

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		24 <sup>th</sup> October 2006
GEF ID:	799		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Conservation of the Tubbataha Reef National Marine Park (TRNMP) and world heritage site	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.749714	?
Country:	Philippines	IA/EA own:	0.146000	?
		Government:		
		Other*:	0.025000	?
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.984707	?
Operational Program:	2	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	1.905421	?
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	World Wild life Fund	Work Program date		?
		CEO Endorsement		03/20/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		08/23/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 8/2004	Actual: 8/2004
Prepared by: Lee Alexander Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 4 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 4 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 0
Author of TE: Raoul Cola, Edgardo Tongson, Angelique Songco, Marivel Dygico, Terry Aquino		TE completion date: 05/2005	TE submission date to GEF EO: 6/8/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 year & 1 month

\* 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

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A).

Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>U/A</b>
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>U/A</b>
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>U/A</b>
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>HU</b>

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No Why? Unfortunately, the evaluation report has not followed GEF EO guidelines for evaluations. It provides no ratings. It is primarily a participatory / appreciative evaluation – this type of evaluation has been combine in the past with more traditional external methods (e.g. See evaluation for Jozani-Chwaka Bay Conservation Project), however in this case it has not. The evaluation does not report against the original project objectives and outcomes in a clear or coherent manner, in what seems to be a good project, which suffers from a poor evaluation process. Although the evaluators should be commended for a participatory approach, however, IAs need to be made aware this is not an acceptable evaluation format.

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

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

The overall objective of the proposed conservation initiative is to conserve the unique and relatively pristine condition of the globally significant biological diversity and ecological processes of the Tubbataha Reefs National Marine Park (TRNMP) and to manage TRNMP and the surrounding area on a sustainable and ecologically sound basis.

The project has five (5) immediate objectives:

1. **Conservation Management:** Bring about the effective long-term conservation management of TRNMP.
2. **Conservation Awareness:** Raise awareness regarding the importance of conserving TRNMP such that stakeholders (local communities, Government, dive operators, tourists, and others) are aware of and actively participating in conservation.
3. **Regulations, Policy, and Advocacy:** Ensure that relevant policies, regulations, and Government appropriations support conservation and resource management in TRNMP.
4. **Ecosystem Research and Monitoring:** Enhance ecological understanding and adaptive management of TRNMP and nearby reefs through an ecosystem research and monitoring program.
5. **Sustainable Resource Management and Livelihood:** Enhance conservation by developing and implementing effective community-based resource management and livelihood projects.

**Any changes during implementation?** None reported

- **What are the Development Objectives?** Same as above

**Any changes during implementation?** None reported

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

1. Conservation Management:

**Outcomes 1: Long-term Conservation Management** The TE reports that the project improved enforcement (in coordination with the Navy) – around 80 patrols of the coral reef are made each year or approximately twice a week.

The project has supported the Tubbataha PA Management Board (TPAMB) which has included a broad range of stakeholders from government, local government, military and the local communities – it is the formal managerial institutional mechanism for the PA. The TE evaluates the effectiveness of the Board by assessing meeting regularity and attendance – both of which were high during the project (see pages 12 – 14). The project also assisted the Board in putting in place 'management systems' (page 16 – 17) such as operation planning, budgeting, financing, personnel, equipment, travel and training. These allow the Board to set short-term managerial goals, allocate resources and monitor progress. The project also produced a training manual for marine park rangers – which includes laws, affidavit-making, arrests, searches and seizures. Training has involved the Navy. However, there is no comprehensive training system in place as yet and it is largely ad-hoc.

**Outcome 2: Conservation Awareness** – The project funded production and dissemination of articles, brochures, and briefing materials. Face to face awareness raising was also completed through workshops, seminars and regular briefing of divers. Radio and televisions broadcasts were also made. The TE reports that awareness raising resulted in 'concrete changes / actions' such as coastal clean up and mangrove planting (see page 13 – 14)

**Outcome 3: Regulations / Policy / Advocacy** – A bill is currently in the Philippine Congress aimed at rationalizing the management of the PA. The proposed bill signifies the growing importance of the PA. The PA is protected by the RAMSAR and UNESCO World Heritage listings. The operation of the PA has been supported by the development of 12 legally binding instruments that testify to the partnership of the groups involved such as municipal government, provincial government and national legislation. However, the conclusion of the TE notes that an overall legal status and instrument for the PA to rationalize the management is still required.

