



To Do

Projects

Reports

Administration

Help Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: [Select](#)

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	<input type="text" value="816"/>
Project Title	<input type="text" value="Restoration of Round Island"/>
Project Type	<input type="text" value="Medium Size Project"/>
Funding Source	<input type="text" value="GEF Trust Fund"/>
Focal Area	<input type="text" value="Biodiversity"/>
Agency	<input type="text" value="World Bank"/>
World Bank ID	<input type="text" value="70392"/>
Country	<input type="text" value="Mauritius"/>
Project Status	<input type="text" value="Project Closure"/>
Duration	<input type="text" value="3"/> years
CEO Endorsement	<input type="text" value="05/19/2000"/>
Agency Approval	<input type="text" value="12/12/2000"/>
Project Effectiveness	<input type="text" value="08/01/2000"/>
GEF Agency Execution Partners	<input type="text" value="(Select Execution Partners)"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Community <input type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify	<input type="text"/>

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	<input type="text" value="Bienvenu Rajaonson"/>
TE Reviewer	<input type="text" value="Pallavi Nuka"/>
TE Peer Reviewer	<input type="text" value="Baljit Wadwha"/>

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	<input type="text" value="9/1/2003"/>
Project Actual Completion	<input type="text" value="2/28/2005"/>
Project Completion Difference	<input type="text" value="17"/> Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	<input type="text" value="09/28/2005"/>
TE Submission to EO	<input type="text" value="11/30/2011"/>
TE Submission to EO Difference	<input type="text" value="74"/> Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	<input type="text" value="03/02/2012"/>
TER Submission to EO	<input type="text" value="03/12/2012"/>
TER Submission to EO Difference	<input type="text" value="0"/> Months

Comments on Delays

The project was extended to ensure achievement of goals. The delay in implementation was due to logistical difficulties (getting basic power, water, etc, and also cyclone damage) in erecting a base on Round Island.

Final GRM received by EO in November 2011.

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="750,000"/>	<input type="text" value="750,000"/>	<input type="text" value="100.00 %"/>
Cofinance Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="831,401"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Total Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="1,581,401"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Comments on Cofinancing

The TE does not contain a clear assessment of co-financing.
 From the TE: "Collaboration with the National Parks and Conservation Service was effective in ways too many to list, and including administrative support (work and residence permits, CITES certificates, approval of studies), provision of equipment (eg water tanks), labour, scientific advice and input, planting material, transport, sterilizer, helicopter transport during expeditions etc c. Rs 1.5m total, part cost of building and transport. Then the Mauritius Police Force provided Boat and helicopter transport at a flat rate, support in emergencies, access to communication with Harbour Radio for emergencies, assistance with transportation of heavy or bulky items."

"Various entities as follows provided support to the project in terms of equipments : Aqualia Ltd.: low pressure water pipes, tanks, fittings, pumps, worth up to Rs 150, 000 at least, as well as engineering advice St Felix Sugar Estate, Lyon Equipment Suppliers (UK): donation of an assortment of top quality tools and security equipment Rs.100 000 Phoenix Camp Minerals: plastic bottles for planting, 1000L water tanks, pallets etc Rs 30 000; British American Tobacco and Les Moulins de la Concorde: jute sacking used for plant mulching, pallets, drums etc Rs 15 000 Ireland Blyth Ltd: construction help (Manser Saxon Co. Ltd.), equipment; Textile Garments: Mini-drums for

 **Logical Framework**

Quality of Logical Framework

4 - Moderately Satisfactory



Project Objectives -

From the Project Brief:
 Goal: "To restore Round Island as much as possible to its original ecological state, and protect it as an example of a sustainable representative Mascarene Island ecosystem practically free of introduced species."



Objective: "To increase populations of endemic species on Round Island through habitat improvement, erosion control, selective weeding and reestablishment of populations of plants and animals that have vanished because of human intervention."


Specific Outcomes:

1. a) Regional and global impact of preserving species, b) model reintroduction technologies for small island ecosystems, c) model quarantine system.
2. Enhanced global capacity for restoration of small island ecosystems.
3. Enhanced understanding of the value of biodiversity in national, regional and international communities.

