GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	9/8/05
GEF ID:	610		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
Project Name:	Removal of Barriers to the Effective Implementation of Ballast Water Control and Management Measures in Developing Countries	GEF financing:	$7.392	Not available (end of project numbers)
Country:	Global	Co-financing:	$2.80	Not available (end of project numbers)
Operational Program:	10	Total Project Cost:	$10.192	Not available (end of project numbers)
IA	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	International Maritime Organization (IMO)	Work Program date		05/07/99
		CEO Endorsement		01/10/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		3/1//00
		Closing Date	Proposed: 10/31/2002	Actual: 5/26/2005
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 2 ½ years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 5 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 2 ½ years
Author of TE: Fox, A. & Julian, M.		TE completion date: 2/17/2005	TE submission date to GEF OME: 7/29/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 5 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**	**N/A**
2.2 Project outcomes	**HS**		**N/A**	Satisfactory
2.3 Project sustainability	**N/A**	Highly Satisfactory	**N/A**	Highly Satisfactory

2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	**N/A**	Satisfactory	**N/A**	MS
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? Yes. It was a very complete report with concrete evidence to support statements and all objectives were addressed. The report also provided an assessment of the expected outcomes as indicated in the project document and presented clearly the shortcomings (e.g. M&E system) and issues with some deliverables not yet received. Although the final costs were not presented because the TE was completed before project closing, it presented the project costs to date, including a breakdown by activity implemented in each country.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

To assist developing countries, encompassing a wide variety of environmental, geographic, and socioeconomic conditions, in reducing the transfer of harmful organisms and pathogens in ship ballast water. This would be accomplished by increasing adherence by these countries to the then current IMO voluntary guidelines on ballast water management, and assist these countries to prepare for the implementation of the IMO mandatory regime when it came into force. No changes were indicated in the TE.

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

Objective 1 A: **Programme Coordination & Management** Ensure effective project coordination, management and support (information, communications, expert assistance, program implementation capacity and evaluation and assessment) through establishment of an IMO based Program Coordination Unit (PCU).
Objective 1 B and C: **Programme Coordination & Management** Identification of, and provision of resources for, the establishment of a Lead Agency in each of the six participating countries; creation of Country Project Task Forces (CPTF).
Objective 2: **Communication, Education & Awareness** Increase knowledge of and potential solutions for ballast water related transfer of non-indigenous organisms at the port, national and regional level, for each pilot site.
Objective 3: **Risk Assessment** Undertake an initial risk assessment at each pilot site to provide the level and type of risks of introductions at each pilot port, the resources and values that might be threatened and the management response required. Also undertake a port biota survey.
Objective 4: **Ballast Water Management** Develop and implement generic and, to the extent possible, country and port specific programs defining the measures necessary to increase compliance with IMO provisions, with special attention to achieving protection of identified, country-specific most sensitive values at risk.
Objective 5: **Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement** Generic and country specific compliance and monitoring programs to ensure compliance with IMO provisions and protection of most sensitive values
Objective 6: **Regional Replication** Make provision, as appropriate, for the creation and operation of Regional or Sub-Regional Task Forces to increase regional level awareness, cooperation and eventual replication of project results across the region.
Objective 7: **Resources and Financing** Identify opportunities for increased project self-financing during the project, financing after the three year project timeframe, and the initiation of a Donor Conference to secure the necessary additional financing to sustain implementation of IMO, participating country, regional and global efforts to implement IMO ballast water provisions.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?** The TE indicates that the project was overambitious. However, the TE indicates that GloBallast has been

highly successful in building international support and momentum to fulfil the aim of removing barriers to the effective implementation of ballast water control and management measures in developing countries, in order to minimize the risk of transfer of invasive marine species. The project also had a considerable catalytic impact in the 6 pilot countries. Specifically, GloBallast:

- Achieved a high degree of country ownership among the 6 pilot countries, creating 6 centres of excellence on ballast water and marine invasive species issues.
- Served as a catalyst, mobilizing substantial additional financing
- Developed sustainable country and regional plans for ballast water management;
- Established the institutional arrangements and technical capacity needed for countries to implement the IMO ballast water management guidelines;
- Enhanced stakeholder and public awareness of the environmental harm that marine organisms transported in ships ballast water can cause.
- Provided knowledge transfer on a global scale, including innovative demonstrations in developing countries, and disseminated best practices
- Provided considerable assistance in the formulation of the IMO International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships Ballast Water & Sediments (BW Convention);

