

United Nations Environment Programme

Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF Medium-Size Project GF/3010-05-09 “Fostering a Global Dialogue on Oceans, Coasts, and SIDS, and on Freshwater-Coastal- Marine Interlinkages”

Yves Henocque

Evaluation and Oversight Unit

November 2008

INDEX

Acronyms and abbreviations	3
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
II. INTRODUCTION	
Background	7
Objective and scope of the evaluation	7
Evaluation approach	8
Structure of this report	9
III. SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT	
PROJECT PERFORMANCE	
Attainment of objectives and planned results	10
Summary level attainment and general observations	22
Implementation approach	25
Achievement of outputs and activities	
Output 1: Global Forum Conferences and related activities	27
Output 2: Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Large Marine Ecosystem (LME)	28
Output 3: GPA and freshwater-coastal-marine interlinkages	28
Output 4: Replication mechanism with IW:LEARN	29
Output 5: Project management and Global Forum sustainability	29
Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems	30
Preparation and readiness	31
Financial planning	31
UNEP supervision and backstopping	32
PROJECT IMPACTS	
Country ownership / drivenness	33
Stakeholder participation / public awareness	34
Sustainability and co-financing	34
Catalytic role	38
IV. CONCLUSIONS	
Main general conclusions	39
Ratings	43
V. FOLLOW-UP	
Lessons learned	44
Recommendations	45
Annex 1 – Questionnaire addressed to the partners	47
Annex 2 – List of questionnaire recipients and interviewees	55
Annex 3 – Co-financing and leveraged resources	58
Annex 4 – Evaluation Terms of Reference	61

Acronyms and abbreviations

AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
Canada DFO	Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans
CMP	Gerard J. Mangone Center for Marine Policy, University of Delaware
CPLP	Community of Portuguese-Speaking Nations
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
EBM	Ecosystem-Based Management
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EPOMEX	Centro de Ecología, Pesquerías y Oceanografía del Golfo de México
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPA	Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities
GWP	Global Water Partnership
ICOM	Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management
ICO	International Coast and Ocean Organization
ICP	United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea
IOCARIBE	IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions
IOC-UNESCO	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
ISA	International Seabed Authority
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IUU	Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing
IW:LEARN	UNDP/UNEP/WB-GEF International Waters Learning, Exchange, and Resource Network Program
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
JPOI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
LME	Large Marine Ecosystem
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NEPAD/COSMAR	New Partnership for Africa's Development/Coastal and Marine Coordination Unit
NOAA	U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
PEMSEA	Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia
SEMARNAT	Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, Mexico
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SOPAC	Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UCC-Water	UNEP Collaborating Centre on Water and Environment
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNCSD	United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDOALOS	United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNU	United Nations University
WHO	World Health Organization
WON	World Ocean Network
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of the UNEP GEF medium-size project was to foster a global South-to-South and South-to-North dialogue, through the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, on the implementation of the activities aimed towards the achievement of Johannesburg Plan Of Implementation (JPOI) targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands, with a special focus on Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and the interlinkages between freshwater and the coastal and marine environment.

The objective of its terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation also assesses project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.

An evaluation planning document has been drafted and submitted to UNEP and project managers. It proposed two main prerequisites: (1) a re-organization of the 11 evaluation criteria under project performance and project impacts categories as reflected in the overall rating table, (2) and classification of project stakeholders under five different categories of Global Forum partners and specific statement about their respective expected outcome related to behavioural change.

The document then proposed a questionnaire covering the 11 evaluation criteria and a list of addressees comprising the 13 project Steering Committee members, the 95 Global Forum Steering Committee members, and a selection of 25 Global Forum Working Groups members along the five partner categories as defined above. The latter were asked only about the project impact-related criteria. Out of 128 addressees, there have been 38 respondents or a return ratio of about 30%.

As a whole, this project:

- has been a learning one, which has considerably evolved in three-year time (2005-2008) to a rapidly changing international environment and the subsequent demands from its constituencies. Unanimously, the steady improvement in the quality and effectiveness of Global Conferences till the 4th Global Conference in Hanoi has been recognized. This adaptive capacity could have been much more evidenced and utilized if it had been supported by an efficient monitoring and evaluation system;
- has provided a cross-sectoral platform and raised awareness among a broad set of decision-makers on a comprehensive set of critical ocean management and governance issues related to the JPOI and MDG targets;
- has developed a strong relationship with AOSIS raising the profile of SIDS challenges and opportunities not only in the achievement of JPOI targets, but also in putting focus on the challenges faced by SIDS and their partners in implementing the Mauritius Strategy including the steps taken to develop capacity-support to SIDS;
- has made significant inputs into UN processes, such as the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (Climate change) or the UN Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea (SIDS, Climate change, Governance of areas beyond national jurisdiction, Maritime security and safety), and the UN Ad Hoc Open-Ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction.

Practically, the project has been targeting a wide range of stakeholders the main “targets” being high level policy-makers and international/intergovernmental organizations, whilst global NGOs and Foundations representatives as well as experts in a number of policy and science areas were well represented. This made the Global Forum a unique and indispensable platform for multi-stakeholder dialogues provided the stakeholder/partners’ specific consecutive long-term impacts are taken into consideration. Nevertheless, a stakeholder analysis and involvement plan would have helped to come up with a clearer strategy map for how the project expects these varied groups of partners to commit to and focus on achieving the project and the Global Forum objectives in relation with their own agendas.

While the Global Forum is tackling new important international issues like *governance of areas beyond national jurisdictions*, in the same time it will have to keep contact with the coastal zone and its dwellers in raising awareness, building human capacity and fomenting leadership, particularly to assist countries in reaching the Millennium Development Goals targets.

In summary, given the short period of time, this GEF project has succeeded in establishing a solid base for the structuring and further development of a unique, independent international platform with efficient gains seen in (i) getting a host of different types of actors together to discuss important policy issues; (ii) putting together expert groups and committees for engaging in dialogue, debate and prescriptions on the way towards JPOI and MDG targets attainment; (iii) promoting debate on implementation modalities for these prescriptions. However, at the end of the day, implementation of agreements made in conferences does depend on national and regional actors. Follow-up and provision of continued support in varied forms is a challenge in this type of project.

While the overall rating of the project is ‘Satisfactory’, it is recommended:

- Thanks to the very proactive stance of the Global Forum Secretariat, a strong constituency within the Global Forum steering committee and the building up of committed working groups, there is a strong insurance that the good results of this GEF project will not be wasted, at least in the short and mid-term period. But it will be important that first, the project outputs are formally recognised by all partners from the Global Forum and in each region so finally as many countries as possible are helped to build national strategies. To achieve this, financial support is of course necessary provided the Global Forum fully realizes it is entering a new phase for which it has to adapt its structure including the Secretariat consolidation (in this regard, ICO like any other structure should charge overheads), more extensive reporting to the partner organizations and steering committee members hence promoting ownership and participation within its steering committee, and thematic grouping of working groups to optimise their functioning whilst keeping the Global Forum’s aim to follow all the major WSSD ocean goals.
- Another important point is the formalization of Global Forum regional leads within existing regional entities. This should not be costly using opportunistically and as much as possible the regional context and initiatives with the help of its steering committee members. A very recent and good example is one of the steering committee members’ proposal to create a Regional Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands for the Channel and the North Sea at a time where the European Union is setting up its marine eco-regions. This could be a very inspiring first step, a kind of pilot, which could incite partners from other regions to create other Global Forum regional affiliates adapted to their specific

context. Such a strategy would considerably help making outputs like capacity needs assessment operational in the next stage of work. This being said and in order to remain globally independent, the Global Forum will always have to find the way for keeping its independence at the regional level as well.

- Having done so and since the Global Forum is a unique independent global platform, while there is a good probability to see more financial support coming from countries and national organisations as shown by the leveraged resources, the support of international financing institutions will remain crucial. As immediate steps, UNEP/DGEF should continue working with the Global Forum to further support its development as suggested above and find the way to further promote programmes and crossing of experiences like the GEF/LME one. In this regard, it should be noted that, beyond the project leveraged resources, the Global Forum has already attained \$1.45 million of resources for its next stage of work, 2008-2012.
- To develop its strategy and rely on clear priorities, the Global Forum will need to further revise and finalize the draft 10-year strategic plan considered as a “living” document giving not only the future activities direction and content but also the “how” they pragmatically will be implemented and deployed through the regions taking into account their specific needs and priorities which are not necessarily the same as those at the global level. The preparation of the 10-year strategic plan should be an opportunity to come up with a coherent system of indicators for monitoring and evaluation for the sake of the Global Forum good management and partners’ systematic information including the financial one, while it could be easily adapted for the purpose of projects like the GEF/MSP one. Such a system could be developed in three phases in the next couple of months: (1) hiring an M&E specialist to build up the system structure; (2) setting up an ad’hoc small committee to work on the specialist’s proposal; (3) submitting the drafted system to the steering committee for finalization.
- Building on the project momentum, the Global Forum has rightly addressed the issue of governance of areas beyond national jurisdiction as one of the important global ocean issues. In line with the fostering of a global South-to-South and South-to-North multi-stakeholder dialogue, it is recommended the Global Forum not only tackle the issue as such but in a continuum with ICM close in the coastal zone, EEZ management, regional collaboration (regional seas and LMEs), and areas beyond national jurisdiction which are sometimes not that far and may have biophysical links from the oceanographic point of view. Such a “nested strategy” would also be a way to keep the rationale hence the balance with addressing coastal issues within territorial waters, all countries’ priority target and developing countries’ main concern.

II. INTRODUCTION

Background

1. The Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, organized informally in 2001 and formalized at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), serves as a multi-stakeholder stock-taking forum for cross-sectoral discussion, policy analyses, and mobilization of knowledge and other resources to promote the implementation of international agreements related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS. The Global Forum brings together leading ocean experts from governments, intergovernmental and international organizations (including all the relevant UN agencies), nongovernmental organizations, private sector, academic and scientific institutions.
2. The goal of the UNEP GEF medium size project was to foster a global South-to-South and South-to-North dialogue, through the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, on the implementation of the activities aimed towards the achievement of Johannesburg Plan Of Implementation (JPOI) targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands, with a special focus on Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and the interlinkages between freshwater and the coastal and marine environment.
3. More specifically, the project aimed to assist the developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition to:
 - a) Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues;
 - b) Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA);
 - c) Establish multi-sectoral dialogues, involving experts from developing countries, countries with economies in transition, and GEF LME projects in the policy analyses, public outreach and cross-learning between Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) experiences and coastal and ocean management experiences;
 - d) Raise the awareness of and promote national ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to large marine ecosystems as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS;
 - e) Improve interlinkages between freshwater, coastal and oceans issues by developing a relationship between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum and associated institutions.

Objective and scope of the evaluation

4. The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:
 - a) Did the project help to increase awareness at a high political level in the developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition on major issues related to oceans, especially the ecological and socioeconomic inter-linkages between the management of freshwater and coastal, marine, and island areas.

- b) Did the project promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA).
- c) Did the project increase the capacity of developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition to, (1) implement the JPOI targets for oceans, coasts, and islands and other relevant intergovernmental agreements, such as the GPA, (2) adopt the use of ecosystem-based approaches including LME, (3) implement the oceans and coasts aspects of the Barbados Programme of Action and the outcomes of the Mauritius International Meeting.
- d) To what extent did the project succeed in securing the sustainability of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands.
- e) To what extent did the project succeed in increasing the replicability of lessons learned in GEF LME projects through interactions with other major ocean programs and efforts in the Global Forum.

Evaluation approach

5. A first draft of an evaluation planning document was prepared and discussed with the project Steering Committee members at their second meeting held within the UNESCO premises in New York on 21 June 2008.
6. The finalized draft of the document was then been submitted and discussed with UNEP/EOU with a copy sent to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager.
7. The approved evaluation approach follows the spirit of the “Outcome mapping” (*Outcome mapping – Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs*, S. Earl, F. Carden, T. Smutylo. 2001) where regular involvement of the primary user, i.e. the project steering committee members, throughout the phases of data collection and analysis test the validity of the findings and increase the likelihood of their utilization, considered to be the ultimate purpose of evaluation.
8. To this purpose, the evaluation planning document proposed two main prerequisites: (1) a re-organization of the 11 evaluation criteria under project performance and project impacts categories as reflected in the overall rating table, (2) and classification of project stakeholders under five different categories of Global Forum partners and specific statement about their respective expected outcome related to behavioural change.
9. The project performance category includes 7 evaluation criteria as follows: A. Attainment of objectives and planned results; J. Implementation approach; C. Achievements of outputs activities; D. Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems; F. Preparation and readiness; I. Financial planning; K. UNEP supervision and backstopping.
10. The project impact category includes 4 evaluation criteria as follows: G. Country ownership / driven ness; H. Stakeholders participation / public awareness; B. Sustainability and co-financing; E. Catalytic role / Replicability.
11. Five categories of partners were defined as reflected by the Global Forum steering committee composition (see Annex 2): (1) Government officials and policy-makers, (2) Intergovernmental and international organisations, (3) NGOs and Foundations, (4) Private sector, (5) Education and research institutions. As a whole, this classification received a very positive feedback from questionnaires and interviews although the

project leaders considered the first two partners (1 and 2) as the project main targets. It should also be noted that some respondents believe they equally belong to at least two different groups.

12. The document then proposed a questionnaire covering the 11 evaluation criteria and a list of addressees comprising the 13 project Steering Committee members, the 90 Global Forum Steering Committee members, and a selection of 25 Global Forum Working Groups members along the five partner categories as defined above. The latter were asked only about the project impact-related criteria as described at Paragraph 10.
13. The questionnaire had a simple rating system as follows: 3 (Strong), 2 (Good), 1 (Fair), 0 (Poor), NR (Not relevant or Don't know). The matching with the Terminal Evaluation requested rating system comes as follows:

2.5 – 3	= Highly Satisfactory (HS)
2.0 – 2.4	= Satisfactory (S)
1.5 – 1.9	= Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
1.0 – 1.4	= Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
0.5 – 0.9	= Unsatisfactory (U)
0 – 0.4	= Highly Unsatisfactory (HS)
14. Out of the 128 questionnaires sent, 38 responses were received back or a return ratio of about 30% distributed amongst the different partner groups as follows: Partner 1 (6), Partner 2 (12), Partner 3 (8), Partner 4 (2), Partner 5 (10). The fact that the private sector has only two respondents reflect this group under-representation in the Global Forum steering committee (Annex 2).
15. Exchanges and interviews were held with the Project Executing (IOC-UNESCO) and Co-Executing (ICO) Managers and Assistants; members of the Project and the Global Forum Steering Committees, upon specific visits (World Ocean Network, Ocean Policy Research Foundation) or telephone interviews. Inputs were also received during the Project second Steering Committee meeting, the Global Forum Steering Committee meeting, and the 9th Meeting of UN Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea (ICP-9), all organized in New York from 21 to 23 June 2008.
16. With considerable help from the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager and the Project Managers, the Consultant reviewed all available documentation concerning the project and the Global Forum, including the minutes of the Project 1st Steering Committee meeting, the UNEP GEF PIR 2007, the Global Forum Report of Activities for 2005-2008, the Reports from the two Global Conferences held during the period of the project, the benchmark “How Well Are We Doing?” report, the 12 Policy Briefs as well as the other listed publications and internet services.

Structure of this report

17. Chapter III covers the specific aspects of the project including the 11 evaluation criteria redistributed around the project performance and the project impacts. Chapter IV covers the main general conclusions and the overall ratings of project objectives and results. It gives the main substance to the Executive Summary first Chapter. Finally, Chapter V lists the lessons learned and recommendations from the evaluation.

III. SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT

PROJECT PERFORMANCE

Attainment of objectives and planned results

18. The following is an analysis of the attainment of the project objectives and planned results stated in Section C (Project design) and the logical framework of the original project document. For more clarity, the latter has been reviewed as regards the numbering of Outputs and Activities though its content remains the same. It should be noted however in the original project document that there is not always a clear-cut link between the five project objectives and the three main Components and “Immediate objectives” indicated in the original logical framework. After a thorough examination and discussion with the project managers, it results the following:
 - a) Objective 1 / Component 1
 - b) Objective 2 / Components 1, 2 and 3
 - c) Objective 3 / Components 1 and 2
 - d) Objective 4 / Component 2
 - e) Objective 5 / Component 3
19. We have therefore to deal with multi-folded objectives, which make the link between activities and results or outputs (Efficiency), results and “immediate objectives” or project purpose (Effectiveness), and objectives and outcomes or project overall objectives (Impact to date) not always straightforward. This is particularly true in regard to objective 2 (Attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements including JPOI and GPA), and objective 3 (Multi-sectoral dialogues and cross-learning between LME experiences and coastal/ocean management experiences). These aspects will be further developed in the subsection on *Achievements of outputs and activities*.
20. The Relevance criteria would have been easier to assess if both a stakeholder analysis and a stakeholder involvement plans would have been made, more particularly to measure the ability of the project to keep its key stakeholders satisfied. In the frame of this terminal evaluation, the proposed stakeholder classification in five categories of partners have met a positive feedback as judged from the questionnaire and interview analyses.
21. Besides the many available documents including the three Progress Reports, there are four main documents reflecting the project status and its evolution through time and within the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands: the original project documents (February 2005), the minutes of the project first steering committee (January 2006), the project UNEP GEF PIR (July 2007), and the Global Forum Report of Activities for the GEF/MSP period 2005-2008 (June 2008).
22. As said before, it does not come as a surprise to observe that the elements of the project have been evolving through time and that there is not always an obvious link between them. Besides the fact that this evolution reflects the capacity of the project to learn and to adapt, it should be noted that this is also a reflection of a supporting

project embedded into the Global Forum which has its own rationale as well. A matching table (Table 1) is proposed for clarification of the links and the analyses below.

