

# GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	780		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1524	<b>GEF financing:</b>	1.495	1.495
Project Name:	Development of Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Tanzania	Government:	0.216	0.216
		Other*:	0.630 FFEM 0.042 IUCN 0.056 Communities	0.430 FFEM 0.042 IUCN 0.056 Communities
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.944	0.744
Operational Program:	OP 2. Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	2.439	2.239
IA:	UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania</li> <li>▪ IUCN</li> <li>▪ FFEM</li> </ul>	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		March 2002 (ProDoc approval)
		Closing Date	Proposed: December 2006	Actual: U/A (TE was conducted a few months before project closing)
Prepared by: Alejandro Imbach	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 54 month	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): U/A	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): U/A
Author of TE: ▪ Philip Tortell ▪ Benjamin Ngatunga		TE completion date:  December 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO:  April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 4 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	<b>MS</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>MS</b>
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	<b>NA</b>	<b>L (Institutional sustainability)</b> <b>ML (Financial sustainability)</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>ML</b>
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	<b>NA</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>U</b>
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>MS</b>
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>S</b>

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

Yes, with qualifications. The TE covered in a very detailed manner the key aspects defined in the evaluation ToR plus several other topics that the evaluation team considered relevant and worthwhile to explore. The evaluation conclusions and recommendations are clear, concise and coherent with the evaluation findings. The evaluation findings are evidence based. No unreasonable assumptions or logic gaps were found in the analysis. Finally, the document itself is well edited (avoiding unnecessary repetitions), user-friendly formatted and well written.

From the point of view of the GEF EO requirements, the TE could have been more clear and precise in analyzing the budget expense, activity costs, GEF funding and co-funding. M&E assessment should have been more incisive and should have taken into account the initial project M&E arrangements in contrast of what was actually done.

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

No, based on the information provided by the TE follow-up is considered not necessary.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

The project did not explicitly state any Global Environmental Objective, although the environmental implications of both the Project Goal and the Project Development Objective are obvious. The project goal was: **“Conserve a representative example of internationally significant and threatened marine biodiversity”**. There was no change in the Project Goal during project implementation.

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

The Project Development Objective remained unchanged during project implementation. The development objective of the project is to **“enable local and government stakeholders to protect effectively and utilize sustainably the marine biodiversity and resources of Mnazi Bay and the Ruvuma Estuary”**.

### 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

**Rating: S**

The relevance of this project is unquestionable. From an environmental point of view the TE found that WWF considers the Mtwara-Quirimbas Complex (which includes the Mnazi Bay), as one of eight sites of global importance on the East African coast, because:

- It is located where the South Equatorial Current meets the African coast.
- It comprises extensive and complex reef systems with high coral diversity (>48 genera).
- It is an important turtle feeding and nursery site.
- It is an important feeding area for Crab Plovers and migratory birds.
- It contains the unique Ruvuma dunes system with the likelihood of rare or endemic flora.
- It is an important nursery area for Humpback whales.

Furthermore, this project is strongly aligned with Tanzania’s national priorities. The Mnazi Bay Park was established by law at the time of project preparation and with PDF funding processes. The full Project has assisted the creation of the Park’s functional capacity. National ownership is now considered as guaranteed, as the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism is currently providing the core funding for Park staff salaries.

#### b. Effectiveness

**Rating: MS**

The TE acknowledges that “The (Evaluation) Team cannot rate progress towards the Development Objective by looking at the Indicators as they do not match the Objective”. In terms of the project outcomes it also concludes that: “the project has carried out virtually all the planned activities and made significant progress towards all the targeted Outcomes. It needs to be recognized that as a result of the type of project – the Marine Park exists, and will continue – many of the activities are open-ended”. Finally, the TE rates the progress attained by the project as satisfactory.