The successful establishment of intergovernmental Regional Task Forces and adoption of Strategic Action Plans provided the framework to allow neighbouring countries in each region to work cooperatively to implement ballast water control and management measures and build on the lessons, experience and expertise of the six Pilot Countries.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts **Rating: S**

A Relevance

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

Yes, the project outcomes were very relevant to the focal area and OP strategies

B Effectiveness

- **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)?**

The TE indicates that adequate conditions have been created for the successful implementation of the IMO Guidelines and the new IMO Convention, and that the six demonstration countries are in a strong position to continue in a leadership role on ballast water issues at the regional and international level. According to the TE, the project achieved most of its objectives to a highly satisfactory degree. The project was also very effective to achieve the expected outcomes as described in the project document including:

- Strong and continuing presence of a ballast water management capacity in 6 pilot countries supported by the IMO through absorption of the PCU activities and a global resource information centre located in the offices of the IMO with the capacity to undertake systematic and ongoing distribution of the latest and most effective approaches to ballast water management.
- A dramatic increase in the knowledge and increased public awareness of the dangers of unmanaged ballast water discharges and remedies based on local port, country and regional settings that are consistent with IMO Guidelines. In addition, the project developed and tested education and training programs to increase knowledge of the ballast water issue and impart the knowledge, skills and attitudes required.
- IMO Coordination of a global network of the research efforts and experience of monitoring centres in relation to ballast water transfer.
- Informed and effective developing country participation in the ongoing global deliberations on the ballast water management issue

In addition, according to the TE the project made significant progress in other areas that will produce environmental impacts such as minimization of loss of coastal biodiversity and protection

of commercial fishery and aquaculture resources.
There were some shortcomings that can reduce the effectiveness of the project given that they were key to the success of the project. For example, under objective 3, the project was supposed to develop a system to allow ports to assess the risk of the ballast water coming into the port in a ship so the ship could manage it accordingly. This was not implemented. Also, under objective 4, at the end of the project, no port was ready to implement a risk-based strategy of ballast water monitoring and sampling.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

- **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?**

The TE indicates that the most important measure of cost effectiveness relates to the impact that the project has had on the pollution problem in question. However, the tools are not yet available to monitor the extent to which GloBallast has had a demonstrable impact by appreciably lowering the risk of ballast-borne invasive species and impacts may not be seen for 20 or 30 years. Nevertheless, the GloBallast Program clearly acted as a catalyst for accelerating the Convention development process, which should in turn hasten ratification of the BW Convention. It is expected that widespread implementation of the Convention can reduce the risks of marine bio-invasion in the future and on this basis a case for the cost effectiveness of the project can be made.

4.2 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: HS**

GloBallast pilot countries have had considerable success in developing financial instruments and mechanisms for the continuation of project efforts. There has been growing interest from shipping and marine technology companies in the ballast water discharge issues, driven by the GloBallast effort, and especially the new BW Convention. Private sector support is building – especially in the development of new technologies to deal with the technical hurdles of monitoring and BW treatment. The indicated cofinancing from the pilot countries was $4.32 M, higher than the $2.8M expected, which demonstrates a high level of commitment to the project outcomes.

B Socio political **Rating: HS**

The socio political sustainability seems likely given the outcomes and effectiveness of the project as mentioned above.

C Institutional framework and governance **Rating: HS**

The TE indicates that GloBallast has had notable success in the development of regional strategic action plans, country plans, and port management plans. As a result GloBallast shows evidence of effectiveness in mainstreaming its objectives into the wider community – especially driving changes in the way that shipping and port managers are considering their environmental responsibilities. An issue that in the past was considered solely a question of ship safety has now been recognised as having significant environmental consequences.

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: S**

The TE indicates that replication was given prominence in project formulation. The proposed funding for a global resource centre to be located at IMO was a fundamental part of the strategy to bring about replication of project results. This centre would become responsible for assisting developing nations in more effectively managing ballast water control after the project completion.