Objective 1: *Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts, and SIDS issues.*

23. Concerning the multi-stakeholder dialogue for promoting the Johannesburg Plan Of Implementation (JPOI) targets on oceans, coasts, and SIDS:
 - a) the 3rd Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts and Islands, *Moving the Global Oceans Agenda Forward*, was held in January 2006 at IOC-UNESCO, Paris. The conference included over 400 participants from 78 countries, with 38 ministers and high level government representatives in attendance;
 - b) a 75-page full-coloured publication presents highlights of the Global Conference and summaries of discussions related to the attainment of major JPOI and Millenium Development Goals (MDG) as regards coasts and oceans;
 - c) not long after (June 2006), a 65-page full-coloured “companion publication”, *Meeting the Commitments on Oceans, Coasts, and Small Island Developing States Made at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development: How Well Are We Doing?*, was presented at the UN Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea and then widely distributed and made available on the Global Forum website;
 - d) the 4th Global Conference, on Oceans, Coasts and Islands, *Advancing Ecosystem Management and Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management in the Context of Climate Change*, was held in April 2008 in Hanoi, Vietnam. The conference was attended by 439 participants from 62 countries including members of governments, regional organizations, UN agencies, academia, NGOs, donor agencies, and industry representatives;
 - e) 12 policy briefs were prepared by 12 multinational working groups involving 254 ocean experts from 68 countries. These working groups were created prior to the conference and are meant to serve on the long-term ;
 - f) the outcomes of the 4th Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts and Islands have been made available on the Global Forum website whilst a special Global Oceans and Coasts (GOC) 2008 website and You’Tube channel have been created for large dissemination around the world.
24. Thus, the objective concerning the holding of two Global Ocean Conferences in a developed and developing country including the preparation and worldwide dissemination of their outcomes has been not only fully met but exceeded since the Hanoi Conference holding was an additional activity to the original GEF MSP, which required a major orchestration of people and resources among and outside the Global Forum and the Government of Vietnam and was carried out in large part with leveraged resources.
25. Concerning policy analyses, rapid assessments for implementation of the Mauritius Strategy (2005) including the capacity development needs have been produced in four Small Island Developing States (SIDS) regions, *Caribbean, Pacific Islands, Indian Ocean, and Atlantic SIDS*, through the hiring of independent consultants and the engagement of regional organizations such as SOPAC and CPLP.

26. Regional capacity assessments have been carried out in Africa, East Asia, and Latin America. They have been made available on the Global Forum website.
27. As an additional outcome, under the Government of Brazil's leadership, a South-to-South cooperation on capacity development has been promoted and developed among 8 Portuguese speaking Nations. A Framework of Cooperation on the Environment has been agreed among the 8 Member States.
28. According to the progress reports and the PIR 2007, the process of preparation of the capacity assessments required more time than originally assumed while the reports still need to be disseminated widely. It appears that this component of the project faced some difficulties because, besides regional organizations like PEMSEA, NEPAD, CPLP and Mexico's SEMARNAT, it was partly entrusted to independent consultants to palliate the fact that there was a low amount of money available for these assessments. The lack of capacity was covered, in part, by a very active involvement of the project manager. This is not an issue anymore when a national government takes the leadership like Brazil in the case of the 8 Portuguese speaking countries' Framework of Cooperation. As mentioned during the last Global Forum Steering Committee meeting (June 2008), the issue of human capacities is also about encouraging synergies between national and regional efforts.
29. Moreover, in term of impact, it seems that the capacity building needs assessments could have led to more specific capacity building actions through regional organisations and regional leads using their own mechanism to let national governments and technical agencies, including them in their respective strategy and programming. In this regard, it seems that no immediate action has been taken up after the completion of the capacity needs assessments but that, in the next phase of work (2008-2012) funds would be made available to support capacity development efforts in ocean training for senior government officials and support of the SIDS Consortium of Universities.
30. Considering that the process of preparing this output has been difficult and that the results were not of the magnitude and significance foreseen in the project (*Assessing capacity building needs at the regional level for the development and implementation of ecosystem-based national ocean policies among developing countries and countries with economies in transition*), particularly in regard to building up regional and national ownership, this aspect of Objective 1 should be considered as partially met. Moreover, as mentioned during the project second steering committee meeting (June 2008), there should have been more peer review of the literature produced and more particularly of these reports which are still under different format presentation. It should be noted that the project design was probably too ambitious in planning to achieve such a difficult task in just two years.
31. Concerning public outreach, a global directory on nongovernmental organization has been completed and made available on the Global Forum website while two issues of the Global Forum Newsletter (May 2005, April 2006) were published. It should be noted that the discontinuity in issuing the Global Forum Newsletter has been largely compensated by a large quantity of informative documents as mentioned above though the purpose and nature of information are somewhat different from those of a newsletter more based on practical day-to-day management information.

32. The Global Forum has also collaborated in 2006 with the Stakeholder Forum, in the production of 6 issues of the *GPA Outreach*, a newsletter that supported the preparatory work for the Second Intergovernmental Review Meeting (IGR-2) of the UNEP Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA).
33. Since January 2005 till the end of June 2008, in all nine Side Events were organized by the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands during major ocean meetings related to the UN Informal Consultative Process (ICP) on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, the World Water Week (August 2006), the UNEP/GPA Intergovernmental Review, the Mauritius International meeting on SIDS, and the 4th World Water Forum in Mexico.
34. This considerable effort in promoting and producing information materials would not have been enough without the recent support of a much improved website and efficient collaboration with the World Ocean Network and the World Ocean Observatory as well as the International Institute for Sustainable Development in covering the 4th Global Conference proceedings and creating the GOC2008 website and YouTube channel.
35. More specifically, in collaboration with the World Ocean Network and Centre National de la Mer NAUSICAA, a package of public information materials, the *Ocean Information Package*, has been prepared and widely disseminated to museums and aquaria staff as well as teachers and educators to communicate towards general public.
36. The last aspect of this objective covers the organizational structure improvement and the preparation of a 10-year strategic plan. The organizational improvement consisted mainly in the design of the Global Forum Working Group Matrix and the setting up of 12 working groups who started working by the end of 2006. Their activity and outputs have been varied and, as a first step, led to the publication of 12 policy briefs presented during the 4th Global Conference in Hanoi. On the basis of their content as well as the conference presentations and discussions, the Global Forum Secretariat prepared a draft form of the 10-year strategic plan (2006-2016) presented as a set of recommendations and submitted at the last Global Forum Steering Committee meeting held in June 2008 in New York. The next steps will involve refinement of the recommendations for action through discussions with the Global Forum Steering Committee, Global Forum Working Groups, and other relevant parties.
37. This set of recommendations is thus underpinning the 10-year strategic plan under preparation. It generated a lot of discussions and comments at the last Global Forum Steering Committee meeting (June 2008). The raised issues turned around the topic selection (e.g. climate change and megacities, public awareness), the actual niches of the Global Forum (e.g. facilitate linkage between efforts), the lack of specific achievements with clear goals and indicators in regard to the different scales of intervention, etc. This lack of consensus reflected a lack of preparation since most of the steering committee members were discovering the document at the meeting. This means that much further exchange and negotiation are needed among the Global Forum Steering Committee members before coming up with a coherent strategic plan and a set of realistic objectives and doable recommendations. This probably means

that there should be a review of the working groups as well, many interviewees judging they were too many and not very focused. Finally, besides the working groups, it looks like the Ocean Donors and Industry/business Roundtables could have been more solicited in directly contributing to the strategic planning reflection.

38. This last aspect of Objective 1 should then be considered as partially met. This result may also reflect a weak design of the project, since it was probably over-ambitious to attempt to set up in just two years an organizational structure at the global level capable of coming up with a negotiated hence robust 10-year strategic plan. Nevertheless, the enabling conditions to make it happen have been considerably enhanced, more particularly during the last year of the project.

Table 1 - Matching the Global Forum Report of Activities, 2005-2008, and the GEF/MSP specific documents

Global Forum Activities 2005-2008	GEF/MSP Outputs and Activities	GEF/MSP Objectives (Main objective concerned in bold characters)
<p>1. Advancing the Global Oceans Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3rd Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands: Moving the Global Oceans Agenda Forward. 2006 ▪ 4th Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands: Advancing Ecosystem Management and Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management by 2010 in the Context of Climate Change. 2008 	<p><i>Output 1: At the national, regional and international levels, increased awareness of, and dialogue on, the activities, targets and timetables of the JPOI for oceans, coasts, and islands.</i> Logframe, Activity 1, Component 1</p> <p><i>Output 4: Replication mechanism with IW:LEARN established</i> Logframe (from PIR 2007), Activity 13, Component 3</p>	<p>Objective 1 - Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues.</p> <p><i>Objective 2</i> – Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the GPA.</p> <p><i>Objective 3</i> – Establish multi-sectoral dialogues, involving experts from developing countries, countries in transition, and GEF-LME projects in the policy analyses, public outreach and cross-learning between LME experiences and coastal and ocean management experiences.</p>
<p>2. Promoting Integrated Oceans Governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TOPS 2005: The Ocean Policy Summit, Lisbon Best practices ex: National Ocean Policy, Mexico Japanese Basic Ocean Law Ocean Strategy Workshop (SIDS) 	<p><i>Output 2: In SIDS, increased awareness of the role of ocean policies, ecosystem-based approaches, and results of LME projects can play for the sustainable management of the resources of their ocean areas and the implementation of the Barbados Programme of Action and the Mauritius International Meeting.</i> Logframe, Activity 6, Component 2</p>	<p>Objective 4 – Raise the awareness of and promote national ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to large marine ecosystems as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS</p> <p><i>Objective 2</i> – As above</p> <p><i>Objective 3</i> – As above</p>
<p>3. Facilitating Consensus-building on International Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction (1) Strategic Planning Workshop on Global Ocean Issues in Marine Areas beyond National Jurisdiction in the Context of Climate Change. Nice, January-2008 (2) 4th Global Conference in Hanoi, April 2008 (3) Workshop, Singapore, November 2008 		
<p>4. Work with Small Island Developing States (SIDS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy analyses on ocean/coastal management issues ▪ Working group on SIDS on Implementation of the Mauritius International Strategy (TOPS 2005, Lisbon) (Policy Brief) ▪ Regional assessments on capacity building in 4 SIDS regions ▪ SIDS Oceans Strategy Workshop (Hanoi, Vietnam) 	<p><i>Output 2: As above</i> Logframe, Activity 5, Component 2</p> <p>Logframe, Activity 7, Component 2</p>	<p>Objective 4 – Raise the awareness of and promote national ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to large marine ecosystems as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS</p>

<p>5. Long-term Capacity Building in Ocean and Coastal Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of capacity-building needs ▪ 8 regional capacity assessment ▪ Working group on capacity development (Policy Brief) ▪ Oceans Strategy Workshop for SIDS ▪ Collaborative activities with IW:LEARN in enhancing replication 	<p><i>Output 1: As above</i> Logframe, Activity 2, Component 1</p> <p><i>Output 4: Replication mechanism with IW:LEARN established</i> Logframe, Activities 10, 11, 12 and 14, Component 3</p>	<p>Objective 2 – Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the GPA.</p> <p><i>Objective 1 - Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues.</i></p> <p><i>Objective 5 – Improve interlinkages between freshwater, coastal and ocean issues by developing a relationship between the Global Forum and the World Water Forum</i></p>
<p>6. Linking the Management of Freshwater and Oceans and Coasts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work with UNEP/GPA (IGR-2 Partnerships) ▪ Working group on Linking management of freshwater and oceans (Policy Brief) <p><i>(1) International Workshop on Freshwater-Coastal-Marine Management Interlinkages (Mexico, 2006)</i></p> <p><i>(2) Management Link for Freshwater and Coasts. Progress in Local Actions (4th World Water Forum, Mexico, 2006)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collaboration with Danish Hydraulic Institute and UNEP/UCC-Water 	<p><i>Output 3: Increased awareness and political recognition of the ecological and socio-economic interlinkages between the management of freshwater and coastal, marine, and island areas, through formalized collaboration between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum and associated institutions.</i></p> <p>Logframe, Activities 8 and 9, Components 3</p>	<p>Objective 5 - Improve interlinkages between freshwater, coastal and ocean issues by developing a relationship between the Global Forum and the World Water Forum</p> <p><i>Objective 2 - Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the GPA.</i></p>
<p>7. Policy Analyses, Publications, and Information Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publications and internet services 	<p><i>Output 1: As above</i> Logframe, Activity 1, Component 1</p> <p>Output 5: Efficient management of project resources; and Monitoring and Evaluation of project impact Logframe, Activity 18, Component 4</p>	<p>Objective 6 (?)– Global Forum sustainability</p> <p><i>Objective 1 - Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues.</i></p>
<p>8. Outreach to the Public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outreach to the public through museums and aquaria ▪ Directory of NGOs involved in Oceans, Coasts, and SIDS 	<p><i>Output 1: As above</i> Logframe, Activity 3, Component 1</p>	<p>Objective 1 - Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues.</p>
<p>III - Future Directions : Global Forum Strategic Planning to 2016</p> <p>IV – Global Forum Organization and Contact Information</p>	<p><i>Output 1: As above</i> Logframe, Activity 4 (+ establishment of Working Groups), Component 1</p> <p>Output 5: Efficient management of project resources; and Monitoring and Evaluation of project impact Logframe, Activity 15, Component 4</p>	<p>Objective 6 (?)– Global Forum sustainability</p> <p><i>Objective 1 - Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues.</i></p>

Note: Logframe activity 16 (Stakeholder analysis) and activity 17 (M&E Plan) are missing.

Objective 2: *Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the GPA.*

39. As shown in Table 1, Objective 2 is a multi-folded objective as the first and next ones except Objective 4 as assessed later.
40. Besides the obvious improvements in the quality of the Global Conferences, up to the 4th one in Hanoi, and their efficient use as Global Oceans Agenda promoting platforms, an important outcome was reached with the holding of The Ocean Policy Summit in Lisbon (TOPS 2005). In synergy with other donors and more particularly the Nippon Foundation, this event allowed the sharing of more than 20 National Ocean Policies experiences as well as the work undertaken among others by the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the UNEP Regional Seas Programme, and the GEF-supported Large Marine Ecosystems.
41. As a result of the work reported at TOPS 2005, a book on *Integrated Regional and National Ocean Policies: Comparative Practices and Future Prospects*, has been published by the UN University Press and officially presented at the 4th Global Conference in Hanoi.
42. Some declarations of people concerned and members of the Global Forum Steering Committee underlined the importance of the lessons learned and their facilitating role, more particularly in the case of the national ocean policy of Mexico, and the drafting and enactment of the Japanese Basic Ocean Law.
43. Thus, the objective concerning the JPOI is fully met.
44. Concerning the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA), the Global Forum organized a Freshwater to Oceans Working Group or Task Force, which has been particularly active setting up specific workshops in Mexico City (2006), at the 3rd Global Conference in Paris where it started preparing the second Intergovernmental Review of the UNEP-GPA (IGR-2) held in Beijing (October 2006). It was also in Beijing that a partnership was concluded with UNEP/GPA including the preparation of a global report on *Advancing the WSSD Targets on Ecosystem Management and on Integrated Coastal Management through the GPA: Global Reporting and Case Studies*. This report, the components of which were presented at the 4th Global Oceans Conference, is planned to be issued in final form in early 2010.
45. Together with the GPA Stakeholder Forum, the Global Forum produced a set of newsletters, *GPA Outreach*, related to UNEP/GPA and IGR-2 during the Stockholm World Water Week (August 2006) and during IGR-2 (October 2006).
46. The objective concerning the GPA is thus considered as fully met.

Objective 3: *Establish multi-sectoral dialogues, involving experts from developing countries, countries in transition, and GEF-LME projects in the policy analyses, public outreach and cross-learning between LME experiences and coastal and ocean management experiences.*

47. The activities to address this objective are under components 1 and 2 including the Small Island Developing States (SIDS), which are particularly concerned with the development of GEF-supported Large Marine Ecosystems though there are not yet at the forefront of it.
48. As for the first aspect of Objective 3, *Establish multi-sectoral dialogues*, it is about the same one as in Objective 1, i.e. *Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues*.
49. The aspect on GEF Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) projects and cross-learning between LME experiences should be strongly related to the Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM) approach since they “represent a pragmatic way to assist countries in getting started in operationalizing the ecosystem approach in an area sufficiently large to include transboundary considerations” (Al Duda, 3rd Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, 2006). Although rarely mentioned as such, this makes the LMEs experiences implicitly included into Output 1 (awareness of JPOI targets) and Output 2 (EBM approach and LME projects in SIDS).
50. After a slow start, the collaboration developed with the Global Environment Facility’s International Waters: Learning Exchange and Resource Network (GEF IW:LEARN) fostered knowledge-sharing on ecosystem-based ocean management in LMEs and coastal areas at global and regional levels through the establishment of an online resource centre and the holding of technical training workshops on Public Participation and Payments for Ecosystem Services in conjunction with the 4th Global Forum Conference in Hanoi. In this regard, it was certainly very beneficial to the project to have representatives from IW:LEARN in the project steering committee as highlighted by the discussion on the matter during the first Steering Committee meeting (January 2006).
51. Amongst the working groups, there is one specifically dealing with Large Marine Ecosystems, which prepared and issued a policy brief on Large Marine Ecosystems at the Global Conference in Hanoi. The latter gives a clear and rather comprehensive picture of the LME concept, case studies and lessons learned but falls short of practical recommendations that could help regions and countries in making synergies with other frameworks and instruments like the UNEP Regional Seas Programme. This is somewhat compensated by the other policy brief on EBM/ICM and Indicators for Progress which does mention the role of LMEs in the implementation of EBM and Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) at regional level and make the connections with other instruments.
52. The Global Forum active collaboration, including their co-financing, with regional organisations like NEPAD and PEMSEA, themselves actively involved in LMEs development, indicates a bigger investment in the South-West Indian Ocean/South Eastern Africa region (Agulhas Current and Somali Current LMEs) and the East Asia region (among others Yellow Sea, East China Sea, South China Sea, Indonesian Sea). This is confirmed by the very positive perception of SIDS leader from these regions of GEF/LME projects cross-regional learning benefits.
53. Finally, a concurrent session was organized on *Experiences in the Practical Implementation of Country-Driven GEF LME Programs* during the last Global Conference in Hanoi. A session about which a global NGO representative commented:

“I did not see anything groundbreaking in the LME sessions except for the very good media coverage of the UNEP Status of LMEs report”.

