Mid-Term Evaluation Report

GEF IW: LEARN/CTI

Portfolio Learning in International Waters with a Focus on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and Regional Asia-Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes

United Nations Development Programme
Asian Development Bank
Global Environment Facility

Countries: Global
                             Indonesia
                             Malaysia
                             Papua New Guinea
                             Philippines
                             Solomon Islands
                             Timor Leste

Project Size: Full-Sized
PIMS: 4164
Atlas Award: 00056969
Atlas Project: 00070147
GEF/Implementing Agency: UNDP
Project Duration:

Report prepared by:

Mark Johnstad   Dr. Madeline Baguio-Quiamco
546 Meadowlark   Asian Institute of Journalism & Communication
Bozeman, MT 59718 USA   Annapolis Wilshire Plaza
                                       11 Annapolis St., San Juan City
                                       Metro Manila, PHIL

Email: mjohnstad@igc.org   Email: madzbaguio@yahoo.com

Final

Table of Contents

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BTOR	Back to the Office Report
CI	Conservation International
CoastPLAN	Coastal Assessment Tool and Planning Software
COP	communities of practice
CMR	CSIRO Division of Marine Research (Australia)
CMWG	Coordination Mechanisms Working Group
CT6	Six countries of the Coral Triangle (viz., Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste)
CRM	coastal resources management
CT	Coral Triangle
CTI	Coral Triangle Initiative
CTI-CLAN	CTI-Climate Learning Adaptation Network
CTI MEDS	CTI Map Enhanced Decision Support
CTSP	Coral Triangle Support Partnership
CZAP	Coastal Zone Asia Pacific
DA	Department of Agriculture (Philippines)
DE	Data Encoder
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation (Papua New Guinea)
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources (Philippines)
DMF	design and monitoring framework
DP	development partner
DSS	decision support system
EAFM	ecosystem approach to fisheries management
EEPSEA	Economics and Environment Program for Southeast Asia
EEPES/TL	Environmental Economics and Payment for Ecosystem Services / Team Leader
E-FACT	Economics of Fisheries and Aquaculture in the CTI
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FGDs	Focused Group Discussions
FISH-BE	Fisheries Information for Sustainable Harvests – BioEconomic
FISHDA	Fishing Industries' Support in Handling Decisions Application
FPE	Foundation for the Philippine Environment
FRWG	Financial Resources Working Group
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOF	Global Ocean Forum
ICE CREAM	Integrated Coastal Enhancement: Coastal Research Evaluation and Adaptive Management
ICRS	International Coral Reef Symposium
IMCC	International Marine Conservation Congress
IPR	intellectual property rights
IT	information technology
ITS	Information Technology Specialist
IW:LEARN	International Waters Learning Exchange Network
JRE	Junior Resource Economist
KI	Knowledge Integrator
KM	knowledge management
KMCS	KM and Communication Specialist
KMIS	knowledge management information system
LGU	local government unit
LIPI	*LembagaIlmuPengetahuan Indonesia (*Research Center for Oceanography of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences)
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MECDM	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management, and Meteorology
MEWG	Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group
MMAF	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries

MPA	marine protected area
MSS	Marine Science Specialist
MTR	midterm report
MTDP	medium term development plan
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
NAR	needs assessment report
NCC	National Coordinating Committee
NCEAS	National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis
NGO	nongovernment organization
NOAA	*National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration*
NPOA	National Plan of Action
NSAC	National Science Advisory Committee
OIST	*Office of Information Systems and Technology*
PES	payment for ecosystem services
PFMS	project file management system
PI	Program Integrator
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PO	people's organization
POA	plan of action
PRIMEX	Pacific Rim Innovation and Management Exponents, Inc.
PSVT	Project Scoping, Visioning, and Teambuilding
RAFE	Research Assistant for Fisheries and Aquaculture Economics
R-Sec	Regional Secretariat
RPOA	Regional Plan of Action
QPR1	First Quarterly Progress Report
QPR2	Second Quarterly Progress Report
QPR3	Third Quarterly Progress Report
RETA	RegionalTechnical Assistance
RPOA	regional plan of action
RSAC	Regional Science Advisory Committee
SAC	Science Advisory Committee
SCTR	State of the Coral Triangle Report
SERD	Southeast Asia Regional Department
SF	sustainable financing
SFS	Sustainable Financing Specialist
SMART	specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely
SOM	Senior Official's Meeting
sq km	square kilometer
SSME	Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion
TA	technical assistance
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TOR	terms of reference
TL	team leader
TWG	technical working group
UN	United Nations
UNTL	National University of East Timor
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UP-MSI	University of the Philippines Marine Science Institute
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VA	Vulnerability Assessment
VA-TURF	VA Towards Understanding Resilient Fisheries
WWF	World Wildlife Fund
WW/DS	Web Writer/Documentation Specialist