The TE also indicates that replication was envisioned at the country and region levels. The project was designed to develop regional replication mechanisms. It was anticipated that port specific ballast management activities would then be replicated by the countries in other ports, and expanded regionally, and serve as a model for countries in other regions. Component 6 in the Project Implementation Plan directs the project participants to: “Make provision, as appropriate, for the creation and operation of Regional or Sub-Regional Task Forces to increase regional level awareness, cooperation and eventual replication of

project results across the region".

Replication was also envisioned through the development of a ballast water management training programme producing "adaptable training packages".

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: MS

The TE indicates that GloBallast Program early on commenced port surveys to determine a biological baseline from which to consider future invasive species risks. A legal baseline was also developed, highlighting where each pilot country was with respect to statutes, orders and regulations that relate to ballast water management. The TE indicates, however, that the Project Document lacked verifiable indicators to track outcomes and impacts. It also indicates that despite UNDP-GEF program management guidelines calling for the development of monitoring plans, none was developed for GloBallast. The M&E consisted mostly of the submission and review of reports.

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

The project reports (i.e., APR/PIRs) and progress reviews provided brief details on project performance and the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) would take action on issues raised in these reports. Monthly activity reports were submitted by the pilot countries. The TE indicates that GloBallast was sufficiently flexible to enable ongoing modifications to the project implementation plan, based on pilot country and PCU recommendations. For example, in the first few months of implementation the PCU identified the need to stipulate specific pilot country activities that should be carried out in order to meet the project objectives. In particular, the project managers in London considered it useful for each pilot country to do a risk assessment and port base-line survey in its designated port. These changes were incorporated in the Project Implementation Plan.

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.)

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 TE included the following lessons:

1. Projects can benefit from taking a two-pronged approach to the management of demonstration sites.

The first is to develop global mechanisms and templates for use by all sites. The second is to enable the pilot countries to develop their own country-specific activities. GloBallast demonstrates that country buy-in and financial support can be significantly increased when countries have the flexibility to shape the project to their specific needs.

2. Global projects dealing with "new" issues, requiring the coordination of multiple pilot sites, need

sufficient time to develop, five years is preferable because three years is insufficient. These projects also need sufficient staff (composed of a team leader, 2 technical experts (e.g. environment, shipping, public relations; etc); project administrator (for contracts, budgets, travels, etc) & two project secretaries) at the project coordination units to achieve their objectives.

3. An effective M&E program is premised on the establishment of a logical framework and verifiable

performance and impact indicators. There also needs to be a monitoring plan developed as part of the initial ProDoc, which stipulates how the project will be monitored –internally and externally. Establishing baselines is essential for effective project monitoring. It is useful to expand the baseline setting approach to other project aspects beyond port surveys and legislative analyses, to include public awareness raising, capacity building, and NGO involvement.

4. The setting up of international scientific advisory panels should be considered whenever a

UNDP-GEF IW project includes the substantial collection, monitoring and reporting of scientific information.

These panels can provide timely peer review of publishable materials, and help to establish R&D priorities. 5. There are inherent risks of tying an IW project to the passage of specific legislation because it is very difficult to forecast the passage of laws and conventions. However, GloBallast contributed to build support for the linked legislation and implementation of the IMO International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships Ballast Water & Sediments (BW Convention).

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.

4.5.1 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.
The International Waters Program Study also found that the project was a highly successful GEF project that has catalyzed the issue of transport of IAS into a global priority, decisively contributing to an emerging international legal regime.

4.5.2 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? Yes. The report provides a very good assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of objectives. The TE also assesses the achievement of expected results and examines shortcomings.	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Yes	S
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes, good assessment of sustainability and exit strategy.	S
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons are supported by the evidence presented and lessons were also extracted from the shortcomings	S
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report includes a good assessment of expenditures by activity up to Dec 2004 when the evaluation was carried out, but then there were still $566,176 remaining in the budget and the project actual closure (completion of activities and financial closing) was in May, 2005 so the latest update was not available by the time the evaluation was done. The breakdown of costs by activity in each participating country was very exhaustive.	S
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes	S

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: X**	**No:**
Explain: It would be interesting to see how the project evolves in the future given its achievements and also the biodiversity and productivity impacts that, according to the report, the project provided positive steps in their direction.		
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?No		

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

TE, project document, IW Program Study