

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 814		Review date:		
		at endorsement (Million US\$)		at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	PMIS 1051	GEF financing:	0.74	0.72
Project Name:	Coral Reef Monitoring Network in Member States of the Indian Ocean Commission (COI), within the Global Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN)	IA/EA own:	0.10	0.14
		Government:	0.07	0.16
		Other*:	0.67	0.67
Country:	Comoros, Mauritius, Seychelles, Madagascar	Total Cofinancing	0.84	0.97
Operational Program:	2	Total Project Cost:	1.58	1.70
IA:	WB	Dates		
Partners involved:	The Indian Ocean Commission (COI)	Work Program date		NA
		CEO Endorsement		04/13/00
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		01/26/01
		Closing Date	Proposed: 01/31/04	Actual: 07/31/05
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 48 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 12 months
Author of TE: N/A		TE completion date: UA	TE submission date to GEF OME: 11/13/06	Difference between TE completion and submission date: UA

* 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

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" 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	No rating	-	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	No rating	-	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	No rating	-	UA
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

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

No. Even though the TE includes information on all of the important issues, its quality is diminished by:
- Does not include ratings.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not include final costs per activity. - Section 4 (Replicability) does doesn't really deal with that issue. - Section 6 (M&E) does not provide an analysis of the M&E system, but rather lists the factors that contributed to the success of the project implementation. - Does not explain the reasons for the reallocation of funds to Category 2 (consultants, training and audits)
<p>Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? The TE does mention that there was a reallocation of GEF funds, but that the revised budget was approved by the WB and the recipient and put into effect in March 2004.</p>

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the Project Document, the Global Environmental Objective was to assist in the conservation of the high biodiversity of coral reefs and their socio-economic value, and in the sustainable management of their resources, through a monitoring network.

No changes during implementation.

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

According to the Project Document, the development objectives were:

- to link, in a coral reef network, stakeholders of the Indian Ocean islands,
- to provide, in the form of decision-making tools for the integrated management of coastal zones, information and data on status and trends of coral reefs for their conservation and sustainable management,
- to participate in the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN) and help to achieve its objectives.
- to bring to the attention of the international community COI activities in the environment sector

No changes during implementation

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

- Establishment of National networks in all participating countries.
- Regional network established and fully operational
- The inventory of the reef flora and fauna has been undertaken in all the countries and the data are available both on national and regional level.
- Number of monitored sites increased from 55 to 88
- A new database (COREMO II) was installed on all the NFP's laptops and training was provided for the users. The field monitoring method was also improved; two monitoring methods were used provided by the GCRMN and the Reef Check Method. The COREMO is more widely used and the methodology has been recognised at International Level by other organisations such as the Reef-Base, Fish-Base and GCRMN.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

A Relevance

Rating: HS

This GEF project was relevant to OP2 since it helped to set up the regional monitoring network at a larger scale by: extending national monitoring to additional sites, initiating regional monitoring, and ensuring coordination with international GCRMN. In addition, at the CBD 3rd COP, the GEF was asked to provide financial resources to developing countries to enhance capacity building for initial assessment and monitoring programs.

B Effectiveness

Rating: S

According to the TE, this project was able to implement all the planned activities and to achieve the expected outcomes with a varying degree of success in each of the participating countries. The TE concludes that monitoring and data analysis on national level was produced and presented in the right format and followed the planned schedule; and that the regional network created was very active. Overall the project was able to successfully produce results that can be used as baseline information for other programs in the region

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

A few delays in procurement of equipments and transfer of funds were noted at the beginning of the project but corrective measures were undertaken.
The project was extended for six months to end by 31st July 2005, so funds had to be reallocated to ensure the successful completion of the activities. The funds available for goods (Category 1), and for Operating Cost (Category 3), were reallocated to the Category 2 (Consultants, training and Audit).

4.1.2 Impacts

The most important impact is that the project was able to link relevant stakeholders of the Indian Ocean islands to form a coral reef network. Member of this network were very active and expressed the desire to keep collaborating after the project ended.
According to the TE, the project has managed to undertake a large range of activities and produced results that can be used as baseline information for other programs in the region.
In the case of Mauritius, the annual activity report of the project has been incorporated into the annual report of the Ministry responsible for fisheries.

