

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
				Review date:	10/24/2006
GEF Project ID:	807		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)	
IA/EA Project ID:	4030-01-01	GEF financing:	0.73	0.73	
Project Name:	Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS), Food Security and Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.03	
Country:	Russia	Government:	0.31	NA	
		Other*:	1.70	NA	
		Total Cofinancing	2.01	NA	
Operational Program:	OP10	Total Project Cost:	2.74	NA	
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) and Secretariat of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) (NGOs)	Work Program date		NA	
		CEO Endorsement		02/22/2000	
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Feb/2001	
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:	
		January 2004	Nov 2005		
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 35 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 57 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 22 months	
Author of TE: Ivan Holoubek		TE completion date: June 2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: July 2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: One 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	S	HS	S	MU

2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	S	MS	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	MS	HS	S	S
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	MS	MS

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

No

The report includes a fair assessment of achievement or results. It is deficient in covering the lessons that could be learned from the project and has also not critically appraised whether project outcomes will lead to global environmental benefits. The report is also not concise.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

No such issue has been mentioned.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the TE report the global environment objectives of the project were:

- Assisting indigenous peoples in developing appropriate remedial actions to reduce the health risks resulting from the contamination of their environment and traditional food sources;
- Enhancing the position of the Russian Federation in international negotiations to reduce the use of persistent toxic substances, and to empower indigenous peoples to participate actively and fully in these negotiations.
- Enabling the Russian Federation and Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON) to increase their involvement in the work of the eight-nation Arctic Council to reduce emissions of PTS.

There have been no changes in project's global environment objectives as the global environment objectives listed in the project appraisal document are the same those listed in the TE report.

- What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the TE report the expected outcomes of the project were:

- Recommendations to federal and local authorities, indigenous peoples and the international community on measures to reduce exposure of indigenous peoples to persistent toxic substance, including identification of priority areas where actions are needed.
- Assessment of the significance of aquatic food chains as a path way of exposure of indigenous peoples to persistent toxic substances.
- Assessment of the relative importance of local and distant sources, and the role of atmospheric and riverine transport of persistent toxic substances.

There have been no changes in project's expected development outcomes as the expected outcomes listed in the project appraisal document are the same those listed in the TE report.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The outcomes listed in the TE are:

- Recommendations to federal and local authorities, indigenous peoples and the international community on measures to reduce exposure of indigenous peoples to persistent toxic pollutants, including identification of priority areas where actions are needed;
- Assessment of the significance of aquatic food chains as a pathway of exposure of indigenous peoples to persistent toxic pollutants; and,
- Assessment of the relative importance of local and distant sources, and the role of atmospheric and riverine transport of persistent toxic pollutants.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance

Rating: MU

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

The project outcomes one and two (listed in section 3.2 of this TER) are not consistent with the objectives of OP10 under which this project is listed. While OP10 focuses at reducing the pollution load on the international water bodies, outcome one and two focus more on how to prevent exposure of the local population to persistent toxic substances and on understanding the manner in which the persistent toxic substances affect local population. These outcomes primarily correspond to "adaptation" as presently understood in the Climate Change focal area. Since projects aimed at facilitating "adaptation" have been allowed only recently in the GEF and that too only in the Climate Change focal area, these two objectives are not relevant to the GEF operational programs, especially OP 10. The third outcome (listed in section 3.2 of this TER) is relevant to the OP10 objectives since it aims to gauge the relative importance of the local and distant sources of pollution. This information could be useful in devising activities that reduce pollutant load on an international water body. However, since none of the activities in the project actually focused on pollutant load reduction, the link of third outcome to the OP10 strategies is a rather tenuous one. Therefore, the outcomes of the project have been rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

B Effectiveness

Rating: S

- **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)?**

Based on the information provided by the TE report it could be inferred that the project was effective in accomplishing the expected outcomes. The TE report points out that all the activities required to accomplish the outcomes were completed. It also informs that the expected outcomes were also accomplished and the one aiming at determining the relative importance of various sources of pollution was even verified by the evaluators conducting the TE.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: S

- **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?**

According to the TE report the project achieved very comprehensive results including gathering information on sources of pollution, emission inventory, and determination of occurrence toxins in the abiotic and biotic matrices. It further opines that the budget was used very effectively and to internationally acceptable standards of accountability.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

The third outcome accomplished by the project involved gauging the relative importance of the

local and distant sources of pollution. This information could be useful in devising more appropriate strategies in future to reduce the pollutant load in international water bodies.

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: ML
According to the TE report the financial sustainability is primarily contingent upon international support. It informs that national resources of financial support are limited given the scale of the persistent toxic substances problem in Russian Federation. However, the TE report informs, a potential system for persistent toxic substances monitoring and evaluation is being discussed and designed at the governmental level.	
B Socio political	Rating: L
According to the TE, there is sufficient public and stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project. However, the TE informs, this support should be sustained on a long term basis and must be closely connected with the national policy development and government strategy.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
According to the TE report, national institutions are fully able to continue this in this work, but a legal framework and relevant laws that address the conclusions of the national industrial policy is required.	
D Environmental	Rating: NA
The TE report has not addressed the issue related to environmental risks. Given the nature of the project such risks are not expected or are likely to be minimal.	

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

A Financial resources	Rating: MU
B Socio political	Rating: S
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: MS
D Environmental	Rating: NA

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good
According to the TE, the project has helped in creating a better understanding of the measures that could be used to reduce exposure of indigenous peoples to persistent toxic pollutants, including identification of priority areas where actions are needed. Further, it has created a better understanding of how aquatic food chains serve as a pathway of exposure of indigenous people to persistent toxic pollutants. Further, it has determined the relative importance of various sources in atmospheric and riverine transport of persistent toxic pollutants.
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 retrospect, 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: MU
The TE report has not rated the quality of M&E plan at entry in terms of its practicability and sufficiency. A review of the project documents shows that the documents did not incorporate a log frame to summarize the project design. However, project objectives, activities and indicators have been summarized. Indicators are suitable for the chosen outcomes. In the project narrative the broad responsibilities for M&E activities have also been described.	
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 implemented during the project was optimal and highly effective. It informs that the M&E system entailed use of interim reports, meetings of the steering committee and all project bodies, a high frequency of field trips of project coordinators and management, detailed systems of control and effective system of quality assurance.	
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?	Rating: NA
This issue has not been directly addressed in the TE. The sections in the project document that deal with the budget also provide clear indication whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted.	
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?	
No. According to the TE the implementation of the M&E system was satisfactory. However, review of the M&E plan included in the project appraisal document shows that the quality of M&E plan at entry was inadequate.	

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?
The TE hardly reports anything substantive on the lessons that could be learned from this project.

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 material 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?	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? The report is generally consistent. It, however, does not critically appraise whether project outcomes will lead to global environmental benefits. The coverage of some of the issues is not comprehensive.	MS
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE report assesses some of the dimensions of risks associated with sustainability well but the coverage of other dimensions is not comprehensive.	MS
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons presented are not substantive.	HU
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	MU

The TE provides only partial information on actual project costs. The information is based on the total and is not segregated based on activities.	
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? It only covers how M&E system was implemented.	MU

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:
There is a case to verify whether the suggested linkage of outcomes with project objectives and goals is there or not.

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

PIR 2005, Project Appraisal Document.