Comment on Changes


There were no changes to project objectives or outcomes during

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
1. a) Systematic restoration of RI soils and flora, establishment of Round Island endemic	1. a) Degraded areas of Round Island's soils, flora and fauna restored b)	1.a) Restored habitats on Round Island with growing populations of native species b) model reintroduction	- Native species survive transplantation - No adverse climate events (storms, droughts), etc.	- Logistical support (transport, supplies) for base station. - Active participation	1. a) Threat of invasives reduced b) globally important reptiles and Round Island petrels safe-guarded (increased populations) 2.	Sustainable conservation of globally significant biodiversity	 Edit  Delete

<p>reptiles on other suitable islets, enhancement of nest sites of Round Island petrel, b) pilot activities for reintroduction of lost fauna and flora, and tortoises as grazers, c) development and implementation of quarantine system. 2. National, regional and international conservationists work on restoration and safe-guarding of Round Island's original ecosystem. 3. a) Awareness-raising amongst Mauritian and international public using a wide range of media, b) Ile aux Aigrettes ecotourism project a 'shop-window' for the Round Island project - enhanced with information on Round Island and pilot reintroduction work on Ile aux Aigrettes.</p>	<p>Round Island endemic reptiles established on other refuge islets, c) Quarantine system established and implemented (protocol prevents introductions of exotics such as Indian house gecko and invasive weeds). 2. National, international staff trained and experienced in small island ecosystem restoration techniques. 3. Up to 150 University of Mauritian biology BSc students, 150 school teachers, 10,000 school children, 10,000 Mauritian and international ecotourists, and 300 Mauritian and international conservation sponsors educated on projects activities and the value of biodiversity</p>	<p>technologies for small island ecosystems, c) model quarantine system. 2. Enhanced global capacity for restoration of small island ecosystems. 3. a) Enhanced understanding of the value of biodiversity in national, regional and international communities b) Number of visitors to Ile aux Aigrettes increased</p>	<p>of national agencies, especially Parks Service.</p>	<p>More effective restoration of other small island ecosystems</p>		
<p> Add New Row...</p>						






 **Project Performance**












[Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFO Ratings](#) [Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFO Comments](#)

Overall Project Rating 

Comment





The project has successfully achieved expected outcomes and the lessons learned are important for guiding similar efforts on small islands. All the project outputs were judged by the TE report to be of high quality. Outputs were delivered largely on schedule despite the setbacks in establishing a base on Round Island. The project garnered world wide attention and made significant strides in raising awareness locally as well.

















Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes 	Last PIR:	5 - Satisfactory 	After considerable effort and indeed solidarity between the diverse groups involved in the project, a field station has been successfully built on the Southern Plateau of the island. It serves to establish and maintain nurseries to support the process of restoring the native vegetation of the island. Actually, most of the areas of Round Island have been replanted with endemic trees which contribute to recover a certain native habitat for fauna. Following to that, reintroduction of native fauna has been executed successfully such as reptile and birds. Then, with the support from the Government a Quarantine system has been put in place as a measure to prevent from introduction of exotic plants and weeds. The Government is now committed to take in charge the continuation of activities beyond the closing of the project. It has been agreed that lessons learned from the project will be implemented for other mauritian islets.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	After considerable effort and indeed solidarity between the diverse groups involved in the project, a field station has been successfully built on the Southern Plateau of the island. It serves to establish and maintain nurseries to support the process of restoring the native vegetation of the island. Actually, most of the areas of Round Island have been replanted with endemic trees which contribute to recover a certain native habitat for fauna. Following to that, reintroduction of native fauna has been executed successfully such as reptile and birds. Then, with the support from the Government a Quarantine system has been put in place as a measure to prevent from introduction of exotic plants and weeds. The Government is now committed to take in charge the continuation of activities beyond the closing of the project. It has been agreed that lessons learned from the project will be implemented for other mauritian islets.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	




