

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	773		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	\$1.00	\$1.00
Project Name:	Caribbean Archipelago Biosphere Reserve: Regional Marine Protected Area (MPA) System	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Colombia	Government:	2.11	2.56
		Other*:	1.07	2.38
		Total Cofinancing	3.18	4.94
Operational Program:	OP#2: Coastal and marine ecosystems; Focal area: Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	4.18	\$5.94
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	CORALINA (executing agency)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		1999
		Closing Date	Proposed: Jan 2005	Actual: July 2005
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 60 mos.	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 66 mos	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 6 months
Author of TE: Not Specified		TE completion date: December 2005	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 28 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	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	MS	NA	NA	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	MS	NA	NA	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	NA	NA	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

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

Yes, the TE presents findings in a well-organized and logical manner with concise assessments of all the significant aspects of implementation, outcomes, and sustainability.

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

No such findings mentioned.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

As described in the project brief, the global environmental objective of the project was “to conserve biodiversity and ensure sustainable use of the Archipelago's coastal and marine resources while enhancing environmental equity by implementing a regional system of marine protected areas zoned for multiple-use and managed to reduce human threats and to protect globally important sites of biodiversity in cooperation with the local community.” Within the project brief various other variants of this objective have been listed in different sections of the report. The terminal evaluation report uses another variant: “to conserve biodiversity of global importance in the western Caribbean, identified as a major site of coral and fish diversity and considered a biodiversity "hot spot" (Roberts, 1998).” Thus, it is difficult to assess the precise global environmental objective that the project was trying to achieve. The terminal evaluation does not report whether there have been changes in the global environmental objectives of the project.

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)?)

The project’s development objective was to implement a system of marine protected areas (MPAs) zoned for multiple uses and managed to reduce human threats in cooperation with local communities. Estimated benefits to local communities include: regained access to traditional fishing sites by artisanal fishers, job creation related to MPA management and maintenance, and stronger community networks organized around environmentally sustainable production activities.

The only output modified during project execution was the declaration of one MPA with three Sections protecting a total of 65,000 square kilometers, versus the original objective of protecting 2,000 km² of significant corals, mangroves and sea grass beds within a system of 4 larger Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). The final approved MPA is estimated to contain 890 km² of significant corals, mangroves and sea grass beds.

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

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:

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

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

National guidelines and strategies include sustainable renewable resource management plans, assessments of economic potential to insure equitable use, protected areas, legislative and institutional strengthening, technology transfer, biodiversity information systems, and community training and participation. Additionally, the National Constitution gives the native residents of the Archipelago special status as an ethnic minority group with a social and cultural identity distinct from the dominant society, requiring that special regional programs be developed to protect their environment and traditional culture (article 310).

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

National action plans, under the Colombian National Policy for Biodiversity (1996), call for coastal and marine-use planning within the framework of integrated coastal management at regional and local levels. Law 99 of 1993 establishes the need for a regional environmental policy in the Archipelago and creates the decentralized national environment system to ensure the design and realization of development programs at the regional level. This law also declares the Archipelago a Biosphere Reserve, empowering the Corporation for the Sustainable Development of the Archipelago of San Andres, Old Providence, and Santa Catalina (CORALINA) to carry out the actions necessary to realize this status. Policies set forth in the 1998 *Plan for Sustainable Development of the Archipelago: 1998-2010* include protective management strategies for the cays and banks, definition of significant marine areas to protect biodiversity, special measures to protect endangered species, and realignment and demarcation of coastal and marine reserve areas to protect essential fish habitat.

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

This project falls within the coastal and marine ecosystems operational program (OP # 2) and the Biodiversity focal area

(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 projects supports implementation of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) ratification, 24 November 1994 : National Law 165 of 1994

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership¹

Not an expressed intent of the project, but the project has developed links to global and regional environmental conservancy organizations.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

This project, executed by CORALINA, has successfully obtained legal ratification in 2005 of a Marine Protected Areas System (MPA) with three sections protecting 65,000 km² of ocean, and including an estimated 890 km² of significant corals, mangroves, and sea grass beds. CORALINA was able to build upon its longstanding presence and credibility in the region to solicit community participation during every step of project design and execution. Due to the project team's outreach efforts, over 90% of the fishermen in the region supported the creation of this MPA. While the project has successfully accomplished all activities in terms of scientific and social data collection and analysis, policy and legislation, and local capacity building, concerns still remain about the effective enforcement and management of the MPA, as well as its longer-term sustainability.

Under the data collection component, physical, biological and socio-economic assessments were conducted for each MPA, including information on threats and vulnerability, and a stakeholder analysis. These assessments were incorporated into MPA system descriptions and an Integrated Management Plan. Two information centers have been established in San Andres Island (SAI) and Old Providence and Santa Catalina (OP/SC) to coordinate with local stakeholders.

Most of the expected policy and legislative outputs were achieved, but the delay in legal ratification of the MPA put stakeholder review of the Integrated Management Plan behind schedule. MPA zoning regulations were reached with wide stakeholder agreement through over a hundred zoning workshops. The second part of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) is complete and is now in a review period, open for comment by all stakeholders. The third and final section of the IMP, dealing with operational guidelines for the MPA, has been written and will be reviewed and finalized by MPA managers once internal zoning agreements become operational.

According to the terminal evaluation the execution of training and capacity-building activities by CORALINA was "highly successful." Outcome indicators included 200 local stakeholders trained in oceans resource management and environmental threat reduction, a college-level degree program under the Christian University with 38 students enrolled (18 graduated), and affiliation with 6 regional environmental networks.

Impact indicators measuring socio-economic improvements were not included in the project's initial logical framework. However, preliminary data show that the project has been successful in curbing key threats to natural resource degradation, including: increasing difficulty of access to collective fishing grounds by artisanal fishers; failure to respect or acknowledge traditional fishing rights and sea tenure; demands for local autonomy in licensing and

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

management; lack of benefit to the island community; severe over-fishing including exploitation of threatened and endangered species, and neglecting to enforce existing fisheries regulations that include gear restrictions and closed seasons.

According to the terminal evaluation the project's main challenges ahead are the implementation and enforcement of what is the largest Marine Protected Area in the Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) region. It is critical to execute a solid financial sustainability strategy and garner dependable financial support for continued operations. Effective enforcement and management actions must promptly follow project closing, in order to meet community expectations and secure the MPA's implementation.

Additionally, indicators measuring conservation impacts were not incorporated into the project's logical framework because the team did not consider that these impacts could be registered during the project's duration. It will be impossible to measure effective impact on conservation for two or three years, when the effects of changes in use and more effective protection become evident.

c. Cost-efficiency

Rating: MS

Once the MPA is in operation, approximately 65,000 km² of ocean area will be under protected status. As the project cost for the GEF was \$1 M, this would put per unit costs at \$15 per sq-km (or \$ 23 if all incremental costs are considered and \$71 if the total project outlay is considered). The final approved MPA is estimated to contain 890 km² of significant corals, mangroves and sea grass beds, indicating a cost of \$1120 per sq-km of significant biodiversity.

The project closing was delayed 6 months in order to obtain legal ratification of the MPA and the actual project costs were \$1.7M greater than the planned budget.

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.

It is not possible to fully assess trade-offs at this stage, as the environmental and socio-economic effects of the project, due to changes in fishing and use patterns, will not be measurable for some time. This said the project design balanced environmental concerns with the needs of local communities, whose livelihoods depend largely on fishing and tourism. Local stakeholders were active participants in project implementation and contributed to the development of the MPA management plans. In this aspect, the project has managed to address both environment and development priorities, without significant tradeoffs.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

In addition to the 65,000 km-2 of ocean area ratified as an MPA, project outcomes included:

1. A comprehensive biodiversity and socio-economic assessments were undertaken of the Archipelago's northern, central and southern sections. These assessments were essential inputs to the MPA's design; their findings were shared with local communities and international collaborators, contributing to local and global knowledge on the region's biodiversity importance.
2. Participatory zoning agreements obtained through negotiations with local stakeholders, demarcating no-take, no-entry, special use, and artisanal fishing zones. As a direct impact, artisanal fishers have regained access to traditional fishing sites, artisanal fishing zones have been legally enacted in collaboration with the Departmental Fishing Board, and agreements have been established with industrial fishers and the tourism industry.
3. Conservation action plans and monitoring action plans written with high levels of community involvement to support MPA enforcement and the conservation of key species.
4. CORALINA's team designed and taught a college-level MPA program, graduating 18 students from local communities, some of whom will work in the MPA's implementation and management.

² 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)

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: MU
At the time of the TE, there was no financial plan to cover annual operating costs for the entire MPA. CORALINA supports a plan to increase the tourist tax by \$1 (generating approx. \$350,000 annually), which would cover the annual operating costs of the Central and Southern section of the MPA. Willingness-to-pay surveys show that a tax increase of up to \$5 is viable, so the \$1 tax is likely to be implemented. However, legal hurdles to implementation remain, and other project activities cannot be continued unless additional follow-on funding materializes. CORALINA is seeking funding over the longer term from the GEF-Colombian National Protected Areas Trust Fund Project (currently in its preparation phase), the GEF Climate Change and related projects with other donors.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: L
Strong stakeholder participation throughout the project, extensive training, and the Christian University degree program in natural resources management have led to strong community support. Marine resources have agreed to cooperate with the MPA management system. Several government officials (elected and civil-service) are on the board of CORALINA and thus committed to sustaining the project. However, there is no guaranteed follow-on funding from government sources.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
As a regional and autonomous environmental corporation, CORALINA is a relatively stable institution, and free to seek both government and outside funding to continue project operations. CORALINA has developed strong links to pan-Caribbean environmental networks as well as to global conservancy organizations.	
d. Environmental	Rating: ML
There is a possibility that pressure from fishers and the tourist industry may undermine environmental benefits. The MPA's Northern Section contains a strong presence of off-island industrial fishers, with whom agreements have proven difficult. The MPA's Central and Southern Sections also face a buoyant tourist industry and pressures from mainland immigrants.	
e. Technological	Rating: 4
No new technologies were introduced in this project.	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders
The terminal evaluation report notes that stakeholder support for the project increased as the potential economic benefits of establishing an MPA became clear. Conflicts between stakeholders were reduced by creating areas reserved for artisanal and industrial fishing, delineated in collaboration with fishers, and by developing cooperative management methods with water sports operators.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
No such changes mentioned in the terminal evaluation.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
Project activities have led to the definition of a new type of environmentally protected area under Colombian law, namely the Marine Protected Areas (MPA).
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)
The project has no guaranteed follow-on funding.
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)?
According to the terminal evaluation, a key contributor to this project was the International Advisory Board (IAB),

³ Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

chaired by Cheri Recchia from the Wildlife Conservation society. The IAB met annually and supported the entire process from design to implementation. The IAB provided valuable advice, disseminated the Project in scientific circles, and provided support in the form of training and equipment donations.

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing (or proposed co-financing) 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?

Co-financing was essential for achieving objectives, as GEF funding was only 17% of the planned project cost of \$4.2M. The initial co-financing proposed was \$3.3 M, including CORALINA's own contribution of \$2.1. Contributions from other donors were initially \$1.2 M and included contributions from technical partners, the Center for Marine Conservation (CMC, now known as The Ocean Conservancy) and Island Resources Foundation (IRF).

Actual costs increased during project execution to a total of US\$5.9m, due to a doubling of the budget for workshops/training and a 50% increase in the budget for technical assistance. Worth noting is that all co-financing donors increased their contributions, providing additional resources to the project of \$1.7 M. "In kind" contributions were not valued during the project and are therefore not included in the cost figures.

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?

According to the terminal evaluation, the zoning expedition to the MPA covering the Northern Cays was delayed for nearly a year due to difficulties experienced by the lead technical partner, The Ocean Conservancy. It was impossible to complete zoning prior to the expedition because information was unavailable on this region.

Staff changes at CORALINA and on the project team in 2003, as well as elections in Dec. 2003 led to additional delays. Elections resulted in a new governor, mayor, secretary of planning, and secretary of agriculture and fisheries, all of whom are on CORALINA's board of directors and are key project stakeholders. All of these officials had to learn about the project in detail and in January 2003 requested more time to do so. Additionally, a new agency concerned with fisheries planning and management (INCODER) began functioning in the Archipelago during PY 3. This agency also had to be thoroughly integrated into the project.

As a result of these delays, implementation and enforcement of the MPA is lagging and the financial sustainability plan is not finalized. A six-month extension was granted from January to June 2005. Legal declaration of the MPA ran behind schedule and would not have been completed without the granted extension.

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.

Country ownership—in this case local ownership—has helped guarantee sustainable outcomes with regard to community and stakeholder support for the project. As CORALINA had significant prior experience working with the affected communities, it was able to implicate a large number of stakeholders in the MPA design and zoning process and successfully negotiate use agreements between native fishers, tourist industry operators, and local government agencies. Central government agencies did not play a large role in this project. The central government was slow to ratify the MPA, and has not indicated whether it will provide follow-on funding for the project.

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 M&E plan in the project brief (ProDoc) was well designed with clearly outlined activities for each component. A logical framework was described to assist in project tracking and data management and an implementation timeline was proposed. In addition, performance benchmarks were developed to complement the overall project indicators presented in the project summary and provided the basis for the Bank's disbursement of GEF funds throughout the project.

b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): S

According to the terminal evaluation, the project team developed a solid monitoring and evaluation system. CORALINA monitored project objectives, outcomes, and activities using logical framework indicators presented in the project brief. Project technical and financial implementation reports were filed every 6 months to meet both project requirements and internal CORALINA planning and evaluation schedules. The team also performed high quality biological and socio-economic assessments of the project zone and built the capacity to continue these assessments into the future. The International Project Advisory Board met least once a year in the Archipelago.

b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Yes.

b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Yes
<p>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?</p> <p>The project monitoring system provided real-time feedback in some components. For example, selected programs of stakeholder consultation, training, and capacity building included evaluation sessions using instruments such as questionnaires, group evaluation forms, and open discussions. Monitoring results and conclusions of evaluation reports were used to recommend and implement changes in project management, and for future reference in the development of similar or related projects.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Yes, the project M&E system provided a clear framework of activities for each component as well as performance benchmarks. Real-time feedback provided by the M&E helped improve the overall quality of project outputs.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</p> <p>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.</p> <p>According to the terminal evaluation, World Bank implementation of this project, through the Bogota office, was successful in generating expected outcomes and in strengthening the capacities of the executing agency and participating communities. Overall, the bank left decision-making to CORALINA and the local community but provided effective supervision, advice and technical support upon request. Bank advisers provided valuable input to project design and, also, substantially built up staff capacity at CORALINA. This led to a number of “spin-off” projects from this project, allowing additional activities to be completed and the leveraging of outside funds and technical support. At CORALINA’s request, the Bank sent two experts to San Andres to train staff in administrative aspects of project management like procurement and project accounting. This training substantially strengthened CORALINA as an institution; an additional output that will not only help ensure long-term sustainability of the GEF project but will also improve this agency’s overall work.</p> <p>The Bank also helped CORALINA promote local management without sacrificing expertise. CORALINA was determined to have local people run the project but there was little local experience in marine management. The idea to set up a board of international experts to advise a local project team emerged in planning meetings with the Bank.</p>
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale) MS
<p><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></p> <p>As described in the terminal evaluation, CORALINA has significant experience in managing environmental projects and was the most suitable choice for executing agency. The project team has maintained a strong focus on goals without sacrificing stakeholder participation, and despite severe disruption in leadership. CORALINA’s General Director during the first years of the project was replaced by election of the Board in December 2003, leading to a delay in project implementation and significant changes in the project team. The original coordinator and project supervisor left and much time had to be spent strengthening new project team members and regaining the sense of teamwork that had originally distinguished the project. The assembly of the new team led to a rapid execution during the final months of the project that allowed the project to meet most of its key objectives</p> <p>Reporting by the project team has been regular and detailed. The only flaw in execution is the failure to realize a solid financial plan to ensure continuation of the project, so that the MPA can be implemented and enforced.</p>

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

⁴ 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.

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<p>a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects</p>
<p>The principal lessons learned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community participation is integral to project success. CORALINA's principal success in designing and obtaining ratification for the Seaflower MPA was stemmed from its thoroughness and effort in ensuring community participation in every aspect of project execution, including design, monitoring, zoning, outreach and capacity building. 2. Biological and socioeconomic assessments should be key inputs to zoning agreements, as should the incorporation of indigenous knowledge. In addition to technical monitoring programs carried out by CORALINA scientists, community members were trained in four community-based monitoring methodologies, ensuring sustainable use and the conservation of ecosystems, key species, habitats and fish spawning aggregation sites. Indigenous knowledge from local communities was also gathered and used as a key input in zoning plans. 3. Trainees become trainers. An integral part of PA projects should be a solid training program as well as informal dissemination efforts. This approach will support the sustainability of project objectives. Stakeholder exchanges are essential to promote project objectives. Coordinating trips and exchanges for key stakeholders was crucial during project execution to support local appropriation and dissemination of project objectives. 4. International Advisory Boards are key players in an MPA. The role of the IAB was crucial, as it provided experience, contacts, lessons learned from previous MPAs, technical support, and in-kind contributions. Importantly, it also allowed the project team to be made up of local people without MPA experience at the time the project began, which engendered trust and support for the process and guaranteed local ownership.
<p>b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MPAs are long-term processes. It became evident during project execution that the objectives of assessing, designing, delimiting and establishing an MPA within the original time frame were too ambitious. Additionally, working with public organizations at national and local levels and extensive stakeholder participation imply longer project execution. 2. Implementing a financial sustainability strategy should be a central component in project execution. In this project, a financial sustainability strategy was designed during the first stages of activity execution. However, it should be ensured that elements of these strategies are implemented within the projects' duration in order to obtain feedback and improvement, as well as securing the MPA's sustainability. 3. Integrating conservation objectives, socioeconomic concerns, capacity building and equity result in MPAs that promote sustainable development. From the beginning the project was designed with an integrated sustainable development mission. A key project objective was the MPA's generation of local benefits. Since native communities depend on the sea and its resources for their economic and cultural survival, respecting ancestral fishing sites ensured the community's sustainable use of marine resources. This commitment was reflected in project implementation and formalized in the MPA objectives and zoning objectives that were agreed upon by the stakeholders and adopted by CORALINA's Board.

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 terminal evaluation provides a comprehensive and detailed assessment of project outputs and results relative to objectives.</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?</p>	S

The report provides fair and complete information about the project. No evidence gaps were noted.	
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report suggests some steps to improve project sustainability, but stops short of outlining a full exit strategy.	S
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned and recommendations are comprehensive and clearly supported by the evidence presented on project implementation and outcomes.	S
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes, project costs and co-financing are detailed.	S
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The terminal evaluation contained a detailed assessment of the project's M&E system and the supervision provided by the IA.	S

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)

--