

# GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		849	
GEF Agency project ID		4290	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Development and Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa	
Country/Countries		Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Seychelles, South Africa, Gambia, Mauritius, Senegal, Tanzania	
Region		Regional	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP9- Integrated land and water multiple focal area operational program	
Executing agencies involved		Advisory Committee for the Protection of the Sea (ACOPS)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		7/26/2000	
Effectiveness date / project start		8/1/2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		7/9/2001	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.75	0.75
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.18	0.08
	Government	0.22	0.72
	Other*	0.58	0.35
Total GEF funding		0.75	0.75
Total Co-financing		0.98	1.15
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.73	1.90
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		3/1/2003	
TE submission date		12/1/2003	
Author of TE		Magnus Ngoile	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Antonio del Monaco	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Aaron Zazueta	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		06/05/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	S	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	MS	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/R	S
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/R	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/R	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	S

### 3. Project Objectives

#### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project as stated in the PD is to assist sub-Saharan African countries in achieving sustainable management of their coastal and marine environment and resources.

This project seeks to identify sites or living resources of regional and global significance that are suffering measurable degradation, and actions agreed by participating countries and other partners for remedial and mitigation actions to solve priority environmental problems in the marine and coastal environment of sub-Saharan Africa.

The aggregate coastline of the 32 sub-Saharan states exceeds 12,000 km (PD, pg. 7). The southern and northern parts of the West African coast are dominated by desert conditions with an intermediate zone of humid tropical conditions centered on the Gulf of Guinea in the West. The climate of East Africa is influenced by two distinct seasons, the southern and northern monsoon. Sub-Saharan African coastal ecosystems include barrier/lagoons, deltas, wetlands, mangroves, coral reefs, and seagrass meadows. Poorly planned coastal development is leading to increased pollution of coastal areas of the region.

#### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objectives of the project, as described in the PD, are:

- (1) To identify areas, sites or living resources of regional or global significance that are suffering measurable degradation (i.e., hot spots);
- (2) To determine the sources and causes of the degradation and associated scales of impact (national, regional and global) to provide a basis for calculating incrementally on regional and extra-regional scales;
- (3) To identify areas, sites and resources of regional significance that, although not currently degraded, are threatened with future degradation either because of the sensitivity of the receptor or the magnitude of the activity posing the threat;
- (4) To determine, through root cause analysis, the fundamental causes of the damage or threat posed;
- (5) To design a programme of interventions, including demonstration projects and pre-investment studies, addressing problems of regional priority that could be presented to the Partnership Conference;
- (6) To present the program of interventions (i.e. subprojects) to the Partnership Conference in order to solicit support for the implementation of the program.

The project is split into two phases. The purpose of phase I of the project is to identify hot spots and sensitive areas; assess impacts and their root causes; and make recommendations for their mitigation. Phase I was to be executed by 11 teams of national experts (natural and socio-economic scientists) from the participating countries. It was recommended at the start of the project that during phase I, the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA) methodology on integrated problem analysis be used to identify, characterize and select the causes of degradation of environmental hot spots and threats to sensitive areas, resources and amenities.

The purpose of phase II of the project is to prepare project proposals on the basis of the outputs of the first phase and to integrate the proposals into a programme of interventions to be presented to the Partnership Conference for its adoption during the Johannesburg Summit.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

Overall, there was no major modification to the original project design and objectives during implementation apart from improvement of the GIWA methodology and the addition of four countries to participate in the African Process:

- (1) During implementation, the methodology was further developed and refined – becoming the African Process methodology – taking into consideration feedback from the country teams of experts. The refinement occurred during two meetings: one was held in Paris from 5 to 7 December 2000, and the second was held in Mombasa from 12 to 14 March 2001. The Mombasa meeting also provided recommendations on the focus, format, process and outcome of the portfolio of projects to be presented to the Partnership Conference. These were taken as input in the development of phase II of the project.
- (2) Initially, seven countries subscribed to the project proposal. These countries were Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Seychelles, and South Africa. Subsequently, four countries were included in the process with additional funding obtained from UNEP and GPA. The additional four countries followed the same procedure and methodology. As a result, they generated the same outputs as the other participants at the national level (i.e., national reports which feed into the synthesis of the regional report, development of project proposals and the programme of interventions).