54. Thus, this aspect of the objective may be considered as almost fully met though probably more pro-active cross-learning could have been done provided the project Executing Agency (IOC-UNESCO) is among others hosting the annual LME consultative meeting.

Objective 4: *Raise the awareness of and promote national ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to large marine ecosystems as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS.*

55. This objective is at the core of the project and has a straightforward connection with Component 2, Output 2.
56. The connection between the Global Forum and the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) is quite strong with many members participating to the Global Forum Steering Committee.
57. The Global Forum contribution to the 2005 Mauritius International Meeting was substantial with the preparation and presentation of a series of policy analyses on ocean and coastal management issues in SIDS.
58. A working group composed of SIDS ocean experts from the Pacific, Caribbean, and AIMS (Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, South China Sea) was formed right after the Mauritius meeting to work with AOSIS, UNDESA, and others on the rapid implementation of the decisions made in Mauritius and to address issues related to capacity development in SIDS. This working group contributed to the Ocean Strategy Workshop for decision makers with a special emphasis on SIDS at the Ocean Policy Summit in Lisbon (October 2005). Another SIDS Oceans Strategy Workshop was convened during the 4th Global Conference in Hanoi (April 2008) with a high participation of SIDS leaders including Ambassadors to the UN.
59. Four regional capacity assessments on the specific steps that can be taken to rapidly implement the Mauritius Strategy in the Caribbean, Pacific Islands, Indian Ocean, and Atlantic SIDS, were prepared under the leadership of regional SIDS experts.
60. As mentioned by the SIDS working group leader, “the Global Island Partnership was influenced by the discussions of the Global Forum, and its success is based upon some of the lessons learned through the Global Forum. The Global Island Partnership is now a recognized programme of the CBD Island Biodiversity Work Programme”.
61. As a result, the policy brief on *SIDS and Implementation of the Mauritius Strategy* looks quite operational in its selection of priority issues, objectives to address them, and recommendations to achieve them.
62. This central objective on SIDS awareness and capacity building has thus been fully met.

Objective 5: *Improve interlinkages between freshwater, coastal and ocean issues by developing a relationship between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum and associated institutions.*

63. This objective is also clearly linked with Component 3, Output 3. The aspect regarding the work with UNEP/GPA is already covered under Objective 2.
64. Although the objective tackles a difficult and long-term issue, it has been particularly well served by a dedicated Freshwater to Oceans Working Group. The latter organized among others a panel session and stakeholder dialogue session on linking freshwater-to-oceans initiatives at the 3rd Global Conference (January 2006), and another one on *Management Link for Freshwater and Coasts – Progress in Local Actions*, at the 4th World Water Forum in Mexico City (March 2006).
65. Following the 11th Global Water Partnership Consulting Partners Meeting and the World Water Week held in Sweden (August 2006), a collaboration has been established with the Danish Hydraulic Institute Water and Environment Group, and the UNEP Collaborating Centre on Water and Environment (UCC-Water).
66. More recently (June 2008), an important meeting was organized to renew cooperation between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the Global Water Partnership. They agreed on a joint working group working in priority in two pilot regions, the Mediterranean and Caribbean regions, and preparing possible specific sessions under Topics 3.3 (Preserving Natural Ecosystems) and 1.1 (Adapting to climate change) of the 5th World Water Forum to be held in Istanbul in 2009. It is not known yet if these proposals have been accepted and endorsed by the Forum.
67. An important move that was made during this meeting is the joint decision to approach the Global Water Partnership network in SE Asia to explore collaboration and involvement of this network in the planning of the May 2009 World Ocean Conference to be held in Mindanao, Indonesia.
68. The policy brief on *Freshwater and Oceans* was produced by the working group and used as a basis for discussion during the 4th Global Conference in Hanoi (2008). While the working link with GPA is consolidated, five practical goals were selected by the working group including the identification of successful cases and their use for building public awareness.
69. Although no Memorandum of Understanding could be concluded between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum, this objective is considered as almost fully met. Here, the non conclusion of an MoU is not necessarily an impediment to the progress of common activities with the World Water Forum and associated institutions.

Objective 6: *Establish a coordination mechanism for successful implementation of the project (and Global Forum sustainability).*

70. There are only five objectives corresponding to three components in the text of the original project document whilst there are four components with four “immediate objectives” and five outputs in the logical framework.

71. In order to correctly cover this sub-section of the Terminal Evaluation, it is thus proposed to logically align the component 4 objective with the five previous objectives and make it a sixth one.
72. It becomes immediately obvious that this 6th objective could have included the logical framework Activity 4 (Component 1, Objective 1), *Enhance organizational structure and conduct strategic planning for the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands*, in order not to dissociate the project coordination mechanism and the Global Forum functioning which are actually and fundamentally not dissociable from both financial and operational points of view.
73. Thus, Objective 6 would become: Establish a coordination mechanism for successful implementation of the project (and Global Forum sustainability).
74. A project steering committee has been set up and met two times: the first meeting was held in Paris, at IOC-UNESCO Headquarters, in January 2006, and the second meeting was held in New York, at IOC-UNESCO premises, in June 2008. Thus, the two expected project steering committees did take place though the timing of the second one, i.e. at the very end of the project, is questionable since there was not much to negotiate or decide anymore. The fact is that there were 6 members attending compared to 13 members at the first steering committee meeting.
75. Thanks to the Global Forum website steady improvements and interactions through the internet, it looks like the information exchange mechanism at least between the project steering committee members was effective enough.
76. The aspect on project management resources as well as the sharing of disbursement between the Executing and Co-executing Agencies has been well covered (Annex 3). Contrary to what is indicated in the Global Forum Report of Activities, there is no apparent financial coverage of the activity on *Governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction*, which makes sense since this objective and activity were not included neither in the original project document nor in the PIR 2007. Actually, this work was carried out with leveraged resources, especially the Nippon Foundation and the Government of Singapore, and may be viewed as partly generated by the project dynamic.
77. Concerning the efficiency of the project, the amount of outputs, the quality of most of them, and the number of institutions and individuals involved, indicate that the project has been very cost effective. More specifically, it should be noted that many activities were carried out at low managerial cost through a part-time Secretariat and involving many volunteer experts.
78. The level of co-funding (Annex 3), with necessary adjustments in sources, has been not only respected but exceeded as a result of the Global Forum growing constituencies, with some governments beginning to commit, but also thanks to the project and Global Forum manager's skill and strong dedication. Besides, the significant contributions in kind from partner organizations, volunteers, Steering Committee members in terms of their time should also be noted.

79. In spite of the observation made during the first project steering committee meeting (January 2006), no funds have been made available for the development of monitoring and evaluation plan. Therefore, there was no specific monitoring and evaluation plan resulting in a poor monitoring and evaluation of project impact within and outside the Global Forum. The unevenly-issued progress reports and the PIR 2007 are the only existing project impact monitoring and evaluation documents based on the initial logical framework, whilst no progress report was produced after June 2007. These aspects will be dealt in more details under the sub-section *Achievement of outputs and activities*.
80. Three Roundtables were established and met at least twice during the 3rd and 4th Global Conferences: Ministerial Roundtable, Donor Roundtable, and Industry/Business Roundtable. Besides these roundtables, the setting up of the 12 working groups has been a crucial step in the Global Forum organizational enhancement though their functioning has still to be enhanced for a number of them.
81. The appointment of Regional leads is not clear yet maybe excepted SIDS though it is more a *de facto* functioning than a formalized one within the Global Forum structure.

Summary level of attainment of the objectives and general observations

82. Table 2 below summarises the level of attainment, in the view of this Terminal evaluation, of the project objectives.

Table 2 – Level of attainment of project objectives

Objectives	Level of attainment	Observations
Objective 1		
a) To foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues	Fully met	
b) To foster policy analyses and capacity needs assessments	Partially met	More accomplished for SIDS and East Asia than for Africa and Latin America. Peer review needed.
c) To foster public outreach	Fully met	Efficient collaborations with World Ocean Network and World Ocean Observatory and use of rich media
d) To enhance the organizational structure and prepare a 10-year strategic plan	Partially met	The project seems to have been ill-designed to meet such an ambitious objective (10-year strategic plan).
Objective 2		
a) Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements including the JPOI	Fully met	
b) including the GPA	Fully met	
Objective 3		
a) Establish multi-sectoral dialogues	Fully met	Overlapping with Objective 1, a)
b) Cross-learning between LME experiences	Almost fully met	It seems there is a better impact on SIDS regions
Objective 4		
Raise the awareness of and promote national	Fully met	This objective is central to the project

ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to LMEs as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS		with convergence from most of the other objectives
Objective 5		
Improve interlinkages by developing a relationship between the Global Forum and the World Water Forum and associated institutions	Almost fully met	It is probably too early for an MoU, which is not an obstacle to the development of further collaboration
Objective 6 (including enhancement of organizational structure)		
a) Set up the project steering committee	Fully met	Second meeting should have been organized earlier
b) Set up information exchange mechanism	Fully met	
c) Management of project resources and co-funding	Fully met	Steady flow of exchange with planned sharing of disbursement between Executing and Co-executing agencies. Co-funding provisions exceeded.
d) M&E plan and M&E of project impact	Poorly met	From beginning till the end of project, use of the same logframe in original project document
e) Roundtables and working groups	Partially met	On-going
f) Appointment of Regional leads	Poorly met	No formalized mechanism. Only apparent for SIDS through AOSIS

Summary concerning the level of achievement of the objectives:

- 9 objectives Fully met (100%)
- 2 objectives Almost fully met (90%)
- 3 objectives Partially met (66%)
- 2 objectives Poorly met (33%)

Using these percentages, the project would have a level of achievement of objectives of 90%. It has to be noted though, that this percentage has more relevance when looking at the achievement of each of the four main objectives:

- **Objective 1: Almost fully met (95%)**
- **Objective 2: Fully met (100%)**
- **Objective 3: Almost fully met (95%)**
- **Objective 4: Fully met (100%)**
- **Objective 5: Almost fully met (90%)**
- **Objective 6: Partially met (72%)**

Besides the fact that the hosting of the 4th Global Oceans Conference may be considered as an additional output in regard to the project original document, Objective 1 is almost fully met because of the rather low level of achievement of the 10-year strategic plan at the time of this Terminal Evaluation. With a better original design of the project, i.e. with an Objective 6 dealing both with the project coordination mechanism and the Global Forum sustainability, Objective 1 would have been fully met.

83. There remains no doubt that the project:

- a) has been a learning one, which has considerably evolved in three-year time (2005-2008) to a rapidly changing international environment and the subsequent demands from its constituencies. Unanimously, the steady improvement in the

quality and effectiveness of Global Conferences till the 4th Global Conference in Hanoi has been recognized. This adaptive capacity could have been much more evidenced and utilized if it had been supported by an efficient monitoring and evaluation system;

- b) has provided a cross-sectoral platform and raised awareness among a broad set of decision-makers on a comprehensive set of critical ocean management and governance issues related to the JPOI and MDG targets;
- c) has developed a strong relationship with AOSIS raising the profile of SIDS challenges and opportunities not only in the achievement of JPOI targets, but also in putting focus on the challenges faced by SIDS and their partners in implementing the Mauritius Strategy including the steps taken to develop capacity-support to SIDS;
- d) has made significant inputs into UN processes, such as the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (Climate change) or the UN Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea (SIDS, Climate change, Governance of areas beyond national jurisdiction, Maritime security and safety) and the UN Ad Hoc Open-Ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction, and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

84. Practically, the project has been targeting a wide range of stakeholders including very high level policy-makers, international/intergovernmental organizations, NGOs and Foundations representatives as well as experts in a number of policy and science areas. This made the Global Forum a unique and indispensable platform for multi-stakeholder dialogues provided the stakeholder/partners' specific consecutive long-term impacts are taken into consideration. More particularly:

- a) national leaders' awareness about JPOI and GPA targets has greatly improved but it did not necessarily and directly lead to the building up of national strategies ;
- b) while the project has contributed to the mainstreaming approach of GPA, there remains much to be done to fully integrate GPA into national integrated water resources management planning and coherent transboundary collaboration;
- c) through global NGOs and Foundations, there is a need to engage a wider network of local and in-region non governmental and civil society organizations;
- d) the engagement of the private sector has still to take place to a significant extent and the concept of public private partnership remained elusive to the majority of project partners. Things are beginning to change with the establishment of some of the working groups (maritime transport, areas beyond national jurisdictions) and the institutionalisation of the Industry/business Roundtable. It has to be underlined that compare to the majority of GEF projects, this move may be considered as quite significant;
- e) besides research and educational institutions deeply involved in the Global Forum, and most notably the University of Delaware G.J. Mangone Center associated with Nausicaa/World Ocean Network and World Ocean Observatory, which have provided crucial support and value-added contributions to the Global Forum project, educational and scientific institutions as an average have not gone beyond contractual expectations, nor have they succeeded in leveraging significant steps forward in overcoming fundamentally crippling obstacles which are data collection and management and access to capacity-building in practically advancing in the global commitments (JPOI, GPA, etc.) not only at regional but also and above all

at national and local levels. One comment issued from one of the scientific/educational partner wondered if their own community was not part of the problem, i.e. the resistance to change.

In spite of the priority that was given to Partners 1 and 2 by the Global Forum, a stakeholder analysis and involvement plan would have helped to come up with a clearer strategy map for how the project expects each group of partners to commit to and focus on achieving the project and the Global Forum objectives in relation with their own agendas.

85. Referring to the latest point, there were many comments connected to the question of the linkage with what is actually happening and needed on the ground, i.e. the links between global policy and local action and it goes both ways: how, for example, a regional policy analyses and capacity assessment can then be translated into national policies and practical and focused local training and, the other way around, how to lay the common ground for partners working in the field in order they acquire the ease of relating to global policy action while serving individual clients and constituents.
86. While the Global Forum is tackling new important international issues like *governance of areas beyond national jurisdictions*, it will have to keep in touch with the coast in raising awareness, building human capacity and fomenting leadership, particularly to assist countries in reaching the Millennium Development Goals targets.
87. In summary, given the short period of time, this GEF project has succeeded in establishing a solid base for the structuring and further development of a unique, independent international platform with efficient gains seen in (i) getting a host of different types of actors together to discuss important policy issues; (ii) putting together expert groups and committees for engaging in dialogue, debate and prescriptions on the way towards JPOI and MDG targets attainment; (iii) promoting debate on implementation modalities for these prescriptions. However, at the end of the day, implementation of agreements made in conferences do depend on national and regional actors. Follow-up and provision of continued support in varied forms is a challenge in this type of project.
88. Besides the observed weaknesses, it is fair to say also that one “positive weakness” of the project design was revealed by the fact that the project was able to generate, with a significant leverage of additional resources, a number of outputs that were not originally envisioned (working groups, policy briefs, new international issues). In this sense, the project manager and the leaders of the working groups deserve commendation.
89. The questionnaire feedback for this critical criteria is the following:

	Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Effectiveness	Highly satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory		Highly satisfactory
Relevance	Highly Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory		Highly satisfactory
Efficiency	Highly Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory		Highly satisfactory

Implementation approach

90. The project implementation involved one executing agency, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, UNESCO (IOC), which received the total GEF financing

and contracted the International Coast and Ocean Organisation (ICO), the Secretariat of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, for the implementation of specific activities under all four project components. Practically, the ICO was operating as a co-executing organisation on a common timetable and work plan with the IOC. The project was managed by a 6-member team: one Project co-Manager on the executing agency's side and, on the ICO's side, another Project co-Manager assisted by a Secretariat of four Technical Assistants including and Accounting/Administrative officer. Here, it should be noted that the ICO support was largely paid for by other sources than the GEF funds, including the University of Delaware and other partners.

