability. The hallmark of the PEMSEA approach has been its deliberate strategy of promoting both vertical and horizontal integration.</p> <p>Lesson 3: <i>PEMSEA's combination of "top-down" and "bottom-up" impetus is effective in securing necessary political commitment.</i></p> <p>Political support and commitment from the decision makers at various levels is critical to the success of ICM. Without the "buy-in" from the concerned political leaders, partnerships are incomplete and hampered from securing full and sustained benefits. At the same time, the active horizontal partnerships across municipalities, across relevant national government agencies, and especially across the various stakeholder groups also provided a simultaneous impetus from the ground, spurring the political leaders to exercise their leadership and political will in promoting ICM.</p> <p>Lesson 4: <i>Partnerships do not happen overnight.</i> It takes much time to build awareness and appreciation for the value of protecting and sustaining marine and coastal resources against the more pressing need for food and income. Hence, building a critical mass of dedicated workers and advocates on the ground necessarily takes a great deal of time and effort.</p>

List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The Evaluation Team strongly recommends continued GEF funding support for the PEMSEA project, based on the following observations and arguments:

- The East Asian region is too critical in the world economy, and its coasts and seas far too vital to the global environment, for it not to be able to access an appropriate share of GEF funding support at this time.
- GEF support for PEMSEA has been relatively modest, yet has been extremely productive, making it arguably one of the most efficient and effective uses of GEF resources.
- A considerable amount of time is required for effective partnerships for the environment to be established and take root, and more time is needed to consolidate the gains made towards the goals of SDS-SEA on a self-sustaining path.
- The unevenness of capacities within the region makes continued external support essential, especially in the efforts toward leveling such capacities.
- There has been clear positive momentum attained so far with the various PEMSEA initiatives, that an interruption through non-renewal of GEF support would be both costly and wasteful.

The proposed EAS Partnership Council with accompanying Ministerial Forum, an idea that has already gained acceptance in principle by the Governments in the region, could provide the comprehensive regional coordination and decision making mechanism that would also serve as venue for obtaining necessary government commitments.

In light of the evaluation, the team expresses concern over the potentially large cost and the wastefulness of interrupting the momentum of progress already built in the region through the PEMSEA initiatives. To PEMSEA's credit, site-specific initiatives in the various ICM sites and marine pollution hotspots now mostly manifest sustainability on their own, owing to the strong partnerships that have been firmly put in place and resource contributions and commitments that have been made by various partners on the ground. Nonetheless, a critical mass of human and financial resources for the entire region, while emerging, has yet to be achieved, and external funding assistance will continue to be essential in firmly securing such critical mass that will provide a self-sustaining momentum.

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 document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.

Not available

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?	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? The TE does not provide convincing evidence about the ratings, particularly about the M&E system and projects costs and co-financing issues.	MS
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Project financial sustainability is not assessed. There is no analysis of Project exit strategy further that recommending an additional phase from GEF	MS
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE does not provide details on actual Project costs. The analysis presented in 4.6.3 is based in PIR 2006 data. The analysis of co-financing is skewed as shown in 4.6.3	MU
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? The TE does not present an assessment of the Project M&E System and procedures.	MU

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p>Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. 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, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>The TE analysis of co-financing is weak and somewhat skewed. On one hand the comparison between what was committed at the beginning of the Project and spent at the end (PIR data) shows that contribution from Governments were 7 to 8 times higher than expected, while there is no record of the EA contribution (committed to 3.3 million) and the contribution from other sources did not reach one million of the almost 6 million committed. The increase in Government contribution out-balanced the lack of the others and the overall cofinancing was double than expected (24 million instead of 12 million). The TE does not address these issues, just the increase in Government contribution. The extrapolation of other mobilized resources not accounted by the Project (more than 4 billion dollars) is not well substantiated.</p>
<p>Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>The Project took 26 months longer than expected (or 43% more than the planned time of 60 months. The TE does not address this issue. Apparently these delays did not affect the Project outcomes or its sustainability.</p>

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.

Yes:	No:
X	

Explain: This Project was highly evaluated in all aspects by the TE, with relatively little problems found. Therefore, a detailed technical assessment of its impacts is recommended as a potential source for valuable lessons on implementation of large GEF Projects.

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

597 PEMSEA Project Document
Revisions to the Project Brief per the STAP Reviewer's Comments
PIR 2006