**Outcome 4: Ecosystem Research and Monitoring** – Over time coral diversity has improved from 260 species (1982) to 372 (2001). But fish diversity has dropped from the know baseline in 1982 of 379 species to 245 in 2004 (project end). Hence, the overall trends are somewhat confusing and have been hampered by irregular surveys (hence could be large surveyor error). The TE reports that Fish biomass has been measured every year since 1998 – however there is drastic fluctuation in values from a low of 22.93 MT per sqkm to 137.33 MT per sqkm in 2002. Hence no trend can be discerned or actually attributed to improved conservation management by the TE (see page 21 – 25). There is a missing data with regard to the status of sea grasses.

**Outcome 5: Sustainable Resource Management and Livelihood** – A survey of household incomes in 2002 shows cash income of PHP2000 in 2004 this has increased to 3812. CPF (livelihood support organization) membership increased from 152 in 2003 to 306 at the time of the TE. The CPF provides micro-finance to local people for livelihood support activities. Other indicators of livelihood improvement (based on WWF surveys) show increases in lot / land ownership from 82% to 86% and home ownership from 85 to 95% over the project period.

#### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1 Outcomes

##### **A Relevance** **Rating: S**

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

The project was relevant to OP2 / SP1.

##### **B Effectiveness** **Rating: U/A**

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

Unfortunately the project provides a detailed description of outputs with little analysis of possible / probable outcome or sustainability on most issues, with the exception of livelihood support aspects, where considerable success was gained (see also LBS report which confirms) although the TE does not make sufficient links between livelihood improvements and conservation related activities (unlike the LBS report). However, overall it is not possible to make an overall assessment of the project outcomes.

##### **C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)** **Rating: U/A**

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?**

Not possible to do this given the lack of assessment / data presentation in the TE. U/A rating is given

##### **Impacts**

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?** The discussion in the TE is predominantly at the output level hence it is not possible to assess outcomes or impacts

**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.

##### **A Financial resources** **U/A**

**Rating:**

No substantive discussion in the TE. Although the conclusion notes that long-term funding is a serious risk to the PA sustainability – but there is not a full discussion of this.

<b>B Socio political</b> <b>U/A</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
No substantive discussion in the TE	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b> <b>U/A</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
No substantive discussion in the TE	
<b>D Environmental</b> <b>U/A</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
No substantive discussion in the TE	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating:U/A</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating:U/A</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating:U/A</b>

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>1. Production of a public good</b> - No discussion in the TE
<b>2. Demonstration</b> - No discussion in the TE
<b>3. Replication</b> – No discussion in the TE
<b>4. Scaling up</b> – No discussion in the TE

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

<b>A. In retrospection, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b> <b>U/A</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
No direct discussion in the TE	
<b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b>	<b>Rating: U/A</b>
No direct discussion in the TE	
<b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</b> <b>Rating: U/A</b>	
No direct discussion in the TE	
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice? Unable to assess</b>	

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b>
The TE does not have a lessons section; however the following ad-hoc lessons can be extracted from the text (see pages 29 – 30) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single group or institution cannot provide all the required management input. A wide network of stakeholders where everyone gives a share is needed</li> <li>• Legal instruments are need to underpin managerial authority and operations</li> <li>• Partnership between a wide range of government and non-government institutions is required for effective conservation</li> </ul>

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
No comment

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report / Overall = 1.4</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	2
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b>	1
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b>	1
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>	1
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b>	1
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b>	2

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes: X

No:

Explain: The TE does not report against project outcomes in the original design, overall there is a lot of descriptive information with minimal analysis. The TE is a disgrace. The Country Portfolio Evaluation should follow up this issue to substantiate the outcomes of the project

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

The Local Benefits Case Study of the project is available however, it is was not used to inform the TE review, as it was based on a visit in early 2004 – a year before the TE. The evaluators referenced the report but do not seem to have actively drawn from its lessons and conclusions. This is a pity.

**Note by Reviewer: David Todd**

The presentation of this document as a Terminal Evaluation is very strange. The authors include both the Project Manager and the Park Manager and the report claims only to present stakeholders' perspectives on the project. Indeed, the report itself says (P2), “Participatory evaluation does not supplant but complement internal and external evaluation and validate their findings”. As noted in the TER, this study is simply not designed to fulfill any of the GEF TE requirements. This is all the more baffling since WWF in the Philippines has considerable capacity to collate more “objective” data, including on marine ecology; and, in general, this project is well documented and has benefited from substantial efforts at monitoring. Based on the evidence of the Local Benefits Study, this is a very good project, targeting difficult objectives in a demanding environment, which should have produced substantive lessons for application more widely. I therefore support the ratings given by the TE reviewer and regret that UNDP has missed

23 August 2006

the opportunity to undertake a more comprehensive and independent review of this important project.