#### **4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability**

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The importance of marine and coastal resources to the economies and livelihoods of the coastal states of sub-Saharan Africa has been discussed in many forums, including the Abidjan and Nairobi Convention processes, the Maputo Conference, the summits of the Organization of African Unity (Algiers, 12-14 July 1999 and Lusaka July 2001) and the NEPAD processes on the sub-theme “sustainable use of coastal, marine and freshwater resources” (TE, pg.1).

The project addresses the UNEP water policy and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) operational programmes on biodiversity, water body-based, integrated land and water multiple focal areas, contaminant-based and integrated ecosystem management. This project is under the GEF operational program-9 which integrates land and water activities. The implementation of OP9 requires cross-sectoral coordination as well as multi-stakeholder participation. The UNEP water policy has three main components: assessment, management and coordination of activities. Among the goals of the water policy is to identify and promote tools that will address critical water issues. According to the TE, it is believed that projects addressing the protection of biodiversity and linkages among the coastal zones, oceans, climate change and international waters provide multiple focal area benefits. The African Process was aware of these GEF and UNEP policy directions.

In line with GEF operational programmes and the UNEP water policy, the project assists eleven African coastal states to develop proposals for projects to address transboundary as well as common issues using technical capacities available in sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, the relevance of the project is Satisfactory.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The project was expected to generate four major outcomes:

- (1) a list of hot spots and areas at risk
- (2) an assessment of root causes and recommended measures and interventions
- (3) adoption of the list and interventions by participating countries; and
- (4) securing funding of the projects included in the programme of interventions through the commitment of partners to execute the programme of interventions.

The project used the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA) approach adapting it to the African context. According to the TE, it seems to have been very successful as it was well received by the international community and many key studies resulted in subproject proposals to address the IW environmental issues identified as critical.

The project prepared national reports and regional consolidated analysis which covered eleven coastal states, identified hot spots (areas affected by degradation) and sensitive areas (at risk of suffering degradation), provided root cause analysis of environmental degradation and recommendations on interventions at the national level, as well as transboundary issues across eleven coastal states. The

reports provided comprehensive information on biophysical aspects, priority issues requiring urgent intervention, and severity of impacts on communities and ecosystems.

The project also prepared a portfolio including 19 framework subproject proposals based on sound scientific information in five thematic areas; (1) coastal erosion; (2) management of key habitats; (3) sustainable use of living resources; (4) tourism; and (5) pollution.

Moreover, several partners expressed their commitment to the execution of the programme of interventions (TE.pg.44).

However, the TE mentions that the recommendations from the national reports were not fully considered in the subproject proposals, particularly the non-inclusion of the some of the suggested hot spots and sensitive areas, and those reports were weak in socio-economic information (TE,pg.19). Moreover, the cost of the portfolio of subprojects was unrealistic and therefore cannot be used directly. Finally, the TE states that the subproject proposals need to be reformulated to be adapted to the needs of participating countries as well as individual donors and development partners.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------

Overall the efficiency of the project is Satisfactory.

The implementation of phase I went according to schedule as provided in the work plan developed during formulation of the project. However, phase II was extended for 12 months. This was in part due to the need to have the Partnership Conference back-to-back with the Johannesburg Summit and also to accommodate the four additional countries that participated in the project. This delay had minor consequences on the other meetings to be held.

The schedules for the expert meetings were discussed and fixed in previous meetings depending on workload and other considerations. According to the TE, this provided flexibility on participation. Moreover, there were three meetings proposed for the Steering Group. The second and third meetings were staggered by up to seven months, due to the postponement of the Partnership Conference. These meetings were important in providing policy guidance, oversight and decisions with respect to the actions required to effectively implement the process.

In the project document, only one technical meeting was planned for phase II. During implementation, four meetings were conducted. Therefore, the work of WGPI was extended.