On the other hand, the 2006 and 2007 PIRs both stated that “the MS rating is a “wake-up call or warning” to the overall team (Government, Project, and UNDP) that time is rapidly running out, for the project to deliver.” Furthermore the 2007 PIR concludes that “only 9 of the 21 targets could be said to have been met or are on-track to be met.” The TE did not address these conclusions from the PIRs and it did not provide a clear analysis of the project delivery in terms of

outcomes and outputs. The TE presented a brief comment for each the progress achieved in terms of each outcome and rated 3 of them as satisfactory and the other 3 as marginally satisfactory (the appropriate term would be moderately satisfactory).

The terminology used in the ProDoc, PIRs and TE is not consistent, what the PIR calls an “outcome” is identified as an “indicator” in the TE. This issue about the ambiguity of the language used was identified and criticized by the TE, although no clarification or homogenization of terms was made.

Taking into account the before mentioned PIR conclusions and the lack of evidence to sustain the TE appreciation, the rating of Moderately Satisfactory is given.

**c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)**

**Rating: MU**

The project design stipulated a two phase implementation process. The first phase (24 months, also called the planning phase) was implemented by IUCN and the second phase (30 months, also called as the implementation phase) was implemented by the Marine Park Team. The fact of having two different field agencies<sup>1</sup> for each phase without a clear strategy and agreements on the handing over process led to significant delays and conflicts among the partners. Issues like the refunding of US\$209,680 which had been unilaterally pre-financed by IUCN, caused a severe implementation slow down in the inter-phase period. Finally the project handover to the Marine Park Team occurred almost 2 years after phase one ended.

The TE findings indicates that choosing the IUCN- Eastern Africa Regional Office (whose regional office is based in Nairobi) as the field agency during Phase 1 introduced an extra layer in all administration processes, along with its inherent inefficiencies: lack of presence in the field, disbursement delays, communication difficulties among partners, confusions between the technical advisor and project manager roles, etc. These difficulties seemed to diminish during Phase 2, when the Marine Park Team took over.

In conclusion, the above mentioned implementation deficiencies (some of which came from the project design itself) combined with an ambitious and tight schedule (considering the expected results and the project time frame) caused serious delays in the project delivery (see point 4.1.1.b Effectiveness) and budget implementation. Due to tight scheduling of some of the project components and activities the project did not achieve several key outcomes and was not able to fully utilize its budget (€200,000 out of €600,000 from the FFEM cofinance is going to be reabsorbed by the donor at the end of the project).

Finally, in relation with the project efficiency, the TE states: “In the opinion of the Evaluation Team and when comparing this project with similar projects elsewhere, the overall budget allocated to this project was adequate for the activities envisaged but not excessive. What led to the unspent balance of FFEM funds at the end of the UNDP/GEF project was the lack of time available to carry out the planned activities which resulted from the delays experienced during the transition between Phase One and Phase Two.”

**4.1.2 Impacts**

At global level, the most significant impact is that the Mnazi Bay Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park is protecting one of eight sites in the East African coast that are considered to be of global importance by WWF.

At regional level, as a result of this project, discussions have been initiated for a transboundary protected area between Tanzania and Mozambique (this would cover the Mnazi Bay–Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park in Tanzania and the Palma-Rouvuma Marine National Reserve in Mozambique).

At national level the project leaves a valuable legacy as an initiative attempting to consolidate the multipurpose protected areas approach, where environmental conservation and different productive activities can effectively coexist (gas extraction, livelihood for 30,000 villagers, ecotourism, etc.).