			The project has successfully achieved expected outcomes and the lessons learned are important for guiding similar efforts on small islands. All the project outputs were judged by the TE report to be of high quality. Outputs were delivered largely on schedule despite the setbacks in establishing a base on Rond Island. The project garnered world wide attention and made significant strides in raising awareness in country too.
Relevance 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on the information in the project brief and the TE report, project outputs and outcomes are consistent with the goals of the Biodiversity focal area and OP#2 Coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems and OP#3 Forest ecosystems. The project was also well linked to national priorities and plans for preserving natural habitats.
Effectiveness 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	Outputs and implementation by component are rated satisfactory.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on information in the TE report, the project's outputs have been consistent with what was intended. There is also evidence that outputs have led to intended outcomes. The TE report notes that the "quarantine system put in place is effective," degraded areas are restored, and native flora and fauna has been introduced. The awareness program has been successful in reaching over 10,000 students and has garnered worldwide publicity for the project. Results have been disseminated broadly, including through a BBC World program.
Efficiency 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	"Cost effectiveness is satisfactory. During the first 2 years of the project, MWF had great difficulties to achieve the project goals and objectives due to the long delay in establishing a base on Round Island (Logistic problems and Cyclone damage). These parameters have been underestimated during the design of the project. As a consequence, supports from various Partners have been requested and have allowed MWF to maintain a safe presence on Round Island (accommodation, water, electricity, communication), provide decent field conditions, support restoration staff, allow a greater understanding of the Round Island ecology and help achieving the overall project goals."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.

	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	As noted in the TE report, despite the delays and setbacks, the project has leveraged significant co-financing to ensure delivery of outputs and outcomes.
--	---------------	--------------------	--

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability ⓘ	Last PIR:	4 - Likely ▼	Arrangements for sustainability rated S.
	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Likely ▼	The sustainability of the project is likely. In order to maintain the basic activities on Round Island beyond the closing date so as to ensure the continuity of the project, the collaboration of the local Authorities (NPCS) has been extended. In addition, MWF has sought financial support for the first six months of year 2005 from the Ministry of Agriculture through the National Park and Conservation Service. Furthermore MWF has also applied for a grant from the Conservation Fund to continue the restoration of the island for another one year starting 1st July 2005. As a long-term strategy for funding, MWF has initiated a Fund Raising Strategic Plan that targeted mainly the international charities and funding agencies. The local business community has also been contacted as potential financial stake-holders. Consequently, conditions have been put in place that would enable to move towards sustainable management of Round Island.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely ▼	While the financial, socio-political, and institutional risks to sustainability seem low, more significant climate risks remain. These risks include re-invasion by non-native species into restored areas as well storm damage, and the effects of more permanent climate change.
	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess ▼	Not rated along this dimension.
Financial ⓘ	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely ▼	The TE report notes that the "Government is now committed to take in charge the continuation of activities beyond the closing of the project." The project has also applied for grants that would enable continuation of activities.
	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess ▼	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	No agency review.

Socio-political 	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely 	The project has political support at local and national levels. The project has also gained broader public support through outreach efforts and links to eco-tourism.
Institutional and Legal 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	Collaboration with local authorities (National Parks and Conservation Service) has been extended. Sustainability would be more secure if this collaboration was formalized through an MOU.
Environmental 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	Environmental and climate risks remain. The project will have to continue efforts to cull invasive species and deal with damage from adverse natural events (storms, climate change, ...)

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No information on M&E.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report.
M&E Design 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No information on M&E.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	The Project Brief includes a very short M&E plan. No logical framework is provided. There is no indication of the amount budgeted for M&E activities. The project summary table does include objective and outcome level indicators, but the indicators do not meet SMART criteria.
M&E Plan Implementation 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No information on M&E.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	The TE report only notes that the Mid-term review was carried. There is no information on whether the recommendations of the review
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No information on M&E.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report.



Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Both the quality of implementation by the IA and the quality of execution by project partner Mauritius Wildlife Foundation are rated S.
Quality of Implementation - IA 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Bank performance is satisfactory. The Bank made the necessary efforts to involve all stakeholders in the preparation and the design of the project. Then, a Mid term Review has been realized to assess the implementation progress of the project. Supervision of the project has been carried out periodically which stated on implementation progress and provided appropriate recommendations. The Closing date of the project has been extended to ensure achievement of project goals. Finally, the project budget is totally used by the project
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the TE report, implementation was satisfactory. The IA provided adequate oversight and adaptively managed the project (granting extensions) when necessary.
Quality of Execution - EA 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on information in TE report, execution was satisfactory. The TE report notes: This project is implemented by MWF which one of the capable NGO in Mauritius in terms of Natural Ressources Management matters. MWF was fully committed to the implementation of the project and succeeded in exceeding targets set for the project. Nevertheless, its close partnership with the NPCS is key to the overall success of the project." MWF furthermore was able to work through the difficulties establishing a base station and leveraged resources to move the project forward and ensure sustainability.