Acknowledgement

This is a large and complex project. Associated parties are spread across the globe. Completing this evaluation would not have been possible without their diligent provision of solicited information. The evaluation team would like to recognize and thank these many stakeholders for the efficient and professional organizational support they provided during this evaluation. Their impressive efforts reflect the skilled approach taken towards overall project implementation. Hopefully, this evaluation will contribute to the project's further achievements and all parties will accept the candid observations with the same collegial spirit with which they are presented.

Part 1: Executive summary

1.1   Brief description of project

The project document states:

"A project to foster structured learning, information sharing, collaboration and replication across GEF's International Waters portfolio through the IW:LEARN network, with a particular focus on the Asia Pacific Coral Triangle Initiative, involving the Governments of Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste. The project incorporates a global component aimed at advancing the oceans, coasts and small island developing states targets of the 2002 Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, and at addressing emerging challenges such as climate change impacts and improved governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction. The project will contribute to the forthcoming World Ocean Conference to be held in Manado, Indonesia in May 2009, the GEF Fifth Biennial International Waters Conference to be held in Cairns, Australia in October 2009, and the Fifth Global Oceans Conference, to be held in Paris, France, April 2010."

"This project is nested within the context of IW:LEARN. According to the Project Document, the objective of IW:LEARN is "To stimulate and facilitate exchange of experience and lessons learned among the global portfolio of more than 60 international waters (IW) projects, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) initiated the International Waters: Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) in 1998. Over the past decade IW:LEARN has been helping to improve the performance of GEF's portfolio of IW projects through experience sharing, portfolio learning, and knowledge management (KM) and aims to build on this through a greater focus on scientific understanding of coastal and marine systems and their dependence on improved management of adjoining terrestrial areas."

There are four project components each with a distinct target outcome. UNDP and UNOPS are primarily responsible for implementing Outcomes 1, 2, and 4. ADB is primarily responsible for implementing Outcome 3.

Component One:	*Advancing the Global Agenda on Oceans, Coasts and Small Island Developing States*
➢ Outcome:	To foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals and the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS, and in response to new ocean issues.
➢ Summary:	Component One broadly tackles global governance and awareness issues in an effort to improve adaptive management of marine, coastal and freshwater systems. This is to be achieved through learning conferences, policy/dialogue recommendations, and public outreach. A majority of investment focused upon implementation of the Global Oceans Conference of 2010.
Component Two:	*GEF international Waters Portfolio Learning*
➢ Outcome:	Improved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems. Expected learning outcomes include assessable increased GEF IW project capacity at 3 levels: (i) individual project stakeholders; (ii) organizations; and (iii) governments, fostering enabling

environments for transboundary cooperation to deepen and accelerate EBM and policy reform processes.

➢ Summary: Component Two also works to foster adaptive learning and improved responses on a global scale.   This is to be achieved through support to a major international conference (IWC5) and setting in place improved knowledge management instruments such as website development and expansion, learning exchanges and a global tracking tool.

Component Three: *Coral Triangle Initiative*

➢ Outcome: Improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action through inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes.

➢ Summary: Component Three takes on strategic planning and management issues on a regional basis, working to strengthen policy dialogue and coordination among the six core Coral Triangle countries. This includes facilitating knowledge exchange and dialogue among national governments and regional entities.

Component Four: *Project Management*

➢ Outcome: Improved coordination and integration between the global oceans and coastal agenda, the GEF international waters portfolio, and CTI.