91. The co-financing was supported by the UNEP-GPA, IOC-UNESCO, Governments (NOAA, DFO Canada, Portugal), NGOs (ICO, Nippon Foundation, World Ocean Network, The Nature Conservancy), and regional organisations (IOCARIBE, PEMSEA, NEPAD/COSMAR, EPOMEX/SEMARNAT/CCA) covering about 53% of the total budget.
92. Beyond the amount committed to the project at the time of approval, financial and in-kind support was provided by 28 international/multi-lateral, government and non-government organizations for three activities carried out under the MSP: 1) TOPS 2005 The Ocean Policy Summit held in Lisbon in October 2005; the 3rd Global Oceans Conference held in UNESCO, Paris, in January 2006; and 3) strategic planning on the global oceans agenda and the 4th Global Oceans Conference held in Hanoi, in April 2008, in order to fully accomplish the project's objectives and to extend the reach of the project's impacts to a wider constituency. The Project Management was assisted by a Project Steering Committee which met twice, the second meeting being organised at the very end of the project (June 2008).
93. Except apparent delays of disbursement from the implementing agency, as mentioned in the PIR 2007, there were no particular cases of serious conflict, and deadlines were in general met though extension of the project was requested twice by the Executing Agency, the first time being agreed by UNEP (December 2007) till April 2008 whilst the second request made in May 2008 to extend the project till 15 July 2008, is still pending. All indications are that the project team was able to maintain very constructive working relations. As highlighted by the minutes of the project first steering committee, it looks like there were some misunderstandings between the executing organisations and UNEP/DGEF as per the monitoring and evaluation and capacity needs assessment respective approach. A good deal of those have then been settled but not exactly all of them, in particular as regards the stakeholder analysis/involvement plan and the monitoring and evaluation plan.
94. Both Project co-Managers play a key role in the smooth running of the project, more particularly on the ICO co-Manager's side, herself co-chairing the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands to which this project was directly contributing. For this reason and since the Global Forum has been organizing or contributing to a number of conferences during the project period, there were many opportunities to gather the project steering committee members with full or partial attendance, resulting in minutes and drafted resolutions that could have been passed to other members from the Global Forum steering committee as well. Because of the project steering committee members' occupation responsibilities and the distance separating them, it

was probably very difficult to set up a specific meeting as the poor attendance to the second and last meeting in June 2008 attested it, a reason more to grab the conference opportunities and make this steering committee a living body instead of a formal frame. This is not to say that there were no exchanges in-between the two meetings, but instead of having them on an individual basis they could have been more participatory. Sharing information individually is quite different from sharing information collectively and drafting even small reports out of it may contribute to the monitoring of the project.

95. It looks like the capacity of some regional organisations to deliver capacity needs assessment, appropriate recommendations and an operational strategy somewhat represented a problem. As a consequence, there has been some delay in their finalization though they have been recently made available on the Global Forum website.
96. To deal with this reality in a more efficient manner, the project contracted regional consultants, but ideally the project should have contemplated in its design a more specific region- and type of country-tailored approach, instead of assuming that the same process could be applied whatever the region and the status of the countries at stake. Except in the case of several SIDS region (North-western Indian Ocean, South Pacific), regional leads have still to be specified and formalized in regard to the Global Forum by sharing, for example, a common charter.
97. While there should have been four of them, only three half-year progress reports have been delivered to the implementing agency, the period of the last one ending up in June 2007 whilst the project was extended, at least formally, till April 2008.
98. The questionnaire used for the preparation of this Terminal Evaluation included one question about the quality of day to day project management. The project steering committee members' feedback was very positive mentioning a "highly effective Executing agency and Secretariat in organizing the policy decisions and decision-making" with a "well-managed Secretariat producing a significant number of draft documents and background papers for the use of the Steering Committee and management". Overall and for each category of partner, the questionnaire feedback on the Implementation approach criteria is the following:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	-	Highly satisfactory

Partner 3 (NGOs and Foundations) "satisfactory" opinion is mainly attributable to the questions concerning the project management and adaptation to changes during the life of the project.

Achievement of outputs and activities

99. This section of the Terminal Evaluation assesses the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness. The following ratings are used: highly satisfactory (HS), satisfactory (S), moderately satisfactory (MS), moderately unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and highly unsatisfactory (HU).

Output 1: Global Forum conferences and related activities

100. *Activity 1: Convene the 3rd and 4th Global Conferences + Side Events* - The effectiveness of Output 1, Activity 1, has been dealt with in paragraphs 23-24 above provided it includes the 4th Global Conferences in Hanoi, which were surprisingly counted under Output 4, an output that was added up after the holding of the project first steering committee meeting. In all, in relation with these conferences and others, nine side events were organized from January 2005 to June 2008. This first activity of Output 1 is rated as highly satisfactory.
101. *Activity 2: Assess the capacity building needs in the three regions of Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and East Asia* – The effectiveness of Output 1, Activity 2 has been dealt with in paragraphs 26-30 above. As said before, although the assessments have been performed, there is a lack of formality and visibility of their findings and recommendations to allow an efficient contribution to national policies. The available reports (website) are in different format and unequal in content. As it was said at the first project steering committee meeting, these reports are not an end in themselves and will get some added-value only if there is an underpinning mechanism “leading to specific capacity building actions and planning” at regional and country level. It is fair to add that such a move has been initiated through the specific working group recommendations about mobilization of further support for implementing the key recommendations and policy prescriptions targeting key areas such as the Coral Triangle Initiative, SIDS, and East Africa. As an activity, it is rated as moderately satisfactory.
102. *Activity 3: Public awareness and outreach* - The effectiveness of this specific activity has been dealt with in paragraphs 30-34 above. It is rated as highly satisfactory.
103. *Activity 4: Enhance organizational structure and conduct strategic planning* – The effectiveness of this specific activity has been dealt with in paragraphs 36-38. As already mentioned, this activity should have been better placed under Output 5 in the project design. It is rated as moderately satisfactory.
104. On average, Output 1 is therefore rated as satisfactory.

Output 2: SIDS awareness and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy

105. This output is considered to be at the core of the project. Its effectiveness has been more specifically dealt with in paragraphs 55-62, under Objective 4. It is rated as highly satisfactory.
106. It is worth quoting one SIDS policy-maker’s comment as follows: “The Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands has become an indispensable voice and platform for SIDS, not only in the achievement of JPOI targets, but more especially in putting focus on the challenges faced by SIDS and their partners/partnerships in implementing the Mauritius Strategy. With its wide-ranging connections the Global Forum is able to highlight and draw attention to areas of concern and to call on a pool of global expertise and informed policy-making for the benefit of SIDS. These activities of the Global Forum have ensured a proper viewing of a major global problem area in all its

integrated complexities, putting forward investigated assessments on efforts made, recognising achievements to date and, more realistically, highlighting the significant constraints faced by SIDS and the world community at large. Especially commendable are steps taken by the Global Forum to ensure the empowerment and capacity-support to SIDS and the direct input and participation of SIDS representatives, stakeholders and partners”.

Output 3: Awareness and political recognition of interlinkages between the management of freshwater and coastal, marine, and island areas through formalized collaboration between the Global Forum and the World Water Forum and associated institutions

107. This output and its activities are essentially covered under Objective 5 in paragraphs 63-69. In spite of the difficulties, a recent agreement was made with the Global Water Partnership in developing a number of common activities. Among others, this was made possible thanks to the Freshwater to Oceans Working Group, which produced one of the more substantial policy briefs. This output is rated as satisfactory.

Output 4: Replication mechanism with IW:LEARN established

108. This output was not in the original project document log frame but was added later as one of the decisions made during the project first steering committee meeting (January 2006). It is evidenced in the third progress report (July 2006-June 2007) and in the PIR 2007 though its insertion under the component “Monitoring and Evaluation” is questionable. In addition, the activity related to the planning of the 4th Global Conference clearly should have been put instead under Output 1, Activity 1.
109. The effectiveness of this long-term capacity building-related output has been dealt with in paragraph 50. It is rated as satisfactory.

Output 5: Efficient management of project resources, and Monitoring and Evaluation of project impact

110. The Output 5 certainly represents the main weakness of the project design hence implementation. As developed in paragraphs 70-80 above there should have been in the original project document a sixth objective related to this output that could have been enlarged to the Global Forum sustainability since the project was organically part of it.
111. Nevertheless, there are nuances in the output overall weakness since there are also some strong points like the Global Forum website steady improvement, the use of rich media particularly in relation with the 4th Global Conference, and the management of financial resources including the important level (in cash and in kind) of leveraged resources the project was capable to generate, particularly thanks to the ICO project Manager’s and Global Forum Secretariat’s skill and dedication.
112. In all, and because of the lack of M&E plan and its beneficial use not only for the project but also for the Global Forum development, this output is rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

113. Overall and for each category of partner, the subsequent rating of the questionnaire feedback on the Achievement of outputs and activities criteria is the following:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	-	Satisfactory

114. Almost unanimously, the SIDS related outputs are regarded as highly successful.
115. Among the four components and their outputs, the most mentioned relative weaknesses were the capacity building needs (Component 1), the Capacity building workshop for SIDS (Component 2), the Policy analyses (Component 3), and an Effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism (Component 4).
116. As regards Partner 3 (global NGOs), to the question on the major problems/challenges besetting the work of the Global Forum, one of the comment said that “The main challenge is to get the relevant top-level people to attend and participate in moving a particular agenda forward. Taking the example of Hanoi, there was good debate and progress on island issues due to the quality and quantity of participants in attendance to that issue, whereas for Marine Protected Areas, most key players were missing therefore little substance came out of it”, a point that is related to the working groups about which “some variability on product” was observed and “where the Global Forum Secretariat had to assist more than they would have desired.” One way out of this, and very often mentioned, is less and more focused working groups whilst it is acknowledged that they should be geared to the tracking of WSSD goals on oceans, coasts and SIDS.

Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems

117. The project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) effectiveness has been dealt with under Objective 6 and Output 5 above. In absence of an M&E plan, the project monitoring and evaluation was more specifically done through the two project steering committee meetings and more elusively during the two Global Forum steering committee meetings, the three progress reports (September 2005 – June 2007), the PIR 2007 and the Global Forum Report of Activities for the period 2005-2008. The records of the second project steering committee meeting (June 2008) were not available at the time of drafting this evaluation report. Besides the project steering committee members themselves, most of the Global Forum steering committee members declared that they were not aware of the project monitoring and evaluation system.
118. Because of the short duration of the project, it was crucial “to undertake the monitoring and evaluation very early in the project’s lifespan” though, when the issue of professional help was raised at the first steering committee meeting, it was remarked that there were no funds available for the development of monitoring and evaluation plan.
119. In the PIR 2007, the project management said that “given the broad nature of this project –raising awareness, producing analyses on the extent of implementation of international agreements, carrying out multi-stakeholder policy dialogues, qualitative as well as quantitative measures should be used”. Consequently, in addition to the logframe numerical indicators, the use of qualitative indicators was proposed like

recorded “opinion of eminent and government ocean leaders who participated in the Global Forum multi-stakeholder meetings regarding the usefulness of activities”. As a matter of fact, these opinions are included in the Global Forum conference reports under varied topics but could have been treated in a more systematic way, as surveys, in order to come up with some kind of quantification in regard to the topic and the stakeholder group. In this regard, although a synthesis of comments made about the Global Forum by ocean leaders around the world was made available to the Terminal Evaluation Consultant, a stakeholder analysis and a stakeholder involvement plan right from the beginning of the project could have been used as a baseline, not just looking at the degree of satisfaction but also at the progress made towards specific expectations.

120. The questionnaire feedback and subsequent rating covering this criteria are as follows:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	-	Moderately Satisfactory

In addition to these ratings, it should be noted that a good deal of responses indicated the “Don’t know” column, in particular for partners 3 (NGOs and Foundations).

Preparation and readiness

121. The Table 1 shows that there are not always clear-cut links between project objectives, components and Global Forum activities whilst objectives are largely overlapping between each other. Once this being said, and putting aside the poor project design regarding its management and Global Forum organizational enhancement (Objective 6, Output 5), it should be noted that for this kind of project it was important to keep some degree of open-endedness in process-related objectives, the project keeping finally a rather good balance between specificity in milestones and targets without imposing unintended constraints to catalytic impacts.

122. Among others, the maintaining of this delicate balance enabled the Global Forum to take on board lessons from GEF-IW:LEARN and other partner agencies and programmes throughout implementation and this adaptive capacity could have been much better evidenced with a proper monitoring system.

123. In all and in spite of the already mentioned weaknesses in the project design, the Global Forum Secretariat supported by the Executing Agency has demonstrated its capacity to effectively manage the project and to bring in new partners during implementation as well.

124. The questionnaire respondents gave the following rating to this criteria:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	-	Highly Satisfactory

Two main comments are worth to be mentioned: from Partner 2, the fact that the project “could have been better supported administratively by UNEP, and might have benefited from greater clarity as to the GEF agency role in supporting the project fiscally and substantively”; from Partner 3, the fact that “probably more dissemination and clarity was needed from the Secretariat to steering committee members” and that

partnership arrangements “is something that might have worked through the steering committee more”.

Financial planning

125. Financial controls, including contracts and reporting between the Executing agency (IOC-UNESCO) and the Global Forum Secretariat (ICO), were effective and globally allowed the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and ensured a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of project deliverables though delays in UNEP/GEF and/or co-funding payments have been sometimes a problem.
126. The Executing agency as the Global Forum Secretariat made a sound management of funds. The fact that the project administration was located in a UN office facilitated the use of UN rules and regulations.
127. The originally planned co-funding has been somewhat respected though with some figure changes depending on the donor and a slightly smaller overall amount. This has been largely compensated through leverage of additional resources of an amount almost equivalent to the co-funding planned in the first place. In this regard, the Global Forum Secretariat is to be commended for its commitment and dedication to ensure the best possible results. The tables in Annex 5 show the co-financing and leveraged additional resources in cash and in kind.
128. The original project time schedule of two years had to be extended to about two years and a half but this delay was not related to poor management. It has to do with: a) the fact that the GEF first disbursement was made six months after the GEF approval date; b) sometimes a weak original design of the project, which for some outputs meant a lack of good step by step planning and realistic time schedules; and c) the fact that unexpected bottlenecks were found, in particular in relation to regional capacities to generate some project outputs like the capacity assessments one.
129. The questionnaire respondents gave the following rating to this criteria:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	-	Moderately Satisfactory

It should be noted that a good number of respondents declared they did not know about this question showing that the issue is more about a lack of financial information than about the actual effectiveness of the project financial planning and management.

UNEP supervision and backstopping

130. As observed by one member of the project steering committee, “maintaining the independent status of the Global Forum while answerable as a project to the GEF and UNEP has been a challenge which the Global Forum leadership has successfully navigated, although a somewhat unclear relationship with the project implementing agency seems to have posed some difficulties which may have been constraints to efficiency”. And from a Global Forum steering committee member: “Unfortunately, there seems to be a misevaluation in the GEF Secretariat of the importance of this

project for the international community, including for the credibility and sustainability of the GEF itself as regards its oceans portfolio”.

131. Another comment said that although UNEP/DGEF “participation in project steering group was on a par with other members, there have been some minor difficulties in maintaining prompt and responsive communication, something that could be improved”.
132. Since, in spite of the Forum Secretariat’s endeavour, the private sector engagement remained poor within the project and the Global Forum while the much-touted concept of public-private partnership still remains difficult to apply in most of the GEF projects, the traditional focus of UNEP on States and intergovernmental organizations could shift to collaboration with organizations outside the United Nations, especially with the private sector and civil society organizations. The LME Strategic Partnership is definitely going into that direction and should be one of the elements articulating the Global Forum 10-year strategic plan.
133. The questionnaire respondents gave the following rating to this criteria:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Highly Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Satisfactory	-	-

It should be noted that Partner 5 representatives unanimously declared they ‘did not know’.

PROJECT IMPACT

Country ownership / driven-ness

134. Given the wide scope of issues and variety of project and Global Forum partners, it is not easy to determine the degree of country ownership of the project. However, all indications are that the project engaged many of the right people to do this, particularly in the case of SIDS. Overall, and more particularly through the global conferences, the project outputs raised strong awareness about the need of national strategies in a number of countries which are named below (paragraph 136) as collected from the questionnaire feedbacks.
135. To the first question of the questionnaire: “What is the project impact on raising awareness at high political levels in developing and in transition countries, SIDS, on major ocean-related issues?”, it is recognized that there is now a broad spectrum of actors who may be qualified as policy-makers like government officials, Ministers, international organisations, the private sector, and civil society organisations. On government officials side, respondents emphasized that they get involved in the Global Forum because it also represents a useful way of developing policy dialogue and thus influencing their own stakeholders not only from the financing point of view but resources in overall sense. They “see the Global Forum as a place for oceans people to go to develop partnerships”.
136. To the question: “What are the countries most involved in the Global Forum?”, there is a wide array of answers though there is finally a good convergence about countries

or organisations involved or somewhat missing. Comes first the participation of past and present AOSIS leadership considered as a “highlight” of the Global Forum activities. The SIDS most mentioned are Seychelles, Mauritius, Solomon Islands, Samoa, Palau, Grenada, and St. Lucia. Other developing countries are Vietnam and Indonesia in South-East Asia, and as a region Eastern Africa. Transition countries are South Africa, Mexico, China, Brasil whilst the most mentioned developed countries are USA, Canada, Japan, South Korea, Australia, and in Europe Portugal, UK, Italy, the Netherlands and France. In regard to the Large Marine Ecosystems management, PEMSEA, BCLME, ASLME, and WIO seem to be the most concerned so far.

137. There is also mentioning of the missing regions and countries like Latin America, Western Africa, and India. Regarding international organisations, Partner 1 (National leaders and policy-makers) are asking for more inclusiveness with the World Water Forum.
138. The questionnaire respondents gave the following rating to this criteria:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	-	Highly Satisfactory

Stakeholders participation / public awareness

139. Most of the respondents recognized themselves as belonging to one or two partner categories whilst the private sector one (Partner 4) is almost non represented.
140. The rate of questionnaire feedbacks is an indicator per se: except Partner 4, it is about the same for each category of partner, i.e. around 30% which may be considered a good participation. The last two Global Forum steering committee meetings were attended by about 75% of the members, which is considered a good participation provided some of them have to come from quite far away, without any financial incentive. In this regard, it should be noted that many partners have contributed time, energy and expertise far beyond that they are paid to do or expected to contribute, especially since the working groups were set up.
141. Some of the working group leadership has been successfully cultivated to assist in bringing new partners (and as a matter of fact, many of the working group contributors are not members of the Global Forum steering committee) but more human and fiscal resources is needed to continue this process to bring all the working groups to sufficiently high level functioning to assist with expansion of inclusivity and participatory representation of new partners and to increase capacity of more or all of the working groups to carry out sustainable support reform processes in their respective sphere of influence. Although a number of working groups seem to remain committed to their effort, further development of cross-communication between them would probably yield bigger results.
142. Many comments converged to say that the working group arrangements were effective though they were too many and would gain in being more focused.
143. Concerning public awareness, as stated by responses to the questionnaire, it is usually considered as good though this is a “life-long” process that never ends. In this regard,

it is worthwhile mentioning the Global Forum secretariat improvement in using outsourced reporting and multimedia communication approaches that certainly should be expanded in collaboration with other organisations.