 **Agency Specific Project Criteria**


Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	Government commitment is rated S.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.


Country or Regional Priority	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The government, especially the National Parks and Conservation Service displayed exemplary commitment and support for the project.
Financial Planning	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report.
Preparation and Readiness	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report.
Stakeholders Involvement	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	public involvement - Moderately Satisfactory
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project seems to have involved numerous public and private stakeholders.
Need for Follow Up	Terminal Evaluation:	No	No mention of follow-up.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Nothing was noted in the TE that would require follow-up.
Gender Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Project design did not have a gender mainstreaming strategy.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Project design did not have a gender mainstreaming strategy.
Effects on Local Population	Terminal Evaluation:	No	No effects were noted in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	No effects were noted in the TE report.









Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not part of the project design.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No	Not part of the project design.
	Terminal Evaluation:	No	Not part of the project design.





Crisis Prevention and Recovery 	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	Not part of the project design.
Democratic Governance 	Terminal Evaluation:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	Not part of the project design.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	Not part of the project design.

 **Progress to Impact**





Progress to Impact 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to Assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	No rating provided. But the TE reports that objectives were achieved.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Significant Progress <input type="button" value="v"/>	There has been significant habitat restoration on Rond Island and the quarantine system developed through the project will help reduce the potential for re-population by invasives. These outcomes will help to achieve more sustainable conservation of biodiversity. Impacts on public awareness are also noted in the TE report.













Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	The impacts of knowledge exchange were fully positive. Indeed, the project undertook various initiative such as talks given at schools, clubs, fund raising functions, scientific gatherings, Two national TV coverage, and one international TV programme (#Country Profile#), article written for Wildlife Preservation Trust Canada, local newspapers, scientific publications (e.g. Solitaire, DWCT), produced posters of Round Island work and distributed, made poster presentations, presented project success at the Small Island meeting with a world wide diffusion. Consequently, among others, partnership with local and international Universities have been established for student in MSc and PHD and a growing interest on biodiversity conservation and/or restoration in Mauritius has been recorded.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	


			Public awareness has been increased through project activities. Information, skills, and technology transfer has taken place between international and national project staff.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	National, regional and international conservationists work on restoration and safe-guarding of Round Island's original ecosystem. Target exceeded by far . At least 17 national (12 staff, 6 volunteer), 53 international conservationists gained experience in, and developed, small island ecosystem restoration techniques. In addition, a minimum of ten staff are actually fully conversant in quarantine procedures.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	Collaboration with the National Parks and Conservation Services has helped institutionalize the quarantine system and ensured that new conservation techniques and practices are adopted nationally.
Implementing Structures and Arrangements 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	Client's policy / program implementation : Rated Substantial This project is implemented by MWF which one of the capable NGO in Mauritius in terms of Natural Resources Management matters. MWF was fully committed to the implementation of the project and succeeded in exceeding targets set for the project. Nevertheless, its close partnership with the NPCS is key to the overall success of the project.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	Project activities have strengthened national capacities for implementing similar initiatives.

































Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	The project was designed as a pilot restoration project. The successful results of this project are likely to be replicated elsewhere throughout Mauritius.

Criteria / Categorization of Results /	Document	Verification	Comment
--	----------	--------------	---------

Investment			
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	Not rated in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No 	No financial mechanisms were established.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	Replicability: Rated Likely Restoration experiences of Round Island and Isle aux Aigrettes, as well as long term involvement with several offshore islets, have already been used towards initial restoration efforts on Gunners# Quoin and Flat Island by the National Parks and Conservation Service. In addition, MWF has additionally shown an interest to manage two Rodrigues offshore islets. All research and experiences from the project on native fauna and plant restoration have been recorded properly in order to be used as lessons learned for other islets restoration program. Moreover, the Quarantine System applied for Round Island was a success and owned by the NPCS. Finally, Isle Aux Aigrette will be continued as living laboratory for native species in its public education and awareness campaign. Consequently, conditions are in place to envisage the replication of the Quarantine system and restoration program to other islets having similar context.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	Evidence of limited replication during the project's lifetime.
Upscaling 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided in TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	The National Parks & Conservation Service's involvement in the project indicates that practices and techniques can be upscaled and applied nationwide in biodiversity management.
Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No mention of mainstreaming in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No 	The project did not contribute to mainstreaming biodiversity concerns.