➢ Summary: Component Four is concerned with matters of project management, including monitoring and evaluation. This component is to serve a very important operational role to ensure that the work of all components is synergistic.

1.2   Context and purpose of the evaluation

The purposes of this mid-term evaluation are to:

- Monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- Provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- Promote accountability for resource use; and
- Document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

This mid-term evaluation follows the specific guidance of UNDP/GEF by:

- Identifying potential project design problems,
- Assessing progress towards the achievement of objectives,
- Identifying and documenting lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and,
- Making recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project.

The evaluation serves as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The evaluation provides an

opportunity for project managers to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The mid-term evaluation took place during month months thirty-three to thirty-four (33 – 34) of the planned forty-eight (48) month project.

1.3   Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

1.3.1   Main Conclusions

The overall rating of this project is "Satisfactory ".

This is a well-designed and implemented project. The project is on-track to deliver most outputs. The cumulative impact of implemented activities represents substantial progress towards the desired outcomes and project objective.

Although several planned for activities have not and will not be undertaken, strategic alternatives were identified and are being implemented. Several of the project's activities hinged upon the 2009 World Ocean Conference. This event occurred prior to project commencement. Other activities such as Outputs 1.4 and sub-Output 2.1.1 related to the "Ocean Leadership Training for High-Level Decision Makers" were shifted to allow the project to support opportunities related to the upcoming Rio+20 meetings. The project has faced challenges with activities related to Output 2.3 intended to design an improved tracking system for GEF IW projects have faced challenges, but this was largely beyond the project's ability to influence. In spite of these issues, the project appears to be delivering critical elements and is on-course to achieving desired outcomes.

This project is relatively small in terms of GEF investment, but has the potential for significant global impact and reach. The project is supported by a diverse group of professionals spread across numerous institutions and located in three distinct global regions (North America, Europe, and Asia). By all accounts, they have provided excellent technical, co-financing, and strategic consultation. Project activities have mobilized substantial co-financing and support from a host of organizations. Approximately one-third of the total GEF project budget was used to support three international conferences and related pre/post activities: 2009 World Ocean Conference, 2010 Global Oceans Conference and 2009 IWC5. These activities and other project initiatives have benefited from the engagement of hundreds of stakeholders representing international, national, regional, and project level decision-makers and practitioners.

Component One (Advancing the Global Agenda on Oceans, Coasts and Small Island Developing States) represents a GEF investment of over US$ 900,000. The GOF is almost exclusively responsible for implementing this component. GOF has provided excellent skills and energy to this initiative. They have facilitated substantial international awareness and discussion regarding ocean and coastal zone conservation through a wide variety of forums. They have also delivered professional level materials, including major policy briefs. They have helped to raise momentum through innovative approaches such as the organization of "Oceans Day" events and consultative processes.

Component Two (GEF International Waters Portfolio Learning) represents a GEF investment of approximately US$ 400,000 and is supported almost exclusively by IW:LEARN and associated partners. Although most effort was focused upon the IWC5, IW:LEARN did an excellent job of using resources cost-effectively to leverage substantially wider impact. Through the project, they have organized project-to-project learning exchanges and improved the knowledge management services of the IW:LEARN network and CTI. The use of electronic media by all implementation partners is setting new standards. This is particularly the case with IW:LEARN efforts.

Component Three (Regional Cooperation on Knowledge Management, Policy and Institutional Support to the Coral Triangle Initiative) represents a US$ 2.467 million initiative financed separately by GEF (US$ 1.2 million), ADB (US$ 500k) and AusAid (US$ 168,000). The six coral triangle governments and various regional initiatives (e.g., the US Coral Triangle Support Program) provide additional co-financing support. Despite a late start, small original funding, and the difficulty of implementing several activities over a large archipelagic area among six countries with disparate information and communication capacities, the project was able to mobilize and obtain the commitment of Coral Triangle governments for a system of knowledge exchange and dialogue, design and produce knowledge products with stakeholder participation, and establish learning systems in about 15 months of operation.

UNDP offices in Bangkok with support from a part-time project manager and UNOPS are responsible for Component Four (Project Coordination and Management). This represents an investment of GEF funds of approximately US$ 200,000. These organizations and individual are providing professional levels of project management service.

The project benefits from effective partnerships, solid project management, and a strong level of commitment on the part of project implementers. The project is reaching hundreds of intended stakeholders. Many of these are high-level decision makers and/or responsible for implementing major GEF IW programs. The project is catalyzing partnerships and awareness of global ocean and coastal area issues amongst these stakeholders. An example of positive movement includes approximately 54% of all GEF IW projects now syndicating content to IW:LEARN. Nearly 100% of GEF IW projects now referencing other GEF projects in their Requests for CEO Endorsement. The CTI efforts are effectively creating a participatory structure for strengthening regional policy dialogue from the organizational to the country and regional level. The research efforts are generating knowledge on the less understood economies of coastal and marine resource management and developing effective knowledge management systems.

Components 1, 2, and 4 are "front-loaded". Most budget allocations and activities are already nearing completion prior to the mid-term. As a result, there is little latitude remaining to make substantial recommendations and/or course changes. The project's effectiveness to date may have been improved with a few minor adjustments. Hopefully, lessons from activities to date will enhance the effectiveness of similar projects in the future. Two key lessons are:

- All four components essentially operate as loosely connected, but largely independent, projects. The project is proceeding along three separate operational tracks. Agencies responsible for implementing these components certainly coordinate their efforts and some synergy occurs. However, the project did not set in place tools such as an integration plan and/or formal steering committee to integrate the components more closely, strategically identify and capitalize upon opportunities, and maximize potential synergy.

- The project would have benefitted from indicators that provide more measurement of impact, particularly in terms of achieving the project objective and outcomes related to improving the governance and management of ocean and coastal areas. The effectiveness of the project would likely have been enhanced had it, from the beginning, identified even broad policy and governance objectives and designed indicators to measure project success at reaching the intended objective and related outcomes.

Work under Component Three commenced after the remaining components. This third component will likely require an extension in order to achieve the desired outcome/outputs.

In spite of minor challenges, the project is providing valuable global contributions to address ocean and coastal area conservation, including the improvement of learning, policy, and cooperation.   Progress is definitely being made towards identified outcomes.

1.3.2   List of Lessons Learned

A full description may be found in Part 6.

1. Investing in high-caliber international expertise can be cost-effective.

2. Investing in multi-layered programs with international perspective can be effective.

3. Complex initiatives with multiple activity tracks may benefit from project design documents that integrate and align components to maximize synergy.

4. Projects designed to catalyze governance and management improvements may benefit from target improvements defined at project inception and reflected in results frameworks.

5. Global projects benefit from the support of a formal Project Steering Committee.

6. Projects generally benefit from completing a detailed work plan at project inception.

7. Projects benefit from actively involving the project designer/drafter in project inception and implementation.

1.3.3   List of Recommendations

A full description may be found in Part 7.

1. Assess project budget and allocations prior to project close

2. Summarize best and most urgent governance and management approaches

3. Create an action plan for operationalizing Rio+20 recommendations

4. Generate comparable indicators for GEF IW projects

5. Mobilize funding to build upon commenced global programming

6. Provide full-time funding for IW:LEARN

7. Provide an extension for Component 3

8. Install permanent Regional CTI Secretariat

9. Sustain successful CMR management practices

10. Focus final evaluation efforts on Component 3

1.4   Table summarizing main ratings received

Explanation of Ratings	
Highly Satisfactory	HS
Satisfactory	S
Moderately Satisfactory	MS
Moderately Unsatisfactory	MU
Unsatisfactory	U
Highly Unsatisfactory	HU

Ratings		
Category	**Rating**	**Comments**
Conceptualization/Design	S	*Overall-Project* This is a well-designed project. Although observed issues include a failure to specify a formal project steering committee, to generate detailed component integration strategy, and indicators that provide solid measurements of project impact rather than progress. However, none of these design issues are critical and should not have a significant impact upon achievement of the project objective/outcomes.
	S	*ADB/Component 3* The approach and methods used in Component 3 worked effectively with the CT6 stakeholders that were diverse in terms of technical knowledge, communication capacity and technology savvy. Project activities enhanced capacity KM and communication, created science-based knowledge products, and built online and face-to-face networks both at the organizational and individual levels largely through the commitment and support of CT6 governments and development partners
Stakeholder participation in the design	S	*Overall-Project* The participation of major stakeholders in the design of the project was well coordinated and adequate.
	S	*ADB/Component 3* It is worth noting the participatory orientation of the project that enabled the implementers to elicit and act on stakeholder inputs. The regional needs assessment and inception workshops and tripartite meeting at the regional level facilitated revisions to the plan that further sharpened its focus or broadened its scope, while the national consultations adapted the activities to the unique conditions of each country.
Implementation Approach	S	*Overall-Project*

		Some project activities were not and will not be implemented as planned. In general, activities that were not addressed have been strategically shifted to reasonable alternatives designed to promote achievement of project objective/outcomes.
	S	*ADB/Component 3* All the activities and outputs the component has been working on are in support of its identified outcome: improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action. The revisions done at the start of implementation were to recognize realities and to correct assumptions at the drawing board. Adaptive management was applied in taking advantage of opportunities to enhance a regional project inherently constrained by resource and capacity problems at the country level.
Monitoring and evaluation	S	*Overall-Project* Project monitoring and evaluation is proceeding according to standard UNDP/GEF protocols. Project implementers actively use and refer to the results framework.
	S	*ADB/Component 3* The project utilizes the monitoring and evaluation system of ADB and also is being evaluated based on standard UNDP /GEF protocols. Three evaluation reports on the project have been filed since its inception.
Stakeholder participation in the implementation	HS	*Overall-Project* Stakeholder participation in project implementation is excellent. This includes international, regional, and GEF IW stakeholders. The project has mobilized the engagement of a wide range of government and development organization decision-makers through meetings, electronic media, and major international forums.
	S	*ADB/Component 3* Stakeholder participation is the backbone of this project's implementation. Activities being done in each CT6 country are led by the NCC. The NCC secretariat is hosted by a relevant government agency, and coordinates the activities of government organizations and development partners. Participating organizations partially subsidize the project activities done in form of staff time, use of facilities, transportation expenses, etc.

Financial Planning	S	*Overall-Project* The evaluation was not provided with comprehensive budget information. However, design planning seems to have been accurate and substantial co-financing secured.
	S	*ADB/Component 3* The project has augmented its original financial budget of 1.7 million US$ (excluding in-kind contribution) with a .167 million US$ fund for research from the Australian government and a subsequent 55,000 US$ research grant for its partner, WorldFish Center - SI. Obtaining this is a demonstration of adaptive management and resourcefulness. Due to late project startup, funds were unexpended at end of Year 1. The project made up for lost time in Years 2 and 3 but kept well under the annual budgets for each year. The project can fund all its remaining targets – and more, if allowed some flexibility.
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective	S	*Overall-Project* On the objective level, the project has stimulated an adaptive learning process. On the Outcome level, the project has fostered critical thinking and learning on a global scale and increased the capacity of GEF IW project capacity to improve management. The project has been challenged with coordination and integration outcome under component four. However, all progress is satisfactory.
	S	*ADB/Component 3* As of 30 June 2011, the project had reportedly accomplished 65% of its targets and spent 43% of its budget. Since then country activities have been strengthened through mobilization of NCCs, appointment and integration of Knowledge Integrators, and completion of the State of the Coral Triangle Report teams. Activities are now being pursued toward institutional and financial sustainability and greater stakeholder involvement. In 2011 the project received the ADB Director General of Southeast Asia recognition award for Knowledge Sharing.

Part 2: Evaluation Purpose and Key Issues

2.1   Purpose of the evaluation

This mid-term evaluation should assist GEF, UNDP, ADB, Project Managers and other stakeholders to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective.   The evaluation is an opportunity for project stakeholders to discuss and critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. The evaluation assesses progress in addressing the baseline, threats, and root causes.   The evaluation identifies any difficulties in project implementation and their causes. The evaluation provides general and specific recommendations to improve the project's potential to achieve expected outcomes and meet objectives within the timeframe. The evaluation provides an opportunity to consider "lessons learned" to date that may be shared widely to facilitate adaptive management globally.

The mid-term evaluation process provides all stakeholders with an opportunity step back from their daily implementation efforts to reflect upon and discuss the efficacy of project activity to date. The evaluation process serves as an important learning experience for all participants. The resulting report will ideally assist the project implementation team to: (1) assess and consider project success at achieving anticipated outcomes given current benchmarks and planned activities; (2) consider possible improvements/approaches to increase the likelihood of success; and, (3) ultimately, enhance both effectiveness (The project's demonstrated ability to produce the desired outcomes) and efficiency (The project's demonstrated ability to produce the highest value result for the lowest cost). A showing of effective action to rectify any identified issues hindering implementation should be a requirement prior to determining whether implementation should proceed.

Both the assessment process and resulting report should be considered as outputs of this evaluation.   The process and report should be used to (a) strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project; (b) ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective, (c) enhance organizational and development learning; and (d) enable informed decision – making.

The mid-term report highlights key issues. These highlights indicate several areas where follow-up investigation and monitoring by project managers and UNDP are required.

2.2   Key issues addressed

The key issues addressed by the MTE were:

1. Is the project "Relevant", "Effective", and "Efficient"?
2. Is this project "on-track" to achieving the objective?
3. What actions should be considered to increase the likelihood of success?

Project performance was measured based on the quantitative and qualitative indicators. The evaluation considered issues related to management and substantive/technical implementation, including project delivery, implementation, and finances.   Particular attention was given to the strategic approaches taken relevant to achievement of project objectives.

Part 3. Project Background

3.1   Project start and its duration

Components 1, 2, and 4:

UNDP/GEF: Portfolio Learning in International Waters with a Focus on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands and Regional Asia-Pacific and Coral Triangle Learning Processes (IW:LEARN/CTI)

Approval, Start, Close, Mid-term	
Project Start	July 2009
Mid-Term Review	March - April 2012
Close Date	July 2013

Project Budget	
GEF Funding	US$ 1,500,000
Co-financing	US$ 1,934,000
Total Project Budget	US$ 3,434,000

GEF Project Budget by Component	
Component One	US$ 900,000
Component Two	US$ 400,000
Component Three	Fund managed by ADB
Component Four	US$ 200,000
Total	US$ 1,500,000

Component 3:

ADB: Regional Technical Assistance of ADB for Knowledge Management, Policy, and Institutional Support to the Coral Triangle Initiative (TA 7307-REG)

Approval, Start, Close, Mid-term	
Project Start	May 2010
Mid-Term Review	March - April 2012
Close Date	October 2012

Component 3 Budget	
GEF	US$ 1,200,000
ADB Funding	US$ 500,000
Government of Australia through AusAID	US$ 167,000
Government Financing (in-kind contribution)	US$ 600,000
Total Project Budget	US$ 2,467,000

3.2   Problems that the project seeks to address

Oceans and coastal areas represent one of the world's most precious resources. They tend to be highly productive ecosystems that offer critical habitat for much of the world's biodiversity. There is an immediate correlation between the integrity of ocean and coastal areas and the vitality of a majority of the globe's human population. Oceans and coastal areas provide priceless ecosystem services, including important food stocks and mitigating the impacts of climate change.

Although critical to our survival, ocean and coastal areas face a daunting number of primarily human caused threats. These well-documented threats include: invasive species, climate change, pollution (e.g, Pacific Trash Vortex), habitat loss/conversion and over-exploitation of biodiversity resources. Addressing these threats in a meaningful way requires global action. To reverse negative trends at a meaningful scale, global organizations, nations and localities must work cumulatively to adopt improved practices.

Project effort is directed towards removing the following key barriers to alleviate these threats and secure the long-term integrity of coastal and marine habitats:

(i)   The lack of scientific knowledge and its effective management for decision-making and actions;

(ii)   Inadequate institutional arrangements, stakeholder participation, and sustainable financing; and,

(iii)   Inadequate strategic planning and policy development at the global and regional levels.

3.3   Immediate and development objectives of the project

Project Goal: Coastal and marine ecosystems, especially in the Coral Triangle, are managed sustainably, with equitable outcomes for all communities that depend on these resources for their livelihoods and with long-term protection of the globally significant biological diversity in coastal and marine ecoregions.

Project Objective: Improved management of coastal and marine ecosystems through efficient and effective inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes.

GEF Objective: The project meets *GEF IW strategic long-term Objective 1* to foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority trans-boundary water concerns through more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approaches to management, *and Objective 2* to catalyze transboundary action addressing water concerns, by assisting countries to utilize the full range of technical assistance, economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reforms that are needed, and in particular by supporting activities that enable countries to:Learn to work together on their key trans-boundary concerns;Set priorities for joint action; and, Implement those actions if a political commitment to sustainability is shown.

3.4   Main stakeholders

Stakeholders involved with and benefiting from this project are diverse and widely distributed geographically. They are best organized and described according to individual components.

Component One is global in scope and broadly touches upon a variety of stakeholders concerned with pressing issues affecting oceans, coasts and small-island developing states (SIDS). Due to the strategic planning and policy objectives of this outcome, the main stakeholders targeted are high-level government officials concerned with issues affecting oceans, coasts, and SIDS at the global level. Additional stakeholders include inter-

governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, the business and private sector, scientific and academic institutions, and museums/aquaria. The executing agency for this component is GOF.

The Global Ocean Forum, and especially its Secretariat, the International Coastal and Ocean Organization, is directly responsible for Component 1 (Advancing the Global Agenda on Oceans, Coasts and Small Island Developing States). Tasks include:

1. Strategic Planning to Advance the Global Oceans Agenda to 2016 and Organization of the 5th Global Oceans Conference in 2010
2. World Ocean Conference 2009, Manado, Indonesia
3. Enhancing Governance of Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
4. Ocean, coasts, and SIDS in the Rio+20 process
5. Public Education and Outreach

Component Two is global in scope. This component is designed to increase learning to enhance trans-boundary cooperation with regards to international waters management. This includes stimulating participatory learning processes and specific management approaches by project managers and institutional partners. The Component should facilitate engagement of marine projects and foster networking and cooperative learning. The component should also assist policymakers, managers and communities with bringing climate change science to on-the-ground solutions. The primary implementing stakeholder is International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) with Mish Hamid as a focal point.

A few stakeholders specific to Component Two include:
- Basin organizations;
- Regional commissions and government counterparts;
- Technical experts;
- Coastal areas managers and policy makers;
- GOF working groups (e.g., Oceans, Climate and Security);
- UNITAR-supported Hiroshima Initiative on Seas and Human Security;
- Government of Indonesia;
- Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre; and,
- CTI, GOF and GEF IW communities.

UNDP and IW-LEARN Network are directly responsible for implementation of Component 2. Tasks include:

1. Organization of IWC5, including the design of a participative learning program

    a. GEF IW leadership learning program
    b. Collaborative website development
    c. IWC5 Pre-conference Targeted workshops
    d. Organization of the Fifth Biennial GEF IW Conference

2. Post-IWC5 learning exchanges and GEF IW, including Experience Notes
3. Monitoring and Evaluation

Component Three is regional in scope and focuses primarily upon stakeholders within the six Coral Triangle nations of Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste. In addition to the Governments and policy makers of these six nations, stakeholders include the CTI Secretariat and Coordinating Committee, ADB, US and Australian Governments, GEF and GEF agencies, NOAA, and international and national NGOs. The primary implementing stakeholder is a CTI Regional Technical Assistance

Team established by ADB. The Component has four objectives: 1) strengthened CTI regional cooperation; 2) regional learning mechanisms for CTI established; 3) communication and information dissemination plan implemented; 4) sustainable financing schemes for national plans of action established.

ADB and, specifically, the CTI Regional Technical Assistance Team, is responsible for leading implementation of Component 3 (Coral Triangle Initiative). Tasks include:

1. Strengthened CTI regional cooperation
2. Established regional learning mechanisms for CTI
3. Implemented communication and information dissemination plan
4. Established sustainable financing schemes for POAs

Component Four is concerned with project management. The main stakeholders for this component relevant to the mid-term evaluation include the Project Coordