

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	653		<u>At endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>At completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	\$1.25	\$1.00
Project Name:	Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation (CMBC) in Mindanao	IA/EA own:	3.60	
Countries:	Philippines	Government:	1.20	0.27
		*Other:		
		Total Cofinancing:	4.80	0.27
Operational Program:	OP#2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems; Focal area: Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	6.05	1.27
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Govt. of Philippines – Dept. of Env. and Natural Resources (DENR); Dept. of Agriculture and Fisheries	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		March 2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: Dec. 2003	Actual: Dec. 2005
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 45 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 69 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 24 months
Author of TE: Ronald D. Zweig		TE completion date: June 30, 2006	TE submission date to GEF EO: June, 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 24 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 AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews ¹	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	S	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	UA	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	N/A	N/A	U
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	S	S	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	MS

¹ This was a blended project. The project was reviewed by the IEG combines both the GEF supported project and the non-GEF part of the project. From the GEF perspective the ICR and its review covers the GEF supported project as a part of the larger blended one. Thus, the ratings are not comparable.

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

No. The ICR for this project describes the implementation experience of the GEF funded Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Component (CMBC), part of the larger Mindanao Rural Develop Project (MRDP). The ICR provides performance ratings for only the GEF supported CMBC.

The ICR Review (conducted by the IEG) covers the larger MRDP and as such does not address the performance of the GEF supported CMBC component in sufficient detail.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings were mentioned.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The global environmental objectives of the Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Component (CMBC) were “to conserve and restore globally important coastal habitats and related marine biodiversity in Mindanao by mainstreaming biodiversity and marine ecosystem conservation in community development and in the coastal fisheries sector” (p.7, Project Document). GEF funding was to support “creating sanctuaries and protected habitats for endangered species found in the area,” and the development of “a model with broad applicability for mainstreaming [coastal and marine area] biodiversity considerations” in tropical regions (p.7, ProDoc).

There were no changes in global environmental objectives during implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (Describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

As stated in the Project Brief, the development objective of the CMBC was to:

“remove the barriers to mainstreaming of marine and coastal biodiversity conservation in coastal zone development by:

- (a) establishing community-based management of marine sanctuaries;
- (b) strengthening local capacity to address marine ecosystem management issues;
- (c) enhancing the knowledge base for sound ecosystem management and decision- making, including monitoring and evaluation for sustainable long-term marine ecosystem management;
- (d) developing policy and action plans for marine biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming it into coastal development plans.”

The Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Component (CMBC) targeted two sites: (i) Paril-Sangay Protected Seascape, Kalimansig, Sultan Kudarat Province; (ii) Bongo Island, Parang, Maguidanao Province. The CMBC had six sub-components (p.7, ProDoc) :

1. A resource assessment survey of selected conservation sites containing marine biodiversity of global significance.
2. Application of a participatory planning and management process for identification and development of the defined protected areas.
3. Strengthening of local marine resource surveillance by coastal communities linked to existing enforcement agencies.
4. Formulation and implementation of a monitoring and evaluation program.
5. Development of alternative income generating activities for those involved in livelihoods that are particularly destructive to the marine environment.
6. Training of Department of Natural Resources/Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources officers, LGU/NGO/PO staff, and schoolteachers as trainers in sustainable marine and fisheries management

There were no changes in development objectives during implementation.

Overall Environmental	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
-----------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Objectives				
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) The national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

The degradation of the Philippine fisheries is a major concern. Nearshore waters are heavily overfished and the continuing rapid population growth and migration to coastal areas is expected to further exacerbate overfishing and over exploitation of coastal biodiversity and resource use. The project objectives were consistent with the government's strategic plan for rural development, which takes a holistic and sustainable approach to rural development and natural resources management. The project components were designed to address the main issues facing the sustainable management of marine resources in the Philippines: the control and management of fishers and fishing areas and insufficient knowledge of sustainable fishing practices.