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document	
	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new

Environmental Stress Reduction 		row.															
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.															
	GEFEO Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y - Yes</td> <td>Demonstration Site</td> <td>Intended</td> <td>Invasive plant species have been removed and native species (flora and fauna) have been re-established at the pilot site. A quarantine system has been put in place to minimize the chance of foreign species being re-introduced to the island.</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: left;"> Add New Row...</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	Invasive plant species have been removed and native species (flora and fauna) have been re-established at the pilot site. A quarantine system has been put in place to minimize the chance of foreign species being re-introduced to the island.	 Edit  Delete	 Add New Row...				
	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments													
Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	Invasive plant species have been removed and native species (flora and fauna) have been re-established at the pilot site. A quarantine system has been put in place to minimize the chance of foreign species being re-introduced to the island.	 Edit  Delete													
 Add New Row...																	
Environmental Status Change 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.															
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.															
	GEFEO Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y - Yes</td> <td>Demonstration Site</td> <td>Intended</td> <td>The project seems to have successfully restored native habitat at the pilot site (Round Island). While some of the techniques demonstrated at this site are being applied on other islands, there is insufficient information to gauge system wide changes.</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: left;"> Add New Row...</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	The project seems to have successfully restored native habitat at the pilot site (Round Island). While some of the techniques demonstrated at this site are being applied on other islands, there is insufficient information to gauge system wide changes.	 Edit  Delete	 Add New Row...				
	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments													
Y - Yes	Demonstration Site	Intended	The project seems to have successfully restored native habitat at the pilot site (Round Island). While some of the techniques demonstrated at this site are being applied on other islands, there is insufficient information to gauge system wide changes.	 Edit  Delete													
 Add New Row...																	
Socioeconomic Status Change 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.															
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.															
	GEFEO Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N - No</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>No changes in socio-economic status. This was</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		N - No			No changes in socio-economic status. This was	 Edit  Delete					
Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments														
N - No			No changes in socio-economic status. This was	 Edit  Delete													

					not a part of the project's goals.
		+ Add New Row...			
Arrangements for Impact M&E	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> + Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Comments		
		Y - Yes	The project included development of a species database and establishment of a field station on Round Island to monitor habitat changes.	Edit Delete	
		+ Add New Row...			

TE Report Quality




Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:		No agency review.
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE report assesses project outputs under each component. Outcomes are assessed with respect to two indicators. The assessment could be strengthened by considering the other measurable indicators listed in the project brief.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report.
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The assessment of sustainability largely focuses on financial sustainability. Consideration of other dimensions of sustainability (environmental, institutional) is also important.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The lessons and recommendations are drawn from the project's implementation experience. One important lesson that is missing is why/how this project successfully achieved results in the face of some major setbacks.
	Agency	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.

Clear Financial Assessment	Review:		
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The disbursement summary presented in the TE report is inconsistent with actual disbursement amounts. The co-financing analysis could be clearer and presented along with the total amount of resources leveraged.
M&E Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The TE report does not rate or assess M&E.




Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Only two indicators are used to assess results. Explicit consideration of other indicators would be helpful.
Consultation with Stakeholders	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report.
Compliance with Guidances	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report.
Compliance with UNEG Norms	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	Not applicable for WB MSPs.
Addressing of ToR requests	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	Not applicable for WB MSPs.
Independence of Report	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Insufficient information in the TE report.

Lessons & Recommendations

Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Other	Risk Management	Never underestimate the difficulty and cost of erecting a field station on a remote island. Never overestimate the restoration scale achievable in small time frame, especially when field conditions are harsh	Edit Delete
Capacity Building		A dedicated field team is the greatest asset of a restoration programme. Staff continuity and training is an essential element of the success of a specialized restoration programme. Whilst volunteer help is welcome, it is best to have a	Edit Delete

		dedicated core restoration team. Volunteers should only be seen as additional help.	
Stakeholder Involvement		It is imperative to maintain excellent relationship with the services on which one depends. Progress on Round Island is the result of good personal relationship with government departments, private sector, partners, etc.	 Edit  Delete
			



Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Other	Risk management	The design of a project in a remote areas such as that of the present project has to take into consideration the difficulty and cost of erecting a field station and never overestimate the restoration scale achievable in small time frame, especially when field conditions are harsh.	 Edit  Delete
			

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility