

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		10/04/06
GEF Project ID:	800		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	673	GEF financing:	0.75	0.67
Project Name:	Marine Ecosystem Management Project	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.00
Country:	Seychelles	Government:	0.52	0.58
		Other*:	0.00	0.00
		Total Cofinancing	0.52	0.58
Operational Program:	Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	1.27	1.25
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Marine Conservation Society of Seychelles Ministry of Environment and Transport Marine Parks Authority	Work Program date		NA
		CEO Endorsement		Mar 2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Aug 2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: July 2003	Actual: March 2004
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: DRAFT	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 35 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 43 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 8 months
Author of TE:	NA	TE completion date: July 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: Sept 2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 14 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

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	S	NA	NA	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	NA	NA	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	N/A	NA	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	MU

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?
The TE covers most of the issues that need to be covered. However, detailing on each of the addressed issues is inadequate and at times cursory. It also does not rate performance. Therefore, it may not be considered a good practice.
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?
No such issues have been mentioned in the TE.
3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation? <p>According to project proposal document the global environmental objective of the project is <i>“successful management of Seychelles’ unique and threatened marine ecosystems in light of recent global and local changes in particular coral bleaching.”</i></p> <p>According to the TE, this remained unchanged during the course of project implementation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation? <p>According to project proposal document the global environmental objective of the project is <i>“to identify, monitor, manage and rehabilitate remnant ecosystems by the removal of critical barriers including lack of skills, scientific understanding and conservation management knowledge and direction.”</i></p> <p>According to the TE, this remained unchanged during the course of project implementation.</p>
3.2 Outcomes and Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the major project outcomes and impacts described in the TE? <p>The TE does not describe the actual outcomes of the project. It describes only the outputs of the project that are expected to lead to outcomes. According to TE, the corresponding outputs of following outcomes have been achieved (implying that the outcomes were achieved):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of recent changes to key marine ecosystem components; - Identification of impacts on key ecosystem components; - Evaluation of the socio-economic impacts of marine ecosystem degradation in Seychelles; - Implementation of direct measures to cope with impacts on marine ecosystems and components; - Institutional strengthening to cope with impacts on marine ecosystems; - Public information and awareness.

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**

Based on the information provided by the TE it can be said that the outcomes and outputs achieved by the project are consistent with the priorities of biodiversity focal area. The TE explains that the efforts on identification of recent changes in the key marine ecosystem components and impacts of the intervention, and assessment of socio-economic impacts of degradation of marine ecosystem, have a diagnostic purpose that helps understand the nature of the problem at hand. Direct interventions to reduce land based sources of pollution, conservation program for sharks, and removal of ‘plague organisms’ are consistent with reducing pressure on the marine biodiversity and helping it recuperate. Institutional strengthening efforts are consistent

with the objective to make the benefits from the project sustainable.	
B Effectiveness	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)? <p>According to the TE, the project's objectives remained unchanged during the implementation of the project and that it was able to achieve all its expected outcomes.</p>	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: UA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>The TE has not directly addressed the issue of cost effectiveness. Although the project was completed after a delay of about 8 months and the TE reports about problems in securing timely release of fund from the government for project activities, this information alone is not enough to determine the cost effectiveness of the project.</p>	

Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? <p>The TE does not discuss the extent project has achieved its intended impacts. The TE does have a section on "Project Impact Analysis," however, in this section only outputs have been discussed. The TE then does not move on to show to what extent these outputs have led to or will lead to achievement of project's intended impacts.</p>

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	Rating: L
<p>According to the TE, the government established a marine unit in 2001 to scientifically assess marine related development projects. The marine unit will remain within the conservation section of the environment ministry. The TE explains that the operating cost of this unit will, therefore, be borne by the government. Further, equipments procured during the project will continue to be used for monitoring of the studied species and environmental and marine parameter long after completion of the project. This ensures that it is likely that the future benefit flows from the initiatives taken as part of the project may not face financial risk.</p>	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
<p>According to TE, legislative measures, such as the one to protect white sharks and for protection of turtle nesting habitat, have been undertaken by the government to create an enabling environment for the activities promoted by the project. Also, steps taken under the project for involvement of various stakeholders will reduce anthropogenic pressure on the protected marine resources. The TE, however, also states that much more socio-political support is needed in order to sustain the benefits of the project. The TE explains the need for establishing an extensive network of protected marine areas to reduce the potential impacts of the factors known to reduce coral recruitment and subsequent growth and production. There is a low risk to the socio-political sustainability of the future flows of project benefits.</p>	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
<p>According to the TE, the project has been effective in developing requisite institutional and individual capacities to understand and monitor the coral reefs of the inner granite islands and to scientifically assess marine related development projects. New policies that are conducive to conservation are also likely to reduce institutional and governance risks to the project's future</p>	

benefit flows.	
D Environmental	Rating: UA
The TE does not address the environmental risks to the future benefits of the project.	

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

A Financial resources	Rating: L
B Socio political	Rating: ML
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
D Environmental	Rating: UA

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good

According to the TE, the evaluation of the socio-economic impacts of project activities within the project design has generated information on the good practices for natural resource management. This information would be useful for replication of project activities in other areas. The TE, however, does not discuss whether conscious efforts were made as part of the project design to facilitate replication of project activities that were found to be effective in generating global environmental benefits.

2. Demonstration

3. Replication

4. Scaling up

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

A. In retrospection, was the M&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&E activities)

Rating: MS

Based on the review of project appraisal document shows that the responsibility centers and time frame for program and M&E activities were clearly specified. However, a major weakness is that the log frame for the project was not included in the project documents. Further, the chosen indicators are primarily output oriented and, therefore, provide only weak information on how well the intended outcomes were accomplished.

B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&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&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

Rating: S

According to the TE, the M&E system of the project was successfully implemented and was effective. It states that the project steering committee met regularly to discuss and monitor progress of the project. Monitoring of the indicators, identified to determine the level of achievement of the project objectives and goals, was effectively carried out during the project. It further states that the surveys conducted for gathering data were scientific and the project was also able to develop tools and instruments for a coherent reporting system.

C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?

Rating: UA

The M&E activities had a separate budget of US \$ 25,000. The TE does not discuss whether this allocation was sufficient. However, it does seem to suggest that the M&E system of the project was effective and successful, and it does not flag any issues pertaining to funding of M&E activities.

Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?

While the TE does regard the M&E system of the project as successful and effective, it does not describe in reason for it being categorized as such in detail. However, the TE does state that

regular meetings of the steering committee to monitor project progress took place regularly, indicators were monitored regularly and data collection was scientific. Prima facie it does appear that the project M&E could be considered a good practice.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

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?

Following lessons mentioned in the TE are the important ones:

- Extensive networking of suitably protected marine areas is a prerequisite for a long term protection of the diversity of the coral communities;
- If a joint program is initiated with the involvement of government bureaucracy then an appropriate financial mechanism should be put in place to ensure that funds are released for project activities in a timely manner;

Remaining lessons listed in the TE don't seem to have wider applicability.

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.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

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 such additional information was available to the reviewer.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	MS
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	U
The report is too brief. Detailing is often cursory and inadequate.	
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	MS
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	MS
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	MS
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	MS

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 implies that the project was able to meet its objectives and outcomes. However, the indicators that have been used to measure performance achievement are primarily output oriented. A technical review of project impact could help determine the extent to which the project's intended outcomes were achieved. Also, such a technical analysis would also help ascertain the extent to which project's M&E system was effective and the attributes that made a

critical difference.

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

Project Proposal Document;
PIR 2002, 2003 & 2004.