Contributions by the participating countries from sub-Saharan Africa were mostly in-kind and are therefore difficult to assess (TE,pg.8). However, the TE states that quarterly financial statements were provided throughout the period of implementation of the project. The disbursement of funds for the period August 2000 to December 2002 was audited and the audit opinion was that proper books of

accounts were maintained, project expenditures were supported by vouchers and adequate documentation, and expenditures were incurred in accordance with the objectives outlined in the project document. The audited accounts, however, only related to GEF trust funds (TE, pg.9).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
--------------------	----------------------------------

Overall the sustainability of the project is Moderately Likely.

Financial Sustainability: Moderately Likely

The project managed to increase co-financing from \$0.975 million to \$1.147 million. This allowed to increase the number of countries participating from 7 to 11 with the introduction of Gambia, Mauritius, Senegal, and Tanzania. However, although the partnership conference received commitment for support for the subprojects, by project end in December 2002, those commitments had not been translated into funding except for Norwegian funding to UNEP. The subprojects funding rely heavily on donor support.

Socio-political Sustainability: Moderately Likely

Many subproject proposals are built on existing national and regional projects and programs. In addition, many of the subprojects not only address IW issues but also contribute to the GEF multifocal area integrated ecosystem management. On the other hand, the agenda of the African Process did not include discussion and consensus building on regional institutional arrangements for implementing the portfolio of subprojects and program interventions. This can potentially cause confusion and misunderstanding in follow-up activities as well as undermine leadership and direction.

Institutional Sustainability: Likely

The following policies or legal frameworks can contribute to support the project outcomes: The eleven participating countries endorsed the prioritized hot spots and sensitive areas, the portfolio of subproject proposals and the program of interventions during the Johannesburg Summit. The New Partnership for Africa Development (NEPAD) embraced the program of interventions. And the participating countries are signatories to the Abidjan and Nairobi Conventions, which are legal covenants aimed at ensuring the sustainable use and conservation of coastal and marine resources. Finally, the project engaged more than 87 African experts in the eleven participating countries who are now conversant in and supportive of the project initiatives.

**Environmental Sustainability:**

Integrated coastal management has been embraced globally as an approach which ensures the sustainability of the use of coastal and marine resources and the environment. In the light of this, the African Process methodology has the potential to be used in other regions, especially in developing countries where there are inadequate capacities and financial resources (TE,pg.17) .

## 5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? 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? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The total cost of the project was \$2,014,000, of which \$750,000 provided by the GEF to cover the incremental costs pertaining to the "global benefits" that the project would yield, and \$1,147,000 provided by co-financing.

During the implementation of the project, the level of co-financing rose to \$1,147,000, against \$975,000 anticipated at the time of project formulation, an increase of 20%. UNEP provided \$120,000 as co-financing to facilitate the participation of the Gambia, Mauritius and Senegal, while the UNEP Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) provided \$40,000 for the participation of Tanzania. The increase in co-financing allowed for the participation of four additional countries, from seven to eleven (therefore it increased the rate of participation by coastal states in sub-Saharan Africa to at least one-third), as well as increased number of meetings of the working groups in order to ensure effective participation by stakeholders.

GEF support was directed toward the following countries: Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Seychelles and South Africa. The co-financing provided by UNEP and GPA assisted Gambia, Mauritius, Senegal, and Tanzania to implement activity 2–6

The core activities of the project were the processes and outputs leading to the development of bankable project proposals. These included the successful implementation of activities 3, 4 and 5. These three activities used more than 60 per cent of the budget, with the largest investment going into the development of national reports.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Initially, the project duration was up to January 2002. However, the project was extended until December 2002 due to a request of the Heads of State to hold the Partnership Conference on the Development and Protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment in sub-Saharan Africa during the World Summit on Sustainable Development (the Johannesburg Summit) in Johannesburg, South Africa in September 2002. This led to minor delays in the planned meetings. But it had no major consequences on the project achievements.



5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

According to the TE, the ownership of the project was ensured through specific feedback mechanisms such as;(1) joint meetings among the national teams and among the five working groups; (2) national workshops and consultative meetings with relevant Government officials and other partners; (3) linking of the proposed projects with Government programmes and their priorities;(4) linking with existing donor supported projects; (5) guidance and oversight provided by the Preparatory Committee and Steering Group.