(ii) The national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

The project supports the goals of the national framework for coastal resource management (CRM) as outlined in the Medium-Term Development Plan (MTDP), the National Marine Policy, and Agenda 21. The project is consistent with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) and the Philippine Biodiversity Conservation Priorities (PBCP), which present the basis for the sites selected.

(iii) The achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?

The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy for Biodiversity, and addresses GEF Operational Program Number 2 (Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems). It directly addresses OP objectives (conservation and sustainable use), including in-situ protection and sustainable use in vulnerable and threatened habitats.

(iv) The implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

The Philippines ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in October, 1993. The project's promotion of community based conservation methods is consistent with COP guidance and the Jakarta Mandate. Through programs for threatened and endangered marine species, including marine turtles and dugong, the project supports the objectives of the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species.

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership²

The project did not have any regional or international linkages.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

The GEF assisted Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Component (CMBC) has successfully achieved the targeted outputs in five out of six sub-components, with a high degree of public involvement. The ICR notes that the project "met its global objective of conserving and restoring globally important coastal habitats and related marine biodiversity." In Bongo Island, a marine protected area (MPA) was established through a Municipal Ordinance following the process prescribed in the Fisheries Code and has been ratified by the Maguinadanao provincial government. In Paril-Sangay, the MPA was declared by the local government and is under review by DENR.

Natural resources and social assessment surveys at both sites were conducted using a participatory approach involving community groups, volunteers, and officials from the eight *barangays* (villages) in the area. Findings were incorporated into draft management plans for the MPAs. An intensive publicity campaign accompanied this effort, including radio programs, newsletters, posters, and educational materials for schools.

Community based management has strengthened local marine surveillance and enforcement. Municipal coordination

² Please consider for regional and global project only

teams (MCTs) were deputized and strengthened to undertake coastal protection and assist in the enforcement of laws and regulations in the two sites. Training, provision of equipment (boats, buoys, signs, communications facilities), and improved links with the National Police's Maritime Group, have further enabled the local groups responsible for environmental protection and law enforcement. Surveillance activities have led to better enforcement of no-take zones (NTZs), apprehension of illegal fishers, confiscation of gear, and cases against violators.

The training sub-component was effective in educating both government staff and the broader community about the benefits of marine biodiversity conservation, sustainable fisheries, and optimal marine resource use. Training included site visits, study tours, coastal zone management plan preparation, resource assessment methods and collaborations with the Sultan Kudarat Polytechnic State College and the Mindanao State University. The ICR notes that these activities have contributed to "an increasing sense of accountability" on the part of local government officials and "growing support accorded by the Local Chief Executives and the Municipal Government Officials to the MCTs." This support has led to some sustained funding through municipal budgets and the integration of environment-friendly policies, strategies and management practices in local governance.

The marine monitoring system has been updated to provide timely and useful information for MPA management authorities. Two resource assessments (2002 and 2004) were conducted and water quality monitoring stations were installed to regularly assess water quality. A census of fishers, and fishing practices, was conducted in 2004 and all fishers were required to become registered as part of the MPA management plan. Additional monitoring activities included turtle tagging, coral surveys, fish counts, and periodic collection of catch data from fishermen. Monitoring results indicate a modest increase in fish populations at both sites and a light increase in fishermen's incomes based on catch-per-unit-effort data. There has been no recorded poaching of turtle eggs since enforcement was stepped up.

The only sub-component that was not able to meet targets was the one focused on alternative income generating (AIG) sub-projects. The alternative income generating (AIG) sub-projects were implemented late in the project timeframe, implementation of this component was poor, and too few project were funded to have a meaningful impact. Additional planning at the start of the project and a clear-cut process for reviewing and approving AIG sub-projects could have improved the results.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

At appraisal, total GEF funding for the CMBC was estimated at \$1.25 M. The actual amount disbursed was only \$0.99M for several reasons. There was a considerable under-disbursement for the alternative income generation sub-component, due to the complicated and centralized approval process. Substantial amounts of funds intended for the international study tour were not utilized. Devaluation of the Ph Peso also contributed to the lower actual costs. In local currency, the actual costs are close to the Project document estimates.