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= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources	Rating: ML
According to the TE, the sustainability of the networks is challenged by the lack of funding. After the end of the project, it was expected that each country would be able to undertake some activities of monitoring through national budget until a reliable fund is secured, but the TE mentions that a budget for the proposed activities had not been established yet so as to facilitate the request for funding.	
B Socio political	Rating: L
No risks mentioned in the TE.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
The participating countries have been equipped with the methodology and tools to enable some activities to be continued on national level and received the required training. The network created has been dynamic and the team expressed the desire to continue working together and to continue meeting on a yearly basis for the exchange of information and to produce the regional report. A regional pool of experts has been formed and they can be called upon to undertake some activities in other programs	
D Environmental	Rating: NA
NA	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good

The project has upgraded the database COREMO1 developed under the PRE: COI/EU programme to include more parameters. This now allows for better data analysis and for the database to be more user-friendly.

b. Demonstration

The project had a strong emphasis on promoting the newly created networks and database. In total 7 publications have been made: 2 for the Status of Coral reef of the World (GCRMN) Coral Reef degradation in the Indian Ocean, 1 for the International Tropical Marine Ecosystems Symposium 2002, and 4 Regional Annual Reports.

Participation of the network in the international symposiums and conferences has helped towards the dissemination of the networks activities both on the regional level and the International level. Communication activities have been carried out in all the countries, on a regional level and international level. Various forms of communication tools have been used, from awareness lectures to website development.

c. Replication

-

d. Scaling up

-

4.4 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

The Project Document specifies that the monitoring and evaluation of the project will be undertaken by independent technical assistance. An evaluation would be undertaken at the end of each year and one at the end of the project. It would include measurements of the indicators identified in the project, grouped as performance, integration and durability indicators, and an analysis on how the evaluation results will be used

to adjust the implementation of the project (adjustment on parameters measured, adjustment on data analysis, adjustment of the network, by modification, if necessary, of key participants, adjustment on the reporting). The evaluation would also include an analysis from the GCRMN coordinator on the performance of the project as a node of the GCRMN. Financial and accounting audits of the project would also be conducted on an annual basis. The Project Document identifies indicators for planned activities and outcomes but does not specify any targets.
B. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): UA
According to the TE, "yearly activity reports were compiled by the implementing agency. Yearly financial audit were conducted. Several supervisory missions were conducted by the GEF team Leader. A mid term review was undertaken in 2004, by IUCN and the report has been produced". Even though the TE does not provide specific information on how the M&E plan was implemented at the project different levels (national and regional), it does provide examples where monitoring and flexibility of project implementation allowed for changes to address concerns at the national level (as in the case of Comoros where the original approach was modified to involve the government technicians). Thus, information from the M&E system seems to have been used for adaptive management.
C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Yes. According to the Project Document, \$20,000 were specifically budgeted for Program M&E, and \$62,000 for regular working and information workshops for project participants/stakeholders.
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Yes. There is no mention of shortage of funding for M&E activities in the TE.
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? Unable to assess since the TE does not provide enough information on how the M&E system was implemented.

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations 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?
a) Light informal structures have been successful for the implementation of the projects; b) Having the technical assistance team within the region helps to resolve technical difficulties; c) The regular yearly meeting of the focal points compels the participants to prepare their annual reports; d) The National focal point being subject matter specialist and being directly involved in the day to day activities; developed the sense of ownership at country level.
List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
No recommendations are included in the TE.

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 document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.
-

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? The TE provides detailed information of the activities carried out by the project, and provides assessment of outcomes at both the national and regional level.	S
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? The TE is consistent but does not include any ratings. In general, the TE presents complete information but does not assess what was the effect of the budget reallocation on the project outcomes (decreased the budget for Operating Costs in more than 50%).	MS
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Sustainability of the project is assessed in a short section of the TE and also addressed on the sections of replicability and stakeholder involvement. The TE does not provide a rating for this criterion.	S
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they	S

comprehensive? The evidence to support the lessons identified in the TE are presented throughout the report.	
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE does include information on the budgeted and the total actual costs. GEF financing is presented not per activity but per expense (e.g. goods and services, consultants, etc). The co-financing information presented gives no indication as to what those funds were used for.	MS
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? The TE section on M&E does not really provide an assessment of the project's M&E (how was the achievement of outcomes monitored, who was in charge of these activities, etc), but rather describes what were the factors that contributed to the success of the project itself. However, other sections of the document do mention the implementation of monitoring activities. The TE does not provide a rating for M&E.	MU

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. 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, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
The mobilized cofinancing was slightly higher than the expected cofinancing. The TE does not explain the reasons for it and its impact on project results.
Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?
The TE does mention that there were a few delays in procurement of equipments and transfer of funds at the beginning of the project but corrective measures were undertaken by the project management.

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.

Explain:	Yes:	No: X
----------	-------------	--------------

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

PIR 2005, Project Document