The organization of the Steering Group meetings back-to-back with the working group meetings provided an opportunity for interaction between scientists, decision makers, non-governmental organizations and the private sector and therefore forged greater linkage and understanding. This enhanced the ownership of the project (TE,pg.18).

## 6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

At the time of the formulation of the project, a logical framework matrix was developed in order to assist in tracking progress and achievements (See TE, Annex V). The project document identified specific activities to achieve the outcomes. These included effective project coordination, production and training on guidelines and criteria for the characterization of hot spots, areas at risk and root causes, and development of a programme of interventions.

A monitoring and evaluation plan is also given in the PD (pg. 26); operational reports will be provided quarterly, periodic reports will be made to UNEP/GEF on both substantive and financial matters; the Preparatory Committee will regularly review the progress of the project on behalf of all countries of the African continent; the Preparatory Committee will also establish a system whereby it invites, on an ad hoc basis, representatives of external partners (lead bilateral donors) in order to maintain a dialogue with them and ensure success of the Partnership Conference, etc.

However, according to the TE, the project's M&E system needs better indicators beyond the project deliverables. For example, it could have measured government financial commitments to implement the

subprojects proposed and other key factors to take this project from a collection of documents to actual implementation (TE,pg.16).

Therefore, the overall M&E design at entry is Moderately Satisfactory.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE contains a table in Annex V listing the project objectives, the indicators to measure their achievement and the actual accomplishment in terms of those indicators.

During implementation, clear terms of reference, including deadlines for delivery of outputs, were prepared and entered into with the consultants. Guidelines and criteria were developed in a participatory manner to guide the process objectively. Going through the national reports, meeting proceedings and the portfolio of projects, the experts adhered to the agreed methodology, guidelines and criteria. Any variations were proposed, discussed, agreed upon and applied by all participating experts. However, the use of expert judgment was necessitated by the inadequate data available to undertake the different types of analysis required by the methodology (TE,pg.13).

## **7. Assessment of project implementation and execution**

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

The implementing agency of the project is UNEP

According to the TE, the process of designing the project was participatory, as evidenced by its endorsement by the GEF focal points of the initial seven participating sub-Saharan African countries. This complied with the GEF requirement that project development and implementation be country driven. During implementation, UNEP participated in all project workshops except for meetings in Paris (5–7 December 2000) and Cape Town (12–13 September 2001) (See, TE, annex XI). UNEP was tracking progress in addition to the normal reporting in accordance with a project requirement established by ACOPS as the executing agency. UNEP, through its joint implementation unit for the two conventions, provided the institutional framework in collaboration with other intergovernmental organizations,

bilateral and multilateral organizations, private sector and non-governmental organizations. The reporting mechanism was through NEPAD and the UNEP Governing Council. According to the TE, UNEP played an active role in making the African Process a reality.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---	-----------------------------

Overall, the project was executed as presented in the PD. The participating experts, executing agency and the implementing agency mutually agreed on any variation to the approach presented in the project document. The implementation of the project was coordinated by ACOPS as the executive agency.

During phase I, the executing agency identified 11 national team coordinators. Each team coordinator had several experts who identified hot spots, conducted the root-cause analysis and provided recommendations on interventions.

During phase II, five thematic regional coordinators assisted by two experts drawn from the participating countries developed the portfolio of projects and the programme of interventions. The international consultants assisted these five thematic teams. Some of the experts who participated in phase I were retained during phase II.

The project was guided by the Preparatory Committee and a steering group comprised of representatives of the participating countries together with representatives from UNEP, IOC, the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) and ACOPS. Members of the Steering Group also served as members of the Preparatory Committee; this provided continuity as well as optimization of capacity and increased efficiency (TE, pg. 6).

## **8. Assessment of Project Impacts**

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project resulted in the identification of sites suffering measurable degradation (hot spots) and resources in danger of being depleted (sensitive areas and resources), however due to its nature there was no direct environmental change.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and

qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

None mentioned.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

#### a) Capacities

The project has assisted in building capacity in the eleven participating countries as well as in sub-Saharan Africa in general. The project engaged more than 87 African experts, 54 during phase I of the project and 33 during phase II. These technical experts, along with the members of the Steering Group and Preparatory Committee who oversaw the project, are conversant in and supportive of the African Process.

Eleven national reports were produced, and contain comprehensive assessments of (i) regionally or nationally significant sites already affected by degradation (hot spots) or at risk of suffering degradation (sensitive areas), (ii) priority issues requiring urgent intervention, (iii) severity of impact of identified issues upon critical ecosystems and related human communities from an environmental, social and economic perspective, and (iv) the main causes of environmental degradation through root cause analysis.

A regional consolidated analysis report presents common and transboundary issues as well as a prioritization of interventions to reverse negative impacts.

Workshop proceedings and meeting reports were also produced and increased awareness.

#### b) Governance

None mentioned.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

None mentioned.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

One of the project output is the production of 19 project proposals containing over 140 sub-projects in five thematic areas: coastal erosion, management of key habitats, sustainable use of living resources, coastal tourism and pollution.

## **9. Lessons and recommendations**

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The following key lessons were reported in the TE:

- (1) Linking the African Process to NEPAD, the African Union and the Johannesburg Summit promoted awareness of coastal and marine resources development issues and therefore support by national Governments and the international community. This ensured sustainability of the process.
- (2) The African Process provided a platform for the forging of partnerships.
- (3) The methodology was supposed to be consistently used in the 11 participating countries. However, the individual national teams adjusted the methodology. Also, while some of the teams focused on sites throughout the analysis, others teams worked with sites only for the prioritization exercise, and they analysed impacts and causal chains with reference to issues as they affect the whole country. This gave room for inconsistencies in the process.
- (4) Only a few experts who participated in phase I of the project participated in phase II, which resulted in weak continuity.
- (5) Not enough time was provided to undertake the scaling and scoping exercises.
- (6) The agenda of the African Process did not include discussion and building of consensus on regional institutional arrangements for implementing the portfolio of projects and programme of interventions. This has caused confusion and misunderstanding in follow-up activities as well as weak leadership and direction.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE:

- (1) Subproject proposals need to better demonstrate added value by properly incorporating the recipient country and donor needs and in that way secure financing from both sides.
- (2) National subprojects must contribute to the achievement of national policies to ensure sustainability.
- (3) The African Process should coordinate activities and be implemented within the framework of the policies of the Abidjan (Convention for Cooperation in the Protection and Development of Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African region) and Nairobi Conventions (Convention for the Protection, Management, and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region), the Global Program of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA), and NEPAD to improve its sustainability.
- (4) Socio-economic data and other information must be gathered to improve the quality and usefulness of the subproject proposals and their implementation.
- (5) Development projects requiring large investments, such as the construction of centralized wastewater treatment plants and beach erosion abatement structures, should be steered by NEPAD.
- (6) IW GEF projects should look beyond the production of project deliverables and signature of international agreements and address the feasibility of implementing the subprojects during the implementation of the initial GEF project even if actual implementation will take place through other projects after the GEF project completion.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report provides a very sound and detailed assessment of the project strengths and weaknesses as well as the achievements as measured by the project objectives. The TE provides details on the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project per objective and overall. The impacts are also very detailed and comprehensive.	<b>S</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence are complete and consistent. However some of the ratings are missing (Quality of project execution and implementation, M&E system etc.)	<b>MS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project addresses sustainability but the recommendations are somewhat general and do not provide specific enough insights to solve the issues of the project such as assisting the local governments and donors to move from commitments to provide sufficient resources for implementation, practical mechanisms to maintain the network to African experts who were involved in the African Process, etc.	<b>MS</b>

To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are supported by the evidence presented but could have elaborated more on issues related to the financial sustainability and other shortcomings of the project to avoid them in future projects.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report presents a bar chart (Annex IX) with a breakdown of estimated and actual GEF funds by activity. The breakdown on actual cofinancing is only by country.	<b>S</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is briefly assessed. A description of the M&E organization is given, however there is no assessment on the quality of the system implementation.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

$$(5+4) * 0.3 + (4+5+5+4) * 0.1 = 2.7 + 1.8 = 4.5$$

**11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).**