Although total project costs were under budget, efficiency is rated moderately satisfactory. Disbursement delays and a slow procurement process hampered implementation. The project got off the ground almost two years later than planned and outputs in a critical sub-component (AIG) were significantly below expectations.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

The CMBC design integrates environmental and development concerns relevant to biodiversity conservation. Sub-components targeted both community based management and sustainable livelihoods as well as more effective enforcement of protected areas, environmental research and monitoring. Implementation was successful in encouraging community participation in MPA creation and management, but the development activities were not accorded enough attention.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts³ (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

³ Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

In Bongo Island, a 2.3 km² MPA was established and in Paril-Sangay, a proposed 1.2 km² MPA is pending legal ratification by the DENR. Both MPAs were formulated with active community involvement. Municipal Coordinating Teams (MCTs) have been established at both sites to manage the protected areas in conjunction local and national government agencies. Core groups of volunteers at both sites have been trained in marine habitat assessment and will provide regular monitoring of the MPA. More effective surveillance of the MPA by maritime police and community based groups has led to a reduction in unsustainable fishing practices, as well as reductions in reported incidents of poaching and mangrove harvesting. Monitoring at the sites indicates an increase in the fish population density, species diversity, and bio-mass since the project started.

Training and outreach activities have enhanced the capacities of government agencies and community groups to monitor and protect marine and coastal biodiversity. Community education activities have significantly increased awareness of biodiversity conservation. At the start of implementation social assessment surveys showed that only 72% of people in Paril-Sangay and 42% in Bongo Island were aware of and appreciated the essence of biodiversity conservation. A follow-up survey in 2004 showed that these figures had increased to 91% and 93%, respectively. Local governments have also incorporated funding for some MPA management activities into municipal budgets, ensuring that some aspects of the project can be sustained.

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= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: L
The local governments at the 2 CMBC sites have indicated support for continued coastal and marine ecosystems management. In addition to the municipal budget allocations accorded to the Municipal Coordinating Teams (MCT), the CMBC has also received funding from the Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Office for Kalamansig, Sultan Kudarat and the Municipal Agriculture Office for Parang, Maguindanao.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: L
Awareness of the benefits of biodiversity conservation has been increased at both CMBC sites. Local government understanding of MPA management has been enhanced and communities have expressed support for protecting the established no-take zones and for expanding these zones if required. There is also strong interest in continuing the AIG program and funding new proposals.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
There is a need to clarify the roles of the MCT and the local governments in order for them to function effectively together and craft an effective plan for coastal zone management. The Alliance of People's Organizations (APOs) for both sites, tasked with supervising the AIG projects, were not yet functional. Additional training and official recognition by the Municipal Council will be necessary for the APOs to effectively do their job.	
d. Environmental	Rating: ML
Although not addressed by this project, growing population pressures in the coastal areas continue to put pressure on coastal and marine resources. There is a risk that some of the CMBC outcomes will not be sustained without an integrated development plan for the coastal zones.	
e. Technological	Rating: NA
There were no technological risks associated with this project.	

4.3 Catalytic role⁴

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders?
The AIG sub-component provided micro loans to promote the adoption of sustainable livelihoods and reduce poverty and resource degradation. 13 out of 30 proposals (total at both sites) were approved and are being implemented. As these proposals were implemented late in the project timeframe, there is insufficient data to judge whether the livelihoods projects are financially viable.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors?
The CMBC established MCTs for each MPA, as well as contributing to the establishment of the MENRO in Kalamansig and the creation of the CRMO in Parang. Local stakeholders were empowered to sustainably manage area resources. Communities have gained an improved understanding of local ecology through their active participation in the various studies, assessments, inventories and consultations conducted. The project has also increased the local