**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.

<sup>1</sup> The TE uses the term “implementing agency” when referring to the field agencies who implemented the project activities at field level: IUCN or Marine Park Team. The implementing agency for this project was UNDP. The executing agency was the Government of Tanzania (through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism) who was the ultimate responsible of the GEF grant.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>The financial sustainability of the Marine Park is not yet secure. The existence of the Park itself is very likely to continue because the core funding for staff salaries is allocated from the central Government budget (this funding is very likely to continue). However, operational costs are significant and additional funds will be needed in order to continue the implementation of the strategic activities that, on the long term, will promote conservation of the Park's biodiversity (through activities that address community engagement, consolidation of alternative income generation activities, transboundary protection agreements, promotion of environmental friendly tourism, mitigation of natural gas extraction, etc.).</p>	
<b>b. Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>The socio political support is perhaps one of the Park's strongest assets as the creation of the Park itself is the result of a multi stakeholder agreement (Mtwara Declaration) including Government authorities, community leaders, the private sector and NGOs.</p> <p>According to the TE most of the communities found inside the Marine Park Protected Area have a positive perception of the Park and they are actively participating (most of them on a voluntary basis) in several conservation and monitoring activities (fish landings monitoring, manning the Park gatehouse and collecting Park entry fees, carrying out reef surveys, monitoring turtle nesting sites, and serving as Honorary Rangers).</p> <p>The TE concludes that a strong sense of ownership towards the Marine Park has been achieved through the coordinated work with the Village Liaison Committees, to the point that "those who were asked why they did it replied that "this was their Park" and they were "protecting their resources".</p> <p>Some conflicts have occurred within one community (out of eleven) that is now reluctant to participate. However, at the time TE was conducted this wasn't considered to be a serious risk.</p>	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>The Mnazi Bay Park was established by law at the time of project preparation as a result of processes financed through PDF funds. The Park personnel is now on the Government payroll and the Park management is going to be fully assumed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism once the project comes to an end.</p> <p>A high sense of country ownership (at national, regional and district level) has been confirmed by the Mid-Term Evaluation and the Terminal Evaluation. For example the Board of Trustees for Marine Parks and Reserves wrote formally to UNDP: "The Board is firmly committed to supporting the ongoing development and management of Marine Parks in Tanzania..., we can confirm that the Board will: [...] Appoint and meet the salary and other expenses of the Marine Park staff including the Warden, Enforcement Officer, Socio-economic Officer, Parks Awareness Officer and other supporting staff; and assume full responsibility for meeting all the ongoing costs of managing the Marine Park at the conclusion of the Project."</p>	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>If the Marine Park Management Team succeeds in implementing the unconcluded project strategies and the remaining activities (particularly those related with engaging the local stakeholders in sustainable productive activities, park regulations, participatory monitoring, etc.), it is very likely that the ecological services provided by the ecosystems protected by this Marine Park will remain. Apparently there are no other serious environmental threats other than those created by the existing activities and habitants of the Park, which are the ones that project strategies have been addressing since the beginning.</p>	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
---	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>a. Production of a public good</b>
<p>The establishment of the Marine Park itself is considered to be a very relevant public good at national and global level.</p>
<b>b. Demonstration</b>
<p>The Marine Park is considered to be a successful example of a multi-purpose protected area. This is just the second marine park in Tanzania and its demonstration effect could promote the creation of other protected areas in Tanzania and its neighboring countries. The projects has also produced and disseminated valuable knowledge among its partners in relation with some innovative principles, such as: participatory planning, alternative income generation, community based biological monitoring, etc.</p>
<b>c. Replication</b>
<p>Trans-boundary discussions between Mozambique and Tanzania have been initiated (partially as a result of the current status of the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park) that could lead to a broader marine protected area linking the two contiguous Marine Parks.</p> <p>The project has also indirectly impacted the management of the Mafia Island Marine Park through information sharing via field trips, meetings and sharing lessons learned and experiences.</p>

#### **d. Scaling up**

The active involvement of the Government since the early stages of the project has produced a strong sense of ownership and has also motivated the review and reformulation of some structures and procedures at the governmental level, such as:

- The Marine Parks and Reserves Act No. 29 of 1994 and its Management structure are being reviewed to meet/address the existing needs and challenges. Some of which have been influenced by experiences in the implementation of the project activities.
- Administrative structure of Marine Parks and Reserves Unit (MPRU) is being reviewed to sort out issues related to overlapping of responsibilities / mandates between units and sections within the Institution as well as between itself and its staff and those of outside organizations such as the Division of Fisheries.
- The staffing levels and organizational structure of MPRU are also being re-evaluated given the experiences both in Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park and in the other Marine Parks and Reserves Units.

#### **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?

Co-financing represented a significant portion of the total project budget (33.2% of the total project budget). From the total co-financing almost 58% came from FFEM and 29% from Tanzania's Government.