144. The questionnaire respondents gave the following rating to this criteria:

Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	-	Moderately Satisfactory

Sustainability and co-financing

145. The planned co-financing has been reached at 94% (Annex 3). The leveraged additional resources have actually doubled the project and Global Forum financing capacity. Financial and in kind support were provided by 28 international, government and non-government organisations for three activities carried out under the GEF/MSP: 1) TOPS 2005 The Ocean Policy Summit held in Lisbon in October 2005; the 3rd Global Oceans Conference held in UNESCO, Paris, January 2006; and 3) strategic planning on the global oceans agenda and the 4th Global Oceans Conference in Hanoi, in April 2008, in order to extend the reach of the project's impacts to a wider constituency. The GEF/MSP generated \$742,436 in cash support and an estimated \$288,500 in-kind support including conference facilities, staff time and travel for a total of \$1,030,936 beyond those committed to the project at the time of approval.

146. The questionnaire used for the preparation of this Terminal evaluation included nine questions regarding sustainability and co-financing.

147. Questions 1 and 2. Financial sustainability: Do you think financial resources are secured enough for letting the Global Forum running in the next few years?, and: To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support?

148. The comments made in relation to these questions included:

- a) Governments are beginning to commit, a good sign, but more work needs to be done on multiple fronts to keep things going at least through 2016.
- b) It was clear from the Hanoi meeting that the level of effort must quadruple... its not enough to have breakthrough impact.
- c) I believe financial resources have been secured for the next couple of years. However, eventually, the interventions need to be incorporated into regional programmes which will have more opportunity to work in a more hands-on manner to implement key initiatives and to monitor them.
- d) GEF should act responsibly and ensure the project's sustainability. Consistently with its rules, it should ensure that adequate funding is secured on a permanent basis, as the Forum is the only venue for informal consultations among stakeholders involved in ocean related issues.
- e) The rate of progress is likely to be more affected than the ultimate outcomes, although missed opportunities can negate gains made, especially in the context of climate change impacts.

149. Questions 3-5. What is the risk that the level of partners ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained?; As one of the partners, is it in your

interest to see the project benefits continue to flow?, and: How would you rate the public awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project, i.e. the Global Forum? To the second question, most of the respondents, whatever their partner category, responded “Very much” or ”profoundly so”.

150. The comments made in relation to the two other questions included:

- a) This is always a significant risk, and it is thus far one of the Global Forum best successes that at present the partner ownership curve seems to be in a steady up-trend.
- b) The partners need to eventually take over the initiatives and provide leadership to implementing them. At that stage, the global forum will be able to play a smaller, coordinating or monitoring role.
- c) Public awareness is a very broad term. There is very significant awareness within national, regional and global stakeholders of the Global Forum. There is however little awareness at the local level. To reach this level would obviously be a challenge.
- d) Awareness is a long haul issue and the question really needs to be about awareness of ocean issues, and then the Global Forum role in that.
- e) In order to ensure sustainability a longer time period is required and possibly more proactive public outreach, reaching not only experts and officials but also practitioners and the public. Asking them what they need. The linkage to other sectors in particular the economic needs also to be strengthened.

151. Questions 6-7. To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?, and “How would you rate the likelihood that institutional, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures will allow for the project/Global Forum outcomes/benefits to be sustained?”

152. The comments made in relation to these questions included:

- a) These (issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance) are critical as there is much evidence of policy implementation deficits. It took IPCC many years to be fully accepted and much evidence was needed before decision-makers gave serious recognition to climate change issues. Furthermore, this was only after in-tandem education of the general public. There are many examples in developed countries which highlight these issues including: MPA implementation in Canada (agreed progress not being made) and developing the Marine Bill in the UK (Scotland taking different direction after election of new Assembly).
- b) Much of the sustainability of outcomes is dependent upon sustained progress in both formal and informal dialogue processes, attention to enabling environments must be kept on issue, this may be best achieved through “projectizing”.
- c) For the achievement of the JPOI and the Mauritius Strategy the ultimate test would be practical implementation and effective mechanisms (institutional framework and governance) for doing so.
- d) Certainly the timing of the fora in relation to other policy events is important in determining whether there is likely to be progress on any specific thematic agenda.
- e) Of course governance is of importance, but this kind of effort can do more in raising awareness, building human capacity, fomenting leadership.

- f) Government participation in on-going Global Forum processes can be expected to increase both in degrees of commitment to reform processes as well as in the number of governments participating; both trends indicative of very good prospects for sustaining benefits and outcomes achieved through Global Forum effort to date. There is always a risk of catastrophic events diverting attention, but for the long term the Global Forum could become a beacon of guidance in times of crisis as well as a steady source of support and facilitation in Ecosystem-based management reforms.
 - g) I believe the mechanisms are there, but efforts are very much dependent on funding by individual countries.
 - h) This depends on whether the Forum continues. Maintaining a high profile and decision-maker involvement is paramount for sustainability in this context. It is easy for issues to ‘slide’ when there is no-one driving progress. The Forum has brought issues to the forefront and has driven progress.
153. Questions 8-9. Generally speaking how would you rate the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the project ending?, and: To what extent did the project succeed in securing the sustainability of the Global Forum?
154. The comments made in relation to these questions included:
- a) If the Global Forum and its growing membership doesn’t drive these processes, who will? There is every probability of steady progress due to the dedication and commitment modelled by leadership and contributed by many more.
 - b) It is likely that many items will continue after the project ending. It is hard to know which, in what capacity, and to what extent; but knowing the principals, it is highly likely that this will continue.
 - c) Needs sustained effort, a major element is the network of people who get benefits from opportunities to interact...
 - d) Its (Global Forum) work has already been helpful, but success overall is a medium to long term consideration, given the nature of the issues being addressed.
 - e) Many of the interventions are embedded with other programmes and are likely to continue to be implemented. Examples are the Coral Triangle Initiative, Access Agreements in East Africa, SIDS initiatives, capacity building in East Asia, Eastern Africa and SIDS.
 - f) The project succeeded in securing the sustainability of the Global Forum in terms of reputation and collegiality.
 - g) New GEF project with some new partners will ensure at least another couple milestones can be met.
155. Because of “reputation and collegiality”, because of a strong constituency within the Global Forum steering committee and some of the working groups, because of the Global Forum Secretariat skills and dedication, the continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends looks assured. The key factor that is likely to contribute to the persistence of benefits after the end of the project will be the ability of the Global Forum to:
- a) maintain its independent status while receiving catalytic and incremental support from GEF and other co-funding donors, in particular national donors, to advance a set of specific goals and objectives, in which the substantive and fiscal support of

the GEF Agencies is specifically promoted, with the understanding that the Global Forum must improve its accountability in regard to its constituency and the dialogue process in which they are involved, thus can only continue to function effectively if it maintains and continues to promote a cooperative culture of inclusivity as a convener, and is not perceived to have been co-opted by any particular donor;

- b) diversify the target audience away from just conservation and development professionals with a more concerted effort to reach out to the private sector, civil society, and government representatives (one project steering committee member mentioned that the greatest long-term impacts will probably come from Government officials and policy-makers (Partner 1) and the Private sector (Partner 4); and
 - c) come up with a clearer strategy map for how this initiative actually expects the 5 groups of partners to commit and focus on achieving specific objectives that should all contribute to linking global policy and local action
156. The project has set up two Roundtables, the Ocean Donors and Industry/business Roundtables, who met twice during the period of the project. Both circles confirmed that “a strategy is needed to engage the media, public, and think tanks, and underscored the need to link funding with other initiatives addressing poverty, economic growth, and business promotion”. While a possible on-going role for such groups and their possible comparative advantage with other similar groups from both the public and private sector were discussed, they “emphasized the need for long-term capacity development as the basis for forward movement in specific areas”. The outcomes of these meetings could become much more operational if there were better articulated with each other, between both Roundtables, in order to feed the decision-making level through another Global Forum instrument which is the Ministerial Roundtable. All these instruments need to be strategically articulated with each other through a hierarchy of interventions, from the global to the local level.
157. Stakeholder ownership of the outcomes of the project has still to be strengthened for a number of steering committee members, more particularly Global NGOs and Foundations (Partner 3), and does not seem to be widespread beyond the international or inter-governmental agencies excepted in the case of SIDS. This sense of ownership has to be maintained if not developed in these agencies and beyond by starting to generate concrete results on the ground through a collaborative network including government officials, the private sector and the civil society.

Catalytic role / Replicability

158. The last two questions of the questionnaire related to the catalytic role and replicability of the project were as follows: Any example of replication and catalytic outcomes? Did the project succeed in increasing the replicability of lessons learned in GEF LME projects through interactions with other major ocean programmes and efforts in the Global Forum?
159. The comments made in relation to these questions included:
- a) The Global Island Partnership was influenced by the discussions of the Global Forum, and its success is based upon some of the lessons learned through the

Global Forum. The Global Island Partnership is now a recognized programme of the CBD Island Biodiversity Work Programme.

- b) The policy brief on marine biodiversity is playing catalytic role to CBD process of measuring the progress in the implementation of programme of work on the marine and coastal biodiversity.
 - c) The Global Forum brought together many organizations in meaningful dialogue. Lessons learned and policy change has been duplicated across many spheres, for example, OSPAR initiatives with seamounts and the Coral Triangle Initiative.
 - d) Regional replication in cooperation with Coral Triangle Initiative. Significant momentum in convening process to address high seas governance.
 - e) The recent UN Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group on issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction directly utilized the outcomes and policy papers of the Global Conference.
 - f) Working groups established provides existing and new GEF LME projects global thematic communities of practice in which to effectively contribute and benefit from exchange of scientific and technical innovation and practical experience.
 - g) I think the question should be phrased the other way around since its is GEF LME projects that have learned from the Forum, as well (if not mostly) in ensuring the replicability of their best practices.
 - h) Very low from the perspective of the Mediterranean.
160. It should be noted that, though globally positive, these statements are somewhat piecemeal and they could have been much better articulated if a monitoring and evaluation system hence indicators had been available to all the partners.
161. It is clear that the project needs a quick follow-up and further strengthening of its leverage of additional resources to ensure that the momentum now created is not lost, building on what has been achieved and lessons learned disseminated across regions and varied categories of partners, from global to local.
162. Since, at the end of the day, it is through regions and nations that the difference will be made, it is of the utmost importance for the Global Forum to come up with a robust mechanism to spread the word and facilitate the translation/adaptation of JPOI and MDG targets into practical implementation on the ground.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Main general conclusions

163. The main general conclusions derived from the responses provided by the project and Global Forum partners to the evaluation questionnaire are summarized here. Although respondents represent about 30% of the people contacted, they may be considered as representatives of the most motivated partners hence those forming the core of the Global Forum engine. This partner's rating has therefore no other ambition than indicating trends. Table 3 below summarized the partner's rating for each of the scrutinized criteria.

Table 3 – Summary of project / Global Forum partner’s rating

	Partner 1	Partner 2	Partner 3	Partner 4	Partner 5
PROJECT PERFORMANCE					
Attainment of objectives and results					
Effectiveness	HS	HS	MS		HS
Relevance	HS	HS	S		HS
Efficiency	HS	HS	MS		HS
Implementation approach					
	HS	HS	S		HS
Achievement of outputs and activities					
	HS	S	MS		S
Assessment M&E systems					
	S	S	MU		MS
Preparation and readiness					
	HS	HS	MU		HS
Financial planning					
	S	MU	MS		MS
UNEP supervision and backstopping					
	HS	MS	S		-
PROJECT IMPACTS					
Country ownership/drivenness					
	HS	HS	MS		HS
Stakeholders participation / public awareness					
	S	HS	MS		MS
Sustainability and co-financing					
Financial	HS	HS	MS		S
Socio-political	HS	S	S		S
Institutions/Govern.	S	S	S		S
Partner’s commitmnt.	HS	S	MS		MS
Catalytic Role / Replicability					
	S	HS	MS		S

164. At a glance, the table above shows that:

- V. there is an overall very good rating from Government representatives and policy-makers (Partner 1), indicating their satisfaction and the high value they give to the unique role of the Global Forum;
- VI. intergovernmental and international organisations representatives (Partners 2) indicate an overall good rating as well though there are more reserved when coming to the topics of financial planning (mostly related to information not made available enough regularly to the Steering Committee members), UNEP supervision, and institutions and partner’s commitment;
- VII. global NGOs and Foundations are conspicuously more critical of the project and the Global Forum performance and impacts. As it will be mentioned later, it is not that they are questioning the usefulness and uniqueness of the role of the Global Forum they highly value, but they are generally asking for more transparency, more focus, and better implementation mechanism;
- VIII. research and education organizations representatives (Partner 5) have an overall good opinion, close to Partner 2’s though more reserved about the M&E system, financial planning, stakeholders participation/public awareness, and partners’ commitment;

- IX. the private sector representatives (Partner 4) are almost not there and since just two representatives responded, the corresponding rating could not have the same meaning as an average of ten respondents;
- X. the fact that the Global Forum considers the first two Partners as its primary targets should not lead to disregarding at least the two other groups' rating (Partners 3 and 5) since a number of their representatives are also members of the Global Forum steering committee.

165. When asked about suggestions for future projects of this kind, comments included:

- a) Partner 1: (i) I think a focus on increasing the involvement of the private sector is essential, (ii) Limit the number of working groups and focus on issues where the Forum's ability to recruit the best international expertise is the highest;
- b) Partner 2: (i) Addressing more practical issues, (ii) Clarity as to the status of the Global Forum as an independent entity which receives catalytic and incremental support from GEF in order to advance a set of specific goals and objectives, (iii) Should build on the Forum's unique experience and aim at institutionalising its format, (iv) One or two easily discernable goals which would be easily understood by everybody and then carried through the entire project, (v) Need to find ways to formalize partnership mechanism with various partners, so that necessary resources can be internally allocated by partner organization for their participation to the Global Forum activities, (vi) Stronger sub-regional involvement early on, such as Carribean;
- c) Partner 3: (i) Focus on Global Forum's function as meeting place across sectorial interests and make this meeting place more attractive and accessible for the private sector and civil society, (ii) Need to tackle the relation to individuals' corresponding institutions and the institutional embedding and de facto mandate of the individuals, (iii) Diversify the target audience away from just conservation and development professionals and a more concerted effort to reach out to industry, fishery and government representatives, (iv) Set reachable, realistic and measurable objectives with a greater degree of focus on fewer key issues;
- d) Partner 5: (i) Translation to other languages besides English, (ii) Focus on fewer priority issues at each Global Conference, (iii) Give more prominence to tourism as impacting on resources, climate change response, and most importantly, resilience of coastal communities, (iv) Come up with a clearer strategy map for how this initiative actually expects the 5 groups of partners to commit to and focus on achieving objectives especially in light of a very decentralized, organic approach, combined with funding mechanisms such as GEF, international banks and aid agencies, all of whom have their own agendas to pursue and would probably only sign on to this effort if its convenient at the moment.

166. Other important conclusions of this Terminal evaluation are as follows:

- a) some parts of the project design were weak especially in regard to the link between objectives and components, components and outputs, and putting in synergy the project management and the Global Forum organization enhancement activities;
- b) another important weakness was the monitoring and evaluation system, which made difficult the project follow-up and sharing of information within the Global Forum steering committee;

- c) the regional capacity assessments are unequal in quality and ownership level especially in the case of Africa and Latin America. It is not the case for SIDS where ownership is stronger thanks to the AOSIS mechanism linking regional and national efforts;
- d) in connection with the above, regional representation mechanism and appointment of regional leads are still unclear except in the case of some SIDS regions;
- e) the 10-year strategic plan will still need time to be negotiated between partners in order to set up “reachable, realistic and measurable objectives with a greater degree of focus on fewer key issues”;
- f) the number of working groups should be limited focussing on issues where the Forum’s ability to recruit the best international expertise is the highest whilst paying attention to the coverage of the WSSD targets on coasts, oceans and islands;
- g) the main successes of the project were: (i) the holding of the two Global Conferences in Paris (2006) and Hanoi (2008) and associated outputs; (ii) the South-to-South cooperation on capacity development between 8 Portuguese speaking Nations; (iii) the production and promotion of information materials supported by an improved Global Forum website, rich media, and the *Ocean Information Package* for large public outreach; (iv) the Ocean Policy Summit in Lisbon leading to the publication of a book on *Integrated Regional and National Ocean Policies*; (v) the collaboration with the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) which lead to well-focused and very significant outputs;
- h) the Freshwater to Oceans Working group and its related activities provide a solid basis for further partnership with the GPA including the preparation of a global report on advancing the WSSD targets on ecosystem management and on integrated coastal management in early 2010;
- i) the collaboration developed with the GEF IW:LEARN has led to the fostering of inter-agency and multistakeholder dialogue including an online resource center and training services;
- j) judging from interviews and questionnaire feedbacks, the Global Forum is supported by a core of highly positioned and quite committed partners from all horizons though the private sector remains poorly represented;
- k) more particularly, global NGOs and a number of practitioners from academic and research institutions are asking for a clearer strategy map in order to find more common ground than they currently do to better relate to global policy action while serving local stakeholders;
- l) opposed to the strong SIDS constituency, there are some signs indicating that some countries in transition feel they have been somewhat put aside while they should be considered as important regional constituents;
- m) the overall conclusion is that the project has succeeded in creating an independent and unique platform and network forging a learning culture among a diverse and representatively global body of decision-making and expert leadership which has begun to demonstrate unity of purpose to cooperate in active consultation on global, regional and critical issues. Doing this, it has established a framework for participation of all GEF marine projects (and some freshwater projects) in dialogue and collaboration processes which can effectively compound benefits to GEF project countries, and enable acceleration of collective contributions to GEF objectives and strategic priorities.

167. Concerning the administrative and managerial aspects of the project, the main conclusions are as follows:

- a) although there was a 6-month delay in the first disbursement of the implementing agency, the project benefited from the fact there was already a structure in place (the Global Forum Secretariat) with running activities, sparing the project from a slow start, which was particularly crucial provided the shortness of the project duration;
- b) partly as a consequence but also partly reflecting some weakness in the Global Forum organisation, termination was delayed eight months provided June 2008 is considered as the date of closure as requested by the project management but without getting any formal approval so far (formal approval has been formally granted till April 2008);
- c) the Executing agency and more particularly the Global Forum Secretariat played a crucial and very positive role in helping the project to succeed though they suffer from weaknesses in the project design, especially in regard to the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and operational linkage between project organizational improvement and the building of the Global Forum sustainability;
- d) in spite of the lack of a robust M&E system, the proactive stance of the project management allowed an effective adaptive management approach to take place, which helped to address some of those weaknesses;
- e) nevertheless, the project would have benefited from a more regionalized approach with well-identified regional leaders and an effective mechanism which would have brought in more proactive collaborators from these regions and countries as it has been so well demonstrated with some of the SIDS regions and countries;
- f) there was a good management of funds with a quite substantial amount of leveraged resources with progress made towards national level commitment. The contracts arrangement and internal reports were dealt with smoothly between the Executing Agency and the ICO as co-executing organisation;
- g) unfortunately, progress reports to the Implementing Agency did not always respect the 6-month requested periodicity and moreover did not cover the last year of the project including its extension period (July 2007 – June 2008) whilst the PIR 2008 was not available at the time of this terminal evaluation.

Ratings

168. Section III of this Terminal evaluation analyses the level of achievement of each of the objectives stated in the project document and the delivery of each of the expected outputs. Table 4 below provides the summary of the ratings attributed, as a result of that analysis, to different categories of the project. The overall rating for the project is ‘Satisfactory’.

Table 4 - Overall ratings

Criterion	Summary Comments	Ratings
PROJECT PERFORMANCE		
A. Attainment of objectives and planned results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	Most of the objectives were attained. Two of them could not be completed due to weaknesses in the project design	Satisfactory
A. 1. Effectiveness	Overall good achievement of project purpose	Satisfactory

Criterion	Summary Comments	Ratings
A. 2. Relevance	Learning project with overall satisfaction of partners and good consistency with GEF areas/operational strategies	Highly Satisfactory
A. 3. Efficiency	High cost-effectiveness and leverage of additional resources allowing further activities	Highly Satisfactory
J. Implementation approach	Effective executing agency and well-managed and very proactive Secretariat producing a number of highly significant background papers/documents though the dynamic that could have been generated by the project steering committee was not fully used	Satisfactory
C. Achievement of outputs and activities	Most of the outputs were of high quality and should serve as a strong basis for the Global Forum strengthening in the short and medium term future	Satisfactory
D. Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	In spite of significant reporting, overall poor monitoring and evaluation of project impact within and outside the Global Forum	Moderately Unsatisfactory
D.1. M&E Design	The logical framework from the original project document did not make a clear link with the project 5 objectives and was not updated as such	Moderately Unsatisfactory
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	In spite of an effective adaptive capacity, the project did not have a specific M&E plan	Moderately Unsatisfactory
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	No funding for building up an M&E system with proper indicators	Moderately Unsatisfactory
F. Preparation and readiness	The project kept a good balance between specificity in milestones and targets taking on board lessons from GEF-IW:LEARN and bringing in new partners	Satisfactory
I. Financial planning	Project funds used and administered in efficient manner but lack of financial information to partners	Satisfactory
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping	Effective participation to both steering committees and follow-up but some steering committee members (Partner 2) complaining about "unclear relationship"	Moderately Satisfactory
PROJECT IMPACTS		
G. Country ownership / drivenness	The project raised strong awareness in a number of countries especially SIDS whilst entire regions and important countries are missing	Satisfactory
H. Stakeholders participation / public awareness	Excellent participation within Global Forum steering committee and at Global Conferences; working groups arrangement effective but number should be reduced with more focus target	Satisfactory
B. Sustainability and co-financing (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	GF Secretariat high skills and dedication; strong constituency within GF steering committee and some working groups though NGO and private sector need strengthening	Satisfactory
B. 1. Financial	Significant leverage of additional resources with more countries or national organizations contributing	Satisfactory
B. 2. Socio Political	Very strong partners' interest but public awareness need to be strengthened through countries commitment	Satisfactory
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	Overall, the GF has brought issues to the forefront and started to drive progress in SIDS and some other countries but future efforts are very much dependent on individual countries funding	Satisfactory
B. 4. Partners' commitment	Strong partners' interest but more commitment can only be generated through better ownership of project and GF outcomes in particular with NGO and private sector partners	Moderately Satisfactory
E. Catalytic Role / Replicability	There are some good examples especially with SIDS but further progress is linked to the GF capacity to set up a proper mechanism to transfer experiences to regions and countries	Moderately Satisfactory
PROJECT OVERALL RATING		Satisfactory

V. FOLLOW-UP

Lessons learned

169. More care should be taken with the project design. This does not mean that everything should be set once for all right from the beginning, but rather the design of this kind of process-oriented project should:
- i. make a clear linkage between objectives, components, and activities and resulting outputs/outcomes clearly reflected in the logical framework;
 - ii. as much as possible, try to avoid too much multi-folded objectives that put then confusion on resulting outputs identification;
 - iii. identify a specific objective for project management that in this case should have been strongly linked to the Global Forum further strengthening and organization;
 - iv. identify clearly the stakeholder analysis and involvement plan as an activity since the different partner groups do not necessarily have the same motivation and expectations;
 - v. be more attentive to region specificities through carrying out a more rigorous assessment of the political, institutional and technical capacity to contribute and benefit from the project. The findings of this assessment (itself based on existing literature) should be incorporated in the project design concerning the kind of outputs, the activities that should lead to generate them, and the implementation approach that may vary depending on the region (in this regard, the GF steering committee members could be usefully more actively involved in the project design);
 - vi. foresee appropriate funding for not only allowing the project to come up with a monitoring and evaluation system right from its inception but also to maintain and adjust it all along the project implementation period.
170. In the case of a global and trans-national project like this one, it is very important:
- a) to develop a strategy map including all regions and taking into account on one hand their specificities and on the other hand the SIDS, developing countries, countries in transition, and developed countries groups they share in common in the design and implementation of the project;
 - b) to ensure that there is a meaningful and effective operational mechanism foreseen in the project design and developed through the project implementation to allow global-local streamlining through regions as well as sharing of experiences between regions and countries.
171. The duration of the project should be such as to ensure that the necessary key results are achieved as indicated in the project original document. In the case of the project under review, the project duration did not allow enough time for carrying out required processes to set up an effective regional mechanism, putting unnecessary pressure on the Executing Agency and Global Forum Secretariat.

Recommendations

172. Thanks to the very proactive stance of the Global Forum Secretariat, a strong constituency within the Global Forum steering committee and the building up of committed working groups, there is a strong insurance that the good results of this GEF project will not be wasted, at least in the short and mid-term period. But it will be important that first, the project outputs are formally recognised by all partners from the Global Forum and in each region so finally as many countries as possible are helped to build national strategies. To achieve this, financial support is of course necessary provided the Global Forum fully realizes it is entering a new phase for which it has to adapt its structure including the Secretariat consolidation (in this regard, ICO like any other structure should charge overheads), more extensive reporting to the partner organizations and steering committee members hence promoting ownership and participation within its steering committee, and thematic grouping of working groups to optimise their functioning whilst keeping the Global Forum's aim to follow all the major WSSD ocean goals.
173. Another important point is the formalization of Global Forum regional leads within existing regional entities. This should not be costly using opportunistically and as much as possible the regional context and initiatives with the help of its steering committee members. A very recent and good example is one of the steering committee members' proposal to create a Regional Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands for the Channel and the North Sea at a time where the European Union is setting up its marine eco-regions. This could be a very inspiring first step, a kind of pilot, which could incite partners from other regions to create other Global Forum regional affiliates adapted to their specific context. Such a strategy would considerably help making outputs like capacity needs assessment operational in the next stage of work. This being said and in order to remain globally independent, the Global Forum will always have to find the way for keeping its independence at the regional level as well.
174. Having done so and since the Global Forum is a unique independent global platform, while there is a good probability to see more financial support coming from countries and national organisations as shown by the leveraged resources, the support of international financing institutions will remain crucial. As immediate steps, UNEP/DGEF should continue working with the Global Forum to further support its development as suggested above and find the way to further promote programmes and crossing of experiences like the GEF/LME one. In this regard, it should be noted that, beyond the project leveraged resources, the Global Forum has already attained \$1.45 million of resources for its next stage of work, 2008-2012.
175. To develop its strategy and rely on clear priorities, the Global Forum will need to further revise and finalize the draft 10-year strategic plan considered as a "living" document giving not only the future activities direction and content but also the "how" they pragmatically will be implemented and deployed through the regions taking into account their specific needs and priorities which are not necessarily the same as those at the global level. The preparation of the 10-year strategic plan should be an opportunity to come up with a coherent system of indicators for monitoring and evaluation for the sake of the Global Forum good management and partners' systematic information including the financial one, while it could be easily adapted for the purpose of projects like the GEF/MSP one. Such a system could be developed in three phases in the next couple of months: (1) hiring an M&E specialist to build up the

system structure; (2) setting up an ad’hoc small committee to work on the specialist’s proposal; (3) submitting the drafted system to the steering committee for finalization.

176. Building on the project momentum, the Global Forum has rightly addressed the issue of governance of areas beyond national jurisdiction as one of the important global ocean issues. In line with the fostering of a global South-to-South and South-to-North multi-stakeholder dialogue, it is recommended the Global Forum not only tackle the issue as such but in a continuum with ICM close in the coastal zone, EEZ management, regional collaboration (regional seas and LMEs), and areas beyond national jurisdiction which are sometimes not that far and may have biophysical links from the oceanographic point of view. Such a “nested strategy” would also be a way to keep the rationale hence the balance with addressing coastal issues within territorial waters, all countries’ priority target and developing countries’ main concern.

Annex 1 – Questionnaire addressed to the partners

UNEP/GEF Midsize Project Terminal Evaluation Fostering a Global Dialogue on Oceans, Coasts and SIDS, and on Freshwater-coastal-marine interlinkages

Background

Project goal

The project goal was to foster a global South-to-South and South-to-North dialogue, through the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, on the implementation of the activities aimed towards the achievement of Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands, with a special focus on Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and the interlinkages between freshwater and the coastal and marine environment.

Project objectives and related components

1. Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues (*Components 1, 2, 3**)
2. Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the GPA (*Components 1, 3*)
3. Establish multi-sectoral dialogues, involving experts from developing and in transition countries, and GEF LME project and coastal/ocean management experiences in policy analyses, public outreach and cross-learning (*Components 2,3*)
4. Raise the awareness of and promote national ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to large marine ecosystems as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS (*Components 1,2*)
5. Improve interlinkages between freshwater, coastal and oceans issues by developing a relationship between the Global (Marine) Forum and the World Water Forum and associated institutions (*Component 3*).

<p>* <i>Component 1: Global Forum Conference and Related Activities</i> <i>Component 2: SIDS</i> <i>Component 3: GPA and Interlinkages to Water</i> <i>Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation</i></p>

Project partners

Project partners are defined as those individuals, groups, and organizations with whom the project interacts directly and with whom the project can anticipate some opportunities for influence.

A **stakeholder analysis** followed by a **stakeholder involvement plan** were foreseen in the project proposal. Here, stakeholders are the actors primarily considered as **partners** within the Ocean Global Forum. They are individual representatives which nevertheless belong to well distinctive groups from which specific outcomes should be expected.

From there, **outcome challenges** may be stated for each of them in a way that emphasises **behavioural change**. They are phrased so that they capture how the actor would be behaving and relating to others if the project had achieved its full potential as a facilitator of change.

The challenge is for the project to help bring about these changes.

From the project documents, the following project partners and respective outcome challenges may be identified:

<p>Partner 1: Government officials and policymakers</p>	<p>Outcome challenge 1: The project intends to see government officials and policymakers who are committed to the global oceans agenda and the implementation of major international agreements and programs according to the targets and timetables agreed upon at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. For doing so, they are actively involved in intergovernmental and regional partnerships and draw lessons from the experience that are relevant and can be used to inform national policy debates and policy formulation. They champion the JPOI targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands and seek funding from national and international sources to ensure the continuation and success of the JPOI in their country/region.</p>
<p>Partner 2: Intergovernmental and international organisations</p>	<p>Outcome Challenge 2: The project intends to see intergovernmental and international organisations that are active promoters of the JPOI including SIDS as a sustainable development tool. They turn their effort towards strengthening mechanisms such as the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) and launch new processes to foster inter-agencies and multistakeholder dialogues at the highest political levels on these issues. They integrate this approach in their planning and programming and advocate the concept to other international donors and international freshwater, coast and ocean-related bodies, more particularly the World Water Forum and related institutions.</p>
<p>Partner 3: Global NGOs and Foundations</p>	<p>Outcome Challenge 3: The project intends to see global NGOs and Foundations that recognize the importance of, and are engaged in, the promotion of the JPOI main targets in partnership with other resource users at regional, national and local level. They have gained the trust of the other member of the partnership and the recognition of government officials so that they can contribute constructively to debates and decision-making processes. They are able to assist governmental officials and policymakers in planning and articulating a vision of the JPOI goals and activities that is relative to their national context and needs. They act as champions for the promotion of the JPOI effective vision in developing and in transition countries.</p>
<p>Partner 4: Private sector (maritime transport, fisheries and aquaculture, offshore industry)</p>	<p>Outcome Challenge 4: The project intends to see private sector actors who are active participants in the JPOI and no longer view their goals and sectoral practices in isolation from other resource users. They recognize that ecosystems and their resources have legitimate multiple resource users and negotiate costs and trade-offs with other, sometimes non-traditional, partners. They encourage economic development while employing sustainable sectoral practices.</p>
<p>Partner 5: Education and research institutions</p>	<p>Outcome Challenge 5: The project intends to see education and research institutions that are active participants in the JPOI, work in partnership and openly share data and tools to assist in decision-making, assessing trade-offs, understanding environmental impacts at the local level, and promoting public awareness. They contribute to putting the JPOI targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands on a practical level and are committed to the participatory process for finding local solutions to the coast and ocean sustainable development.</p>

QUESTIONS

With this background in mind, we kindly ask you to first reflect, in your own words, on the following **open-ended questions**:

- Do you recognize yourself in one of the five partner types and would you agree with the corresponding outcome challenge ? (any rephrasing is welcome)
- What have been the major accomplishments of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands in the period 2006-2008 ?
- What have been the major problems/challenges besetting the work of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands in the period 2006-2008 ?
- Was the general format for the UNEP/GEF project productive, both in terms of the range of participants and the subjects covered ?
- What suggestions would you have for future projects of this kind ?

In the following questionnaire, you are then invited to put a cross in the column of your choice and add any comment you think appropriate.

Rating system: 3 = Strong
 2 = Good
 1 = Fair
 0 = Poor
 NR = Not Relevant or Don't Know

PROJECT PERFORMANCE

Attainment of objectives and planned results

Effectiveness: ***Results / Purpose***
Extent to which the project is able to fulfill its purpose with consideration of main stakeholders' understanding of project function and dimensions.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	3	2	1	0	NR	
What is the project impact on raising awareness at high political levels in developing and in transition countries, SIDS, on major ocean-related issues ?						
Do you foresee any consecutive long-term impacts in line with your or/and any other partner outcome challenges : - Partner 1: - Partner 2: - Partner 3: - Partner 4: - Partner 5 :						

Relevance: **Objectives / Changes**

- Ability of the project to keep its key stakeholders satisfied
- Ability to be a “learning project” by innovating and creating new and more effective situations as a result of insight into the changing environment and new knowledge integration

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	3	2	1	0	NR	
Were the project’s outcomes consistent with the areas/operational strategies and wider portfolio of the GEF ?						
To what extent the project implementation mechanisms outline in the project document have been closely followed ?						
Was the role of the various committees established clear enough and their functioning good enough to enable effective and efficient implementation ?						
How well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable its implementation ?						
How would you rate the efficiency and adaptability of project management at the following levels: - policy decisions: Steering Group - day to day project management: Executing agency and Forum secretariat						

Efficiency: **Activities / Results (Outputs)**

A ratio that reflects a comparison of results (outputs) accomplished to the nature and costs of activities (inputs) incurred for accomplishing the objectives of the project.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	3	2	1	0	NR	
Was the project cost-effective ?						
Was the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing efficient in regard to project implementation ?						
Was the cost per component and activity made clear enough ?						
Has the leverage of additional resources been effective for further activities ?						
Did the project make effective use of available scientific and/or technical information ?						
In comparison with other similar projects you know, how would you rate this project efficiency ?						

Achievement of outputs and activities

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>NR</i>	
Generally speaking, do you think the project outputs have been produced both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness?						
How would you rate the achievement of the following project outputs : Component 1 - Global Conference and other meetings - Capacity building needs - Public awareness - Organizational enhancement Component 2 - Policy analyses on SIDS and post-Mauritius implementation - SIDS panels at Ocean Policies Conference - Capacity building workshop for SIDS Component 3 - Policy analyses on GPA and interlinkages to freshwater - Ocean Panels at 4th World Water Forum in Mexico Component 4 - Overall coordination of the project - Effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism - Effective project information and lessons learned dissemination - Enhanced replication of project outcomes through the GEF IW projects						
In your opinion, what are the best results that can be related to the GEF MSP contribution ?						
How would you rate the project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) design and plan application ?						
Were the project Steering Committee members involved in setting up and following up the M&E system ?						
Were the indicators appropriate and informed?						
Was the project baseline informed enough ?						
Was the project adaptive enough using its Monitoring and Evaluation system ?						

Preparation and readiness

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>NR</i>	
Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe ?						

Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed ?						
Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?						
Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation ?						
Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place ?						

Financial planning

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>NR</i>	
Was the initial budget plan and its budget lines actually implemented as such ?						
Was the co-financing initial plan achieved as such ?						
Was the financial information made available to the Steering Committee members ?						

UNEP supervision and backstopping

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>NR</i>	
Was the UNEP/DGEF supervision and administrative and financial support effective ?						
How would you rate the communication level between UNEP/DGEF and the project management ?						

PROJECT IMPACT

Because of the nature of the project, its impact should also be looked at following the incurred processes. The project strategy may be seen as founded on persuasion and building supportive networks where the project seeks to facilitate change whilst the ultimate responsibility rests with the partners composing the Global Forum.

Therefore you are invited to look at the following questions trying to consider both the above project strategy and your own partner's outcome challenge:

Country ownership / driveness

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	3	2	1	0	NR	
Do you think the project was effective enough in involving SIDS experts in the further development in EBM and ICM national strategies ?						
Idem for policy-makers in building up national strategies ?						
In your opinion, what are the countries most involved in the Global Forum on Oceans and the World Water Forum?						

Boundary partner participation / public awareness

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	3	2	1	0	NR	
Following the earlier definition of "partner", do you identify yourself in one of the outcome challenges as presented above ?						
Do you think the mechanism that has been put in place efficient enough for identification and engagement of new partners ? Please, identify strengths and weaknesses.						
How would you rate the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners during the course of implementation of the project ?						
How would you rate the degree and effectiveness of public awareness activities during the course of implementation of the project ?						
Do you think the setting up and running of the Working Groups have been efficient enough to contribute to the 2006-2016 strategic planning?						
If member of one of the Working Groups, how would you rate your involvement ?						

Sustainability and co-financing

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>NR</i>	
Generally speaking, how would you rate the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the project ending ?						
To what extent did the project succeed in securing the sustainability of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands ?						
Do you think financial resources are secured enough for letting the Global Forum running in the next few years ?						
To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support ?						
What is the risk that the level of partners ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained ?						
As one of the project partners, is it in your interest to see the project benefits continue to flow ?						
How would you rate the public awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project, i.e. the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands ?						
To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes and the dialogue for the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance ?						
Do you think that institutional, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures are essential for the project/global forum outcomes/benefits to be sustained ?						

Catalytic role (Replicability)

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>NR</i>	
Any example of replication and catalytic outcomes ?						
Did the project succeed in increasing the replicability of lessons learned in GEF LME projects through interactions with other major ocean programs and efforts in the Global Forum ?						

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME !

Annex 2 – List of questionnaire recipients and interviewees

Project Steering Committee members

Executing Agencies Representatives:

Biliana Cicin-Sain, Secretariat, ICO, Global Forum on Oceans
Miriam Balgos, Secretariat, ICO, Global Forum on Oceans
LaVerne Walker, Secretariat, Global Forum on Oceans
Julian Barbieri, IOC-UNESCO

Donor Representatives:

Ralph Cantral, Coastal and Ocean Resource Management, NOAA
Lori Ridgeway, Director General Policy, DFO Canada
Renée Sauvé, International Oceans Advisor, DFO Canada

GEF implementing agencies:

Takehiro Nakamura, UNEP/DGEF
Andrew Hudson, UNDP/GEF
David Freestone, Office of General Counsel, World Bank
Dann Sklarew, IW:LEARN
Janot Mendler, IW: LEARN
Cees van de Guchte, UNEP-GPA

Global Forum Steering Committee members

Partner 1: Government officials and policymakers (24 members)

- David Balton, Bureau of Oceans, US Department of State
- Margaret Davidson, Coastal Services Center, NOAA, USA
- Gerhard Kuska, Ocean and Coastal Policy, White House Council on Environmental Quality, USA
- Tom Laughlin, International Affairs Office, NOAA, USA
- Lori Ridgeway, International Coordination and Policy Analysis, DFO, Canada
- Camille Mageau, Marine Ecosystems Conservation Branch, DFO, Canada
- Antonio Diaz de Leon, Environmental, Regional Integration and Sectoral Policy, SEMARNAT, Mexico
- Phil Burgess, Department of the Environment and Water Resources, Australia
- Haiqing Li, State Oceanic Administration, China
- Gi-Jun Han, Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Republic of Korea
- Indroyono Soesilo, Agency for Marine and Fisheries Research, DMAF, Indonesia
- Nguyen Chu Hoi, Institute of Fisheries Economics and Planning, MARD, Vietnam
- Aldo Cosentino, Directorate for Nature Protection, Sea Protection, MEPT, Italy
- Mario Ruivo, Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education, Portugal
- Magnus Johannesson, Ministry for the Environment, Iceland
- Rejoice Mabudafhasi, Environmental Affairs and Tourism, South Africa
- Magnus Ngoile, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Kenya
- Ali Mohamed, Coastal and Marine Secretariat, New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), Kenya
- Ambassador Angus Friday, Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), PR of Grenada to the UN
- Ambassador Jagdish Koonjul, Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), Mauritius
- Ambassador Enele S. Sopoaga, Alliance of Small Island Developing States (AOSIS), Tuvalu
- John Low, Ministry of Marine Resources, Cook Islands
- Rolph Payet, President Office, Seychelles

Partner 2: Intergovernmental and international organisations (32 members)

- Salvatore Arico, Ecological Sciences, UNESCO
- Patricio A. Bernal, IOC-UNESCO (**Global Forum SC Co-Chair**)
- Julian Barbieri, IOC-UNESCO
- Stefano Belfiore, IOC-UNESCO
- Veerle Vandeweerd, Environment and Energy Group, UNDP (**Global Forum SC Co-Chair**)
- Chika Ukwe, International Waters, UNIDO
- Torkil J. Clausen, DHI Water Policy, Global Water Partnership
- Anjan Datta, GPA
- Ahmed Djoghlaif, Executive Secretary, Convention on Biological Diversity
- Al Duda, International Waters, GEF
- Andrew Hudson, International Waters, UNDP/GEF
- Vladimir Mamaev, UNDP/GEF
- Dann Sklarew, GEF, IW:LEARN
- Marea E. Hatziolos, Environment Department, The World Bank
- Indumathie Hewawasam, The World Bank
- Mary Power, Resource Mobilization Office, WMO
- Eduard Sarukhanian, World-Weather-Watch Applications, WMO
- Diane Quarless, Small Island Developing States Unit, UNDESA
- Anne Rogers, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA)
- David Johnson, OSPAR Convention
- Vaclav Mikulka, UN Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UNDOALOS)
- Annick de Marffy, UNDOALOS
- Satya Nandan, International Seabed Authority
- Eugenio Yunis, Sustainable Development of Tourism, World Tourism Organisation
- Franklin McDonald, UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme
- Grant Trebble, African Marine and Coastal Resource Over-Exploitation Prevention Strategy (AMCROPS), South Africa
- Chua Thia-Eng, PEMSEA, IMO/UNDP/GEF
- Tiago Pitta e Cunha, Cabinet of Fisheries and Maritime Commissioner, EC
- John Richardson, Maritime Policy Task Force, EC
- Cristelle Pratt, South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)
- Asterio Takesy, Secretariat, Pacific Regional Environment Programme
- Khulood Tubaihat, The Regional Organisation for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA)

Partner 3: Global NGOs and Foundations (23 members)

- Milton Asmus, Brazilian Agency for Coastal Management
- Awni Behnam, International Ocean Institute, Malta
- Charles A. Buchanan, Luso-American Development Foundation, Portugal
- Simon Cripps, Global Marine Programme, WWF
- Dawn Martin, Sea Web, USA
- Tony Ribbink, Sustainable Seas Trust, South Africa
- Julius Francis, WIOMSA, Tanzania
- Matthew Gianni, Deep Sea Conservation Coalition, Netherlands
- Lynne Hale, Marine Strategy, The Nature Conservancy
- Gerald Miles, Pacific Region, The Nature Conservancy
- Art Hanson, Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI)
- Dan Laffoley, World Commission on Protected Areas – Marine, IUCN
- Carl Lundin, Marine Programme, IUCN
- David VanderZwaag, Ocean Law and Governance Trust, IUCN
- Iouri Oliounine, International Ocean Institute, Malta
- Hiroshi Terashima, Institute for Ocean Policy, Ocean Policy Research Foundation, Japan
- Jens Ambsdorf, Lighthouse Foundation, Germany
- Charles Ehler, Consultant to UNESCO
- Serge Garcia, International Consultant

- Gunnar Kullenberg, International Consultant, Norway
- Sian Pullen, International Consultant, New Zealand
- Nirmal Jivan Shah, Nature, Seychelles
- Alan Simcock, International Consultant
- Chris Tompkins, International Consultant

Partner 4: Private sector (maritime transport, fisheries and aquaculture, offshore industry)

- Pietro Parravano, Institute of Fisheries Resources, World Fisheries Forum

Partner 5: Education and research institutions (15 members)

- Biliانا Cicin-Sain, Marine Policy, University of Delaware, USA (**Global Forum SC Co-Chair**)
- Jan Mees, Flanders Marine Institute, Belgium
- Guillermo Garcia Montero, National Aquarium, Havana, Cuba
- Marjo Vierros, Institute of Advanced Studies, United Nations University, Vancouver
- A.H. Zakri, Institute of Advanced Studies, United Nations University, Yokohama
- Richard Delaney, Center for Coastal Studies, Provincetown, MSS, USA
- Sylvia Earle, Deep Ocean Exploration and Research, National Geographic Society
- Vladimir Golitsyn, Moscow State University of International Relations
- Gregor Hodgson, Reef Check
- Kristian Teleki, International Coral Reef Action Network, Switzerland
- Victoria Radchenko, International Ocean Institute, Ukraine
- Evelia Rivera-Arriaga, Centro de Ecologia, Pesquerias y Oceanographia del Golfo de Mexico (EPOMEX), Mexico
- Nancy Targett, University of Delaware, College of Marine and Earth Studies
- Philippe Vallette, NAUSICAA and the World Ocean Network, France
- Manuel Cira, NAUSICAA and the World Ocean Network, France

Working Group members (not members of the Global Forum Steering Committee)

Partner 1 <i>Government Officials</i>	Partner 2 <i>International Org.</i>	Partner 3 <i>NGOs / Foundations</i>	Partner 4 <i>Private sector</i>	Partner 5 <i>Education/Research</i>
Tuiloma Neroni Slade Maria Candela-Castillo Jake Rice Steven Murawski Fatima Dia Toure	Yihang Jiang Jihyun Lee Nicole Glineur Ivica Trumbic Ellik Adler	Carl Bruch Margarita Astralaga Monica Verbeek Bill Eichbaum Denny Kelso	Patrick Anvrouin Thierry Desmaret Jim Greenwood Ampai Harakunarak Peter Neill	Clive Wilkinson Donald Robadue Mike Phillips Qinhua Fang Daniel Pauly

Annex 3 – Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

Title of Project:	Fostering a Global Dialogue on Oceans, Coasts, and SIDS, and on Freshwater-Coastal-Marine Interlinkages						
Project Number:	PMS: GF/3010-05-09		IMIS:GFL-2328-2732-4854				
Name of Executing Agency:	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO						
Project Duration:	From: 1 October 2005			To: 30 June 2008			
Reporting Period:	1 October 2005 –30 June 2008						
Source of Cofinance	Cash Contributions			In-kind Contributions			Comments
	Budget original	Budget latest revision	Received/ spent to date	Budget original	Budget latest revision	Received/ spent to date	Received to date
UNEP/GPA	60,000		60,000	110,000		110,000	Support Freshwater-Marine Task Force/activities
UNESCO/IOC	70,000		35,000	140,000		140,000	Professional and Admin Support staff
NOAA (CSC)	50,000		25,000	25,000		25,000	TOPS Conference (25K) and Working Groups
DFO Canada	41,125		37,000				Received in April 2005-SIDS Rapid assessment
ICO/University Delaware				150,000		150,000	Facilities and Secretariat Support
Portugal	65,000		65,000	65,000		65,000	Local costs for TOPS 2005 Conference
Nippon Foundation	135,000		135,000				Task Force on National Ocean Policies
World Ocean Network				50,000		50,000	
SOPAC				50,000		50,000	
The Nature Conservancy	80,000		80,000				SIDS – Mauritius International Meeting
IOCARIBE				5,000		5,000	Latin America Regional capacity assessment
NEPAD				5,000		5,000	Africa Regional capacity assessment
PEMSEA				5,000		5,000	East Asia Regional capacity assessment
EPOMEX,SEMARNAT,CCA				15,000		15,000	Mexico meeting – Workshop freshwater-coastal-marine interlinkages
Total	501,125		437,000	620,000		620,000	
<i>All amounts in US dollars</i>							
<i>Certified by Executing and Implementing partners</i>							

Leveraged Resources

Financial and in-kind support was provided by 28 international (including multi-lateral), government and non-government organizations for three activities carried out under the MSP: 1) TOPS 2005 The Ocean Policy Summit held in Lisbon in October 2005; the 3rd Global Oceans Conference held in UNESCO, Paris, in January 2006; and 3) strategic planning on the global oceans agenda and the 4th Global Oceans Conference held in Hanoi, in April 2008, in order to fully accomplish the project's objectives and to extend the reach of the project's impacts to a wider constituency. The MSP generated \$742,436 in cash support and an estimated \$288,500 in-kind support including conference facilities, staff time and travel for a total of \$1,030,936 beyond those committed to the project at the time of approval. Please see the attached list of leveraged resources per activity.

	<u>Cash (US\$)</u>	<u>In-kind (US\$) (all in-kind costs are estimated)</u>
Support for the TOPS 2005 the Ocean Policy Summit, October 2005		
1. Associação Industrial Portuguesa		7 000 In-kind support for TOPS 2005
2. Banco Espiritu Santo		7 000 In-kind support for TOPS 2005
3. Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian		7 000 In-kind support for TOPS 2005
4. Fundação Oriente		7 000 In-kind support for TOPS 2005
5. Luso-American Development Foundation (FLAD)	18 000	2 500 Hosting of meetings
7. Oceanário de Lisboa	7500,00	
8. Port Authority of Lisbon	12 500	1 000 Time
9. Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC)	25 000	
Support for the 3rd Global Oceans Conference, January 2006		
1. General Directorate for Nature Protection, Ministry for the Environment and Territory, Italy	12 000	
Support for the Strategic Planning on the Global Oceans Agenda and for the 4th Global Oceans Conference		
1. The Nippon Foundation, Japan	200 000	
2. Le Centre de Decouverte du Monde Marin, Nice, France	20 000	7 000 Time (Workshop arrangements)
3. Lighthouse Foundation	39 436,00	
4. Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC)		10 000 Time (Preparation of Working Group report)

5. Flemish Minister for Economy, Enterprise, Science, Innovation and Foreign Trade, Belgium	30 000	
6. International Ocean Institute		50 000 Travel
7. International Union for the Conservation of Nature		10 000 Pre-conference Meeting costs
8. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and National Parks Board, Singapore		5 000 Time (Working Group on High Seas)
9. Ministry of Land, Transportation and Maritime Affairs, Korea and Pusan National University	50 000	
10. Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia	50 000	5 000 Time (Working Group on Fisheries and
11. NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service	68 000	20 000 Time (Working Group on Fisheries and Aquaculture; Working Group on EBM/ICM
12. Ocean Policy Research Foundation, Japan	10 000	
13. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vietnam	125 000	50 000 Time (includes involvement of 30 staff members)
14. World Bank		Time and travel
15. World Ocean Network		35 000 Time and travel (Nice and Hanoi)
16. USAID (pre-conference workshop)	50 000	
17. Department of Fisheries, Canada	25 000	15 000 Time and travel
18. University of Delaware Gerard J. Mangone Center for Marine Policy		50 000 Facilities and staff support
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>742 436</u>	<u>288 500</u>
<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>		<u>1 030 936</u>

Annex 4 – Evaluation Terms of Reference

Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF project “Fostering a Global Dialogue on Oceans, Coasts, and SIDS, and on Freshwater-Coastal- Marine Interlinkages”

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in 2002 catalyzed the international community around the challenge of protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development through the endorsement of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) detailing goals, activities, targets and timetables up to 2015, including for oceans, coastal areas, fisheries, small island developing States (SIDS), and freshwater. The global process to promote and sustain the achievement of these objectives, targets and timetables will require significant and continuing efforts on the part of the international community: the exploitation and degradation of coastal, marine, and island resources is serious and not coming to a halt, to the point that it may become irreversible in places. Yet, while the WSSD provided a key occasion to create a momentum around these issues, an overall assessment of the global progress will only be carried out by the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) in 2014-2015. Moreover, interlinkages between freshwater management and coastal and marine management are not sufficiently addressed by existing fora and mechanisms. Efforts were required both to strengthen existing mechanisms (such as the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA)) and to launch new processes to foster a multistakeholder dialogue at the highest political levels on these issues.

The **goal** of the project was to foster a global South-to-South and South-to-North dialogue, through the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, on the implementation of the activities aimed towards the achievement of JPOI targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands, with a special focus on SIDS and the interlinkages between freshwater and the coastal and marine environment.

This GEF Project aimed to assist the developing countries and countries with economies in transition to put the Oceans, Coasts, and Islands issues on the high political agenda of their governmental policies and strategies. By involving developing country and countries with economies in transition officials and GEF Large Marine Ecosystems (LME) projects in this global dialogue, the project helped build their capacity in addressing those issues. The project aimed to foster learning of experiences and lessons drawn from the GEF projects on LMEs, and integrated coastal management conducted in the past 12 years in 118 developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The project attempted to assist the countries in the development of policy analyses on critical issues, especially cross-sectoral issues not typically addressed by other entities. The project assisted the developing countries and countries with economies in transition achieve the JPOI targets for oceans, coasts, and islands as well as promote the adoption of ecosystem-based approaches including large marine ecosystems.

The Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, organized informally in 2001 and formalized at the WSSD, serves as a multi-stakeholder stock-taking forum for cross-sectoral discussion, policy analyses, and mobilization of knowledge and other resources to promote the implementation of international agreements related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS. The Global Forum brings together leading ocean experts from governments, intergovernmental and international organizations (including all the relevant UN agencies), nongovernmental organizations, private sector, academic and scientific institutions. The original focus of the Global Forum was multifold and included the following components:

- assessment of progress achieved (or lack thereof) of the protection and management of oceans, coasts, and SIDS since the 1992 Earth Summit;
- participation and influence of the oceans agenda at the WSSD;
- mobilization of resources to implement the oceans, coasts, and SIDS targets agreed to at the WSSD;
- preparations for the 10 year review of progress achieved in SIDS since the 1994 Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States organized at the International Meeting in Mauritius in January 2005.

Since 2003, there was a growing necessity to address the gaps and needs identified by the Global Forum. This was made even more urgent in January 2005 with the outcomes of the Mauritius SIDS review meeting. The project had the intention to address the following needs:

- *The need for cross-sectoral dialogue on freshwater-coastal-marine interlinkages:* There is a need for addressing oceans, coasts, and islands issues in a cross-sectoral and comprehensive manner, as emphasized in the 1992 Earth Summit which underscored that given the interrelationship among uses and processes in the coast and ocean, ocean and coastal governance must be “integrated in content and precautionary and anticipatory in ambit.”

Existing fora related to oceans, however, are largely sectoral--that is, they tend to treat different aspects of sustainable development of the oceans separately. For example, there are different fora on fisheries issues, marine science issues, marine navigation and safety issues, and marine pollution control issues, among others. This sectoral approach is mirrored in the United Nations agencies which address ocean issues, whereby there is no United Nations agency which is tasked with addressing oceans, coasts, and islands issues (including connections to freshwater) in a comprehensive way. Among the nongovernmental organizations, too, there is no global organization devoted to the sustainable development of oceans, coasts, and islands (while there are many large environmental groups with substantial ocean programs, they tend to emphasize mainly the environmental aspects of the sustainable development equation).

There was also a need to apply the experiences learned through GEF projects to the global dialogue on freshwater-coastal-marine interlinkages. The GEF has typically used ecosystem-based approaches to improve management of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) and these experiences should be shared with the global water community.

- *The need for dialogue among governments, NGOs, international organizations, and the private sector:* There was also a need for a forum where participants from nongovernmental organizations, governments, especially from developing countries, intergovernmental and international organizations, and the private sector can interact together, share information, draw lessons from existing practice, consider emerging issues, and engage in a fruitful dialogue.

The project aimed to bring the GEF LME experience in these dialogues, particularly the lessons learned in the application of the GEF processes known as the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Programme.

The need for oceans awareness at the highest political levels, especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition: Notwithstanding the economic, social, and environmental importance of oceans, coasts, and islands, because of their complexity and diversity, sometimes these issues are not adequately addressed in developing countries and in countries with economies in transition, and there are gaps in addressing these issues in international fora. A case in point is the World Summit on Sustainable Development which initially, during the Summit preparatory process, did not address oceans, coasts, and SIDS issues. Enhanced awareness of ocean issues is needed to help insure the appropriate inclusion of oceans, coasts, and islands concerns in the policies and

strategies of developing countries and in countries with economies in transition, as well as in important global and regional discussions on sustainable development.

The need for linking oceans and coasts to freshwater basins: Because of interrelated natural processes, what happens upstream affects the downstream environment and vice versa. In order to preserve overall system integrity, it is imperative to link management measures regarding oceans and coasts to the improved management of river basins and watersheds. And yet, discussions of freshwater management and oceans management typically take place separately in different fora. The GEF, through the GPA, has provided assistance to countries in improving management of river basins draining to coasts in order to improve water flow regimes and reduce pollution loads. There is a need to replicate the models initiated by GEF- assisted projects such as the Danube/Black Sea Basin Strategic Partnership with the World Bank and the Mekong River Basin Water Utilization Project, which have started to produce results from on-the-ground pollution reduction mechanisms and adoption of policies and national and regional institutional reforms.

Project Objectives:

In response to these needs, the project aimed to assist the developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition to:

1. Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues, policy analyses, and public outreach on oceans, coasts and SIDS issues;
2. Promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA);
3. Establish multi-sectoral dialogues, involving experts from developing countries, countries with economies in transition, and GEF LME projects in the policy analyses, public outreach and cross-learning between LME experiences and coastal and ocean management experiences;
4. Raise the awareness of and promote national ocean policies and ecosystem-based approaches to large marine ecosystems as a vehicle for achieving sustainable development of SIDS;
5. Improve interlinkages between freshwater, coastal and oceans issues by developing a relationship between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum and associated institutions.

The project aimed to promote cross-learning among existing national and regional activities related to ocean and coastal management and share significant experience in ecosystem-based management of large marine ecosystems gained through the GEF LME projects to achieve maximum synergy among related efforts.

Relevance to GEF Programmes

As stated above, the **goal** of the project is to foster a global South-South and South-to-North dialogue, through the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, on the implementation of the activities aimed towards the achievement of JPOI targets and timetables related to oceans, coastal areas and islands, with a special focus on SIDS and the interlinkages between freshwater and the coastal and marine environment. This GEF Project will assist the developing countries and countries with economies in transition to put the Oceans, Coasts, and Islands issues on the high political agenda of their governmental policies and strategies. The project proposal is consistent with the Operational Program #10: Global Technical Support component, "Targeted technical demonstration and capacity building projects can help build awareness in countries that are participating in International Waters projects and serve as a means to encourage best practices, develop tools for finding solutions, and formulate policies for innovative institutional approaches." The project proposal is also consistent with new GEF IW Strategic Priority 2: Expand global coverage of foundational capacity building addressing the two key program gaps with a focus on cross-cutting aspects of African transboundary waters and support for targeted learning. South-to-South "structured learning" contributes significantly to the success of GEF's foundational/capacity building work in IW."

Executing Arrangements

UNEP is the implementing agency for this project. The executing agency is the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, UNESCO (IOC), which received the total GEF financing and contracted the International Coast and Ocean Organization (ICO), the Secretariat of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, for the implementation of specific activities under all four project components (ICO is an international NGO accredited to UN ECOSOC).

Other collaborating executing agencies which carried out specific project activities included: NEPAD/COSMAR (New Partnership for Africa's Development, Coastal and Marine Coordination Unit); IOCARIBE (IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions); PEMSEA (Partnerships for Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia); SOPAC (South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission); EPOMEX (Centro de Ecología, Pesquerías y Oceanografía del Golfo de México); SEMARNAT (Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y de Recursos Naturales); CCA (Consejo Consultivo del Agua); and the World Ocean Network.

The project was guided by a Steering Committee (SC) that comprised members from the GEF implementing agencies, project executing agencies, and donor representatives. The SC provided policy guidance; approved work plans, budget, and audit reports; and provided general oversight of implementation. The Steering Committee also reviewed and approved project monitoring and evaluation reports.

Project Activities anticipated at the time of the project inception

Component 1 – Foster cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogues and raise awareness of oceans, coasts and SIDS to promote the attainment of the commitments agreed upon at the WSSD and in other relevant fora.

- *Activity 1a—Convening the Third Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, including a Ministerial segment, in January 2006:*
- *Activity 1b— Assessing capacity building needs at the regional level for the development and implementation of ecosystem-based national ocean policies among developing countries and countries with economies in transition.*
- *Activity 1c—Increasing public awareness of the global agenda on oceans, coasts, and island.*
- *Activity 1d—Organizational enhancement and strategic planning for the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands:*

Component 2 – Increase awareness within SIDS nations in the development and implementation of national and regional oceans policies and the implementation of the ecosystem approach through LME projects and SIDS projects, and carry out associated capacity building efforts.

Activities in Component 2

- *Involve SIDS experts and policy makers in the further development of ecosystem-based national and regional ocean policies through participation in policy analyses, workshop/conferences, and capacity building efforts.*
- *Build the capacity of SIDS experts and policy makers through participation in scientific meetings and in analytical activities on ocean policies, ecosystem-based management, and large marine ecosystems as a means to advance the Barbados Programme of Action and the outcomes of the Mauritius International Meeting.*

Component 3 – Foster improved understanding of the interlinkages between freshwater and coastal and oceans issues, support the 2006 Intergovernmental Review of the GPA, and develop formal collaboration between the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum.

- *Contributing to preparations for the GPA IGR-2, particularly in relation to fostering freshwater-coastal/marine interlinkages through integrated coastal area and river basin management. Preparation of a policy analysis on freshwater/coastal/marine interlinkages, including GPA implementation, and holding of an associated workshop in Mexico.*
- *Organizing oceans panels at the 4th World Water Forum in Mexico in 2006 for the formulation of a cooperation agenda, and concluding a Memorandum of Understanding between the Global Forum and the World Water Forum.*

Budget

The total project cost was US\$ 2,115,725 with contributions from GEF US\$994,600 and US\$ 1,121,125 from co-financing. The details are in annex 6:

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:

1. Did the project help to increase awareness at a high political level in the developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition on major issues related to oceans, especially the ecological and socioeconomic inter-linkages between the management of freshwater and coastal, marine, and island areas?
2. Did the project promote the attainment of intergovernmental commitments and agreements, including the JPOI and the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA)
3. Did the project increase the capacity of developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition to:
 - a. implement the JPOI targets for oceans, coasts, and islands and other relevant intergovernmental agreements, such as the GPA?
 - b. adopt the use of ecosystem-based approaches including large marine ecosystems?
 - c. implement the oceans and coasts aspects of the Barbados Programme of Action and the outcomes of the Mauritius International Meeting
4. To what extent did the project succeed in securing the sustainability of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands?
5. To what extent did the project succeed in increasing the replicability of lessons learned in GEF LME projects through interactions with other major ocean programs and efforts in the Global Forum?

2. Methods

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/EOU and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be delivered to UNEP EOU and then circulated to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary or suggested revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
 - (b) Notes from the Steering Group meetings.
 - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
 - (d) Relevant material published on the project web-site.
2. Interviews with project management and technical support including the staff from the UNESCO/IOC, the secretariat from the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands. Selected members of the Forum steering committee members;
3. Interviews and Telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including the participants in the project activities and international bodies, such as FAO, UNDP and UNEP GPA. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.
4. Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project task manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with International Waters-related activities as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
5. Participate in project steering committee to have interviews with participants – 22 June 2008.

Key Evaluation principles.

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "*what happened?*" and "*what would have happened anyway?*". These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to **attribute** such outcomes and impacts **to the actions of the project**.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

3. Project Ratings

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from ‘highly unsatisfactory’ to ‘highly satisfactory’. In particular the evaluation shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below:¹

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results:

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the “achievement indicators”. The analysis of outcomes achieved should include, *inter alia*, an assessment of the extent to which the project has directly or indirectly assisted policy- and decision-makers to apply information supplied by. In particular:
 - Evaluate the immediate impact of the project on raising awareness at a high political levels in the developing countries, SIDS, and countries with economies in transition on major issues related to oceans
 - As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place upon completion of the project and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time.
- *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and the wider portfolio of the GEF?
- *Efficiency*: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources. Did the project build on earlier initiatives, did it make effective use of available scientific and / or technical information. Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

B. Sustainability:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. In particular the evaluation should determine to what extent did the project succeed in securing the sustainability of the Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands?

Five aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, environmental (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources*. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)? To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support?

¹ However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

- *Socio-political:* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example; construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project; or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures; or a vector control intervention may be made less effective by changes in climate and consequent alterations to the incidence and distribution of malarial mosquitoes.

C. Achievement of outputs and activities:

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of approaches used to build the capacity of SIDS experts and policy makers through participation in scientific meetings and in analytical activities on ocean policies, ecosystem-based management, and large marine ecosystems as a means to advance the Barbados Programme of Action and the outcomes of the Mauritius International Meeting
- Assess to what extent the policy analyses produced on freshwater/coastal/marine inter-linkages, including GPA implementation have the weight of scientific authority / credibility necessary to assist the developing countries to implement JPOI targets.

D. Catalytic Role

Replication and catalysis. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Specifically: Did the project succeed in increasing the replicability of lessons learned in GEF LME projects through interactions with other major ocean programs and efforts in the Global Forum? If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

E. Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems.

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for 'project design of M&E' and 'the application of the Project M&E plan' (see minimum requirements 1&2 in Annex 4). GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project

managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project.

M&E during project implementation

- *M&E design.* Projects should have sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators (see Annex 4) and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- *M&E plan implementation.* A Terminal Evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period (perhaps through use of a logframe or similar); annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; that the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and that projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities.
- *Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.* The terminal evaluation should determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

F. Preparation and Readiness

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

G. Country ownership / drivenness:

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was effective in involving SIDS experts and policy makers in the further development of ecosystem-based national and regional ocean policies through participation in policy analyses, workshop/conferences, and capacity building efforts.
- Assess the level of country commitment to Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and the World Water Forum.

H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF- financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.

- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

I. Financial Planning

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNON/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project (table attached in Annex 1 Co-financing and leveraged resources).

J. Implementation approach:

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management by the IOC/UNESCO and the Forum secretariat.

K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping

- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table*. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory

MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

4. Evaluation report format and review procedures

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 1 of this TOR. The ratings will be presented in the format of a table ***with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.***

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities; The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, requires that a TE report will provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology.
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all eleven evaluation aspects (A – K above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see Annex 1);
- vi) **Lessons (to be) learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:
 - Briefly describe the context from which they are derived
 - State or imply some prescriptive action;
 - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (perhaps two or three) actionable recommendations.

Prior to each recommendation, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available
2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

viii) **Annexes** may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:

1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference,
2. A list of interviewees, and evaluation timeline
3. A list of documents reviewed / consulted
4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity
5. The expertise of the evaluation team. (brief CV).

TE reports will also include any response / comments from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP EOU.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at www.unep.org/eou

Review of the Draft Evaluation Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations and the preparation of a draft management response to them. UNEP EOU collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluator(s) for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

5. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent to:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief,
UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: (254-20) 7624181
Fax: (254-20) 7623158
Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

UNEP EOU will then provide copies to:

Maryam Niamir-Fuller
Director
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: + 254-20-7624686

Fax: + 254-20-623158/4042
Email: maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org

Takehiro Nakamura
UNEP/GEF International Waters SPO
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)
PO Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 20 7625077
Fax: 254 20 7624041/2
Email: takehiro.nakamura@unep.org

The final evaluation report will be published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit's web-site www.unep.org/eou and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

6. Resources and schedule of the evaluation

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on 22 June 2008 and end on 5 September 2008 (22 days) spread over 12 weeks (3 days of travel to New York). The evaluator will submit a draft report on 14 August 2008 to UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by 30 August 2008 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than 5 September 2008.

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with EOU and UNEP/GEF. If possible he will travel to New York to attend a steering Committee meeting on 22 June 2008 to meet with representatives of the project executing agencies and the intended users of project's outputs.

In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the EOU. The evaluator should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project in a paid capacity. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international expert in coastal zone management, ocean laws and capacity building for coastal and ocean management, marine resources management. The consultant should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience in marine and coastal issues; (ii) experience with management and implementation of a project related to fostering policy dialogues; (iii) experience with project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Knowledge of Indonesian, Chinese and / or Russian is an advantage. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

7. Schedule Of Payment

The consultant shall select one of the following two contract options:

Lump-Sum Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service

Agreement (SSA) of the evaluator and **is inclusive** of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

Fee-only Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is **NOT** inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

When submitting the Travel Claim upon completion of travel, kindly note some of the following points: that UNON's primary operating currency is the US Dollar and reimbursements are made at the USD equivalent at the ruling UN exchange rate and not necessarily the currency of expenditure. If the consultant wishes to be paid in any other currency other than USD the consultant should indicate on the Travel Claim and special arrangements can be made with UNON's bank. The UN has standard rules for reimbursement of travel expenses and UNON enforces compliance on behalf of UNEP. Taxis to and from Hotel to Airport/Train/Bus station are covered by terminal allowances and the maximum reimburseable is USD 38.00. Taxis from Hotel to meeting venues