⁴ Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

governments' level of awareness and capacity for coastal and marine biodiversity conservation, as evidenced by the growing support from Mayors and Municipal Government Officials.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
CMBC activities led to the issuance of Municipal and Barangay ordinances to designate MPAs and provide logistical support to MCT enforcement groups.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (This is different than co-financing.)
Sustained follow on funding from municipal governments has been secured to continue some of the CMBC activities.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
No champions were mentioned in the TE report.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? 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? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The co-financing amount proposed in the ProDoc for the Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Component (CMBC) was \$4.8M, with \$3.6M from the IBRD and \$1.2M from the Govt. of the Philippines. The ICR indicates that proposed Govt. co-financing for CMBC at project appraisal was \$0.51 M (Annex 2C, p.23, ICR). The Borrower's Completion Report (p.40, ICR) notes that the Govt. of the Philippines had allotted \$0.26 M for the CMBC. The actual co-financing from the Govt. of the Philippines was only \$0.27M. Actual project costs were much lower than budgeted in the ProDoc, due to both currency devaluation and poor implementation of the AIG sub-component. The co-financing has largely supported the development of community based MPA management plans.
b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
There were several delays in project implementation. The delay in hiring consultants severely affected project implementation and led to its extension for two years. The national and local elections in May 2004 hampered project activities. Activities related to the protected area establishment of Paril/Sangay were deferred several times because of the May 2004 election. In Bongo Island, election and post-election conflicts stalled the implementation of planned activities during the first half of 2004.
c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.
The strong involvement of local governments in this project has had a positive impact on project outcomes. Project activities have been supported through allocations from municipal budget and local elected officials have moved quickly in establishing the MPAs and endorsing the community based management plans. Based on information in the TE report, the project has garnered growing support from local government and civil society groups. Country ownership at the national level has not had a significant impact due to the complex project implementation arrangement and frequent changes in DENR leadership.

4.5 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): S
The ProDoc contains a project design summary for the entire MRD Project, with performance indicators and M&E methods for each development objective, as well as a list of critical assumptions. The design summary stipulates annual marine resource assessments, periodic surveys, as well as a mid-term and final project evaluation. The ICR does not discuss the CMBC's M&E plan. The IEG report notes (in reference to the MRDP) that "Considerable attention was devoted to the design of the M&E system, but it could not be operationalized fully because financial constraints and poor quality of M&E staff, especially at the level of LGUs."	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): U
The ICR does not discuss M&E, but the IEG review indicates that the MRDP did not systematically track progress towards project outcomes. The review notes "The planned community-based M&E system was not operationalized, the baseline data was not fully encoded until the last year of implementation, and the project Management Information System (MIS) in most cases, was not able to provide immediate and critical inputs for management decision-making. Moreover, the mid-term review and terminal evaluation exercises were not adequately funded, despite the planned budgetary allocations, which resulted in a lower than expected quality of evaluations. The implementation of the M&E	

system was also affected in the early years of the project by the conflict in Mindanao.”
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Funding for project M&E, including the GEF supported CMBC, was included in the component focusing on Institutional Capacity Building and Program Development.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess.
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? Unable to assess.
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. No, there was no systematic tracking of results.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i>
The implementing agency for this project was the World Bank. Based on information in the ICR, IA supervision and oversight of this project was satisfactory. There were no obvious flaws in project design and the choice of executing agency was appropriate. The IA carried out ten supervisory missions at six-month intervals. When site visits were prevented due to political instability in the area, representatives of the beneficiaries and executing agency were gathered for workshops and consultation meetings. The Assistant Team Leader (ATL) at the country office provided addition support and supervision as needed, which according to the TE “proved helpful to the executing agencies.”
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁵ (rating on a 6 point scale): MS <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.</i>
The executing agency for this project was the Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (DENR). The ICR rates the overall performance of DENR as satisfactory, despite some avoidable delays and incidents of poor supervision. The DENR maintained close interaction with the Bank and other implementing partners, ensured that counterpart funds were released, and that project implementation reports were timely. However, implementation was hindered by delays in procuring consultant services, which resulted in an extension of 1.5 years. There were also delays with the approval of AIG sub-projects. The poor quality of the initial proposals required several iterations that resulted in an excessively lengthy review process, and, according to the ICR, the funded projects did not focus on sustainable use of marine and coastal resources. Some of these problems could have been prevented if DENR had provided adequate training and education for beneficiaries at the start of the project.
The project suffered from an overly complex execution arrangement. The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries of the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (DAF-ARMM) led field-level implementation, while oversight and central level coordination was lodged with national Department of Agriculture-Bureau of Agriculture and Aquatic Resources (DA-BFAR). With regard to the management and coordination process, Municipal Coordinating Teams (MCT) were created at both sites to oversee site-level project implementation. While this arrangement was useful in ensuring technical and policy support from DA-BFAR as well as representation in central-level discussions regarding the project, it created administrative and financial burdens. Communication and financial disbursements were initially very slow. Eventually, however, recognizing the need to speed-up implementation in Bongo, a direct line of communication between DENR and DAF-ARMM was established.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects
1. A stronger link between resource conservation and management and local economic priorities (poverty alleviation

⁵ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

and food security), through well-chosen conservation-oriented income-generating activities, is necessary to ensure success and sustainability.

2. Institution building at the community level in support of conservation and natural resource management initiatives is a time-consuming and challenging effort, especially for two project sites that have different cultural orientations and traditions. It is beneficial to develop "champions" who will pursue the initiatives started under the project after assistance has terminated.

3. Culture should be understood and recognized, especially in Mindanao where feudal relations of the *Datu* (leaders) are still deeply rooted and influential in defining power relations in the community. Practices, beliefs and traditions of multi-cultural/religious groupings in the area must be appreciated, respected and taken into consideration in the implementation of project interventions.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

1. An effective policy and institutional framework is essential to successful NRM. Legal harmonization (e.g., the Local Government Code, the Fisheries Code, the NIPAS, the Wildlife Act) and agency coordination is necessary. Where there is more than one implementing agency involving different stakeholders, such as the CMBC, additional effort is required to create an atmosphere of respect, trust and cooperation among all actors.

2. Project sustainability has a greater chance when management is lodged within a regular office of the local government. It may have been more strategic to strengthen the municipal planning office or the municipal ENR office where budget can be assured and activities are linked with local development planning. A multi-agency task force, such as the MCT, created solely for the project usually disbands by the end of the project because it is not organic to existing structures. This requires a review of the LGU bureaucracy, and determination of existing - projects, units/projects that may be used as vehicles for the new project, so as not to create more layers and *ad hoc* teams.

3. Marine biodiversity conservation should adopt an integrated and holistic approach. Siltation and sedimentation brought about by destructive agricultural land-use in the upland and forest areas that drain into the coast pose major constraints to the recovery of coral reefs, mangroves and seagrass beds.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

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 terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE report contains a comprehensive assessment of project outputs and outcomes relative to the objectives of the CMBC component of the larger Mindanao Rural Development Project.</p>	S
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The report is internally consistent, and no evidence gaps were noted. The IEG ratings cannot be compared to the ICR ratings, as the IEG looked at the entire rural development project, while the ICR focused only on the Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Component (CMBC).</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report discusses project sustainability, but does not give sufficient attention to the sustainability of the MCTs.</p>	MU
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are well supported by the evidence presented, and but miss a few obvious points, such as the importance of M&E.</p>	MS

<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report includes actual project costs for each component and the actual co-financing contributed.</p>	S
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? There was no evaluation of the project's M&E system in the ICR. This issue was, however, covered in the review conducted by the IEG.</p>	U

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)