Initially the FEMM co-financing was expected to be around US\$400,000 but finally €630,000 materialized. Ironically, the project was not been able to utilize all the funds within the agreed timeframe and some €200,000 will be reabsorbed by FFEM at the end of 2007. At the moment of the TE, there was an ongoing negotiation between the Government and FFEM to extent the Project Second Phase (implying no extra cost to the donor), in order to utilize the remaining €200,000

According to the TE, the co-financing funds were effectively raised: "the TE team traced the direct co-financing to the extent possible and was able to ascertain that the greater part of the funds had been raised.[...]. The Government contribution in kind [...] has been well and truly spent [...]."

The TE did not provide a detailed analysis about the project funds origin and expenses. It is, therefore, not possible to track down how the GEF funds were invested or to differentiate between the different funding sources. Project funds were grouped together as if there were all coming from the same funding source.

**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?

The project was expected to be complete by the end of December 2006. At the time when terminal evaluation was completed (December 2007) the project had not been completed. Thus, there has been a delay of more than a year in project completion.

Possible reasons for these delays include an ambitious project design and a short time frame to accomplish results. In addition, the execution arrangements also seem to be a significant cause. The idea of selecting two different executing agencies for each phase, without a clear handover strategy, caused significant delays and conflicts among the partners (see point 4.1.1.c).

Without any doubt, these delays had a negative effect on achievement of the project outcomes. The fact that the project was unable to deliver some key outcomes (such as the Financial Strategy for the Marine Park for example) increased the threats of the Park sustainability itself (see point 4.2.a).

**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.

A strong sense of country ownership has helped project implementation at various levels and it has also influenced the project sustainability in a very positive way. Proof of this is the fact that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism is ready to take over the Park Management and that the Government is already paying the Park Staff salaries. Obviously, these decisions dramatically increased the likelihood of the Park sustainability, at least from the financial point of view (see point 4.2.a)

From the implementation point of view, the country ownership has also translated in collaborative actions. At the beginning of Phase 1, the Park HQ was located in Mtwara, in a government offices complex.

At local level, country ownership was also very helpful for conducting a successful participatory planning process. Communities inside the park have actively participated in different aspects of the project implementation (most of them

on a voluntary basis) (see point 4.2.b).

#### 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): MS

In relation with the M&E design, the project appraisal document defined the following arrangements:

- Environmental and socio-economic (baseline) assessment from the start of the project (the budget for this activity was \$ 32,875).
- Project performance monitoring according to the indicators and benchmarks defined in the Logical Framework Analysis.
- Evaluation missions at the end of each phase to report independently on progress against the defined indicators and benchmarks.
- Performance of the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit monitored and evaluated through the Advisory Committee at the local level and the Project Steering Committee at the national level.
- Major review of the AIG<sup>2</sup> projects in the final year of the Project.
- A schedule for Phase 1, including some of these M&E activities and other UNDP and GEF internal administrative procedures and reviews (such as Annual Workplan and Progress Report, Quarterly Workplan and Progress Report, Annual Financial Report, Quarterly Financial Report, Audits, etc.)

The project log frame identified over 20 indicators and its corresponding verifiers, to assess the project progress in terms of the project results (also called outcomes in the ProDoc) and the project development goal. Some of these indicators were fairly clear and coherent, others were actually project outputs. The document did not specify how (costs, staff, schedule, etc.) the log frame indicators were going to be verified.

##### b. M&E plan Implementation

Rating (six point scale): U

Although the ProDoc identified several arrangements for the project M&E it is not possible to assess whether these activities were carried out or not. The TE does not make any references or comments about the M&E initial plan (except for the Mid Term Evaluation).

The TE reports some specific efforts that were made in terms of monitoring (such as applying a scorecard to assess the Park management effectiveness, compliance monitoring activities with the assistance of community volunteers, incipient ecosystem monitoring, etc.). It is the opinion of the TE that the lack of a coherent M&E Framework resulted in a diminished project capacity for adaptive management.

According to the evaluation team, the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) provided valuable and opportune feedback. The MTE suggested 3 strategic recommendations and 99 specific recommendations. Unfortunately, and even with the Management Response accepting almost every recommendation (only 7 were not accepted and 1 was partially accepted), just a few were implemented.

At this point it is difficult to avoid the inevitable question: what is the point of undergoing MTE, accepting its recommendations and not having them implemented? Perhaps the project closing scenario could have looked much better.

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

No. The ProDoc defined an M&E Schedule for Phase 1 with a budget of \$76,275, which represents 7.4% of the total budget for that particular Phase which is a little low (considering 10% as a normal practice). No budget allocation could be found for M&E actions on Phase 2.

b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?

The TE does not provide any information about the M&E Plan execution. It is not possible to answer this question. Some M&E activities were implemented but this was done without following a coherent plan. Given the available information, it is not possible at the moment to trace back the funds and time allocation for these activities.

b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feedback? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? From an operational point of view, the UNDP and GEF administrative requirements helped the project to carry out its day-to-day tasks and to fulfill its obligations. From a strategic point of view, the TE does not mention the systematic use of any analytical tool to provide feedback (except perhaps the use of a scorecard for assessing the Park management effectiveness). Evidence of this is that the Logframe, supposedly a dynamic tool for adaptive management, remained untouched throughout the entire project.

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so,

<sup>2</sup> Alternative Income Generation

explain why.  
No. See previous sections.

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

##### **a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS**

##### **b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): U**

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.

UNDP as the IA, and the Tanzanian Government agreed that the project will be executed under the NEX (national execution) modality, with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism as the EA. It was recognized that during the initial stages of implementation, national capacities would be weak, so the project was designed in two phases with First Phase implementation entrusted to a well-known international organization (IUCN) and the Second Phase to be implemented by the Government, after a Mid-Term Evaluation.

Although, this looked like a good plan at the time, the absence of plan or strategy to manage the handover process led to several conflicts, misunderstandings, delays and other inefficiencies. UNDP leadership and experience in the region should have foreseen this arrangement as a probable cause of conflict or at least it could have reacted more rapidly (it took almost 2 years for the handover to become effective).

This and other strategic deficiencies mentioned before, such as: poor project design, absence of a M&E Plan, poor quality of the Logframe, no follow up of the Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations, unclear project exit strategy, underspent budget, etc; which all fall under the IA responsibilities, result in an Unsatisfactory rating.

##### **c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>3</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): S**

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.

The EA for this project was the Government of Tanzania, through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. During Phase 1 the project implementation was delegated to the IUCN. It is difficult to assess the role of the EA for this period, because the TE is not clear about what were the operational arrangements and responsibilities for each of these two institutions during Phase 1.

During Phase 2, the project implementation fell under the responsibility of the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit, and through the Unit, to the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Team. The whole idea of having a two phased project was based on the recognition that the national capacities needed to be strengthened first, so it is difficult to assess the performance of the EA, when one of the project objectives was to improve the EA capacities considered insufficient at the very beginning

Taking into account the progress made by the EA from its initial state (when it was found unsuitable to run the project on its own), the situation where it is now (completing Phase 2 and preparing to carry on with the Park Management once the project ends) and its commitment with the project (core funding of the Park), and also its quota of responsibility towards the project execution and delivery, its execution is rated as Satisfactory.

## 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**

The TE clearly brings out four key lessons extracted from the project review:

- “The project has genuinely strived to provide avenues for community participation; however, its efforts did not always create the envisaged results, at least not in the early stages of the project. The lesson from this is that it takes time, maybe a long time, to encourage and convince people to change the way of life that they have practiced for generations – projects that rely on the good will and collaboration of communities need to allow adequate time for confidence to be built and credibility to be established before they can expect results.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

- “In an effort to build capacity in the First Phase and then enhance that capacity through operational responsibility, the project was designed in two Phases and entrusted to two different actors. In hindsight this was not a good model and the project suffered because of the problems of transition. The lesson is that before such a model is applied again, the project proponents need to weigh and balance the benefits of such an approach, with the risks which appear inevitable.”
- “Alternative Income Generation activities are a recognized way of easing the pressure on natural resources without penalizing communities that have depended on them. But in order to maintain credibility in the eyes of the communities, these activities must be successful. The lesson is that all AIGs must be worked through thoroughly and before they are applied, because no AIG is a lesser evil than a failed AIG.”
- “The Park is going to depend on sustainable financial support sources for its continued effective operation and the Sustainable Financing Strategy is still being developed and negotiations are still ongoing, a few weeks from project closure, with the risk that time will run out before a robust strategy has been developed. The lesson is that such an essential element for sustainability must be finalized early in the project life so that it can be tried out, refined and adopted well before the Park becomes reliant on it.”

- b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**
- TE recommends to UNDP and GEF that the role and function played by Project Steering Committee in project governance should be examined and that they should consider developing guidelines for the setting up and operational procedures of PSCs.
  - The unclear distinction and relativity between the roles of Project Manager and Technical Advisor are a recurring problem in UN projects and the TE recommends against this sort of model in future.
  - The TE recommends that when a phased project is designed in future, there should not be a change in implementing agency and, if this is unavoidable, there needs to be a strategy to ensure an orderly hand-over of project management responsibilities.
  - The TE recommends that for projects implementing “open-ended” activities (such as this project: establishing and running a Marine Park), progress should be measured by the distance from the baseline rather than the distance towards an objective.

**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.**

NA  
 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><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b></p> <p>The TE presented a fairly good assessment of the project outcomes, including specific comments and ratings for each one of them. It also commented on the project progress according to the Project Management Unit, which is useful for the reader to have an idea of how the project conceived itself and progress achieved. This was coherent with the participatory approach that TE aimed to follow. In terms of project impact, a separate analysis was presented for impacts at national level and impacts at global level.</p> <p>The TE analysis of project outcomes was in weak in terms of the project outputs. The progress assessment and the ratings given by the TE would have been better sustained and justified if such information would have been properly presented and analyzed (see point 4.1.1.b).</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>



<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>The report has 4 separate chapters (out of 6) dedicated to present the evaluation findings and its sustaining evidence and then, on the last chapter, the conclusions and recommendations are introduced. The logic sequence linking the findings, the conclusions and the recommendations is generally clear and consistent. Outcome ratings provided in the terminal evaluation report seem to be slightly optimistic.</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b></p> <p>The TE has one specific chapter dedicated to the project sustainability assessment. This analysis is addressed through 6 main subjects: institutional sustainability, financial sustainability, knowledge management, exit strategy, replicability and follow-up. A fairly detailed and critical assessment is presented for each one of them and separate ratings were given for the first four aspects mentioned.</p>	<p><b>HS</b></p>
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b></p> <p>Throughout the report several relevant lessons were identified but the list of lessons learned presented at the end of the report is rather short. An effort should have been made to be sure that all the useful lessons were picked from the different parts of the report and were properly summarized in its corresponding section. Lessons learned is one of the most valuable contributions that a project evaluation can make, so it is important not to loose them by leaving them scattered through different parts of the document. The few lessons learned (presented as such) are very clear, relevant and evidenced based. Definitely, future project designs could benefit from them.</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b></p> <p>The overall figures of the project costs and co-financing were clearly indentified and discussed. Project budget was presented, including the costs for each outcome. However, a more detailed analysis including the cost for each activities or even better for each project output, would have been useful. This information could have allowed the reader to track down the budget expenditure with greater accuracy.</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b></p> <p>The M&amp;E analysis was not very strong. A deeper analysis of the project initial M&amp;E arrangements and what actually took place should have been done. It is not clear to what extent the M&amp;E plan was implemented and if it was implemented differently or not implemented at all, there is no mention to the causes for these changes.</p> <p>A small confusion was introduced by the fact that the TE mistakenly assumed that the compliance and ecosystem monitoring were part of the project M&amp;E Plan when they were actually project activities. In general, the ratings given and critical approach applied to this section were less strict than the ones used on other sections of the TE.</p>	<p><b>MS</b></p>

<p><b>7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.</b></p>
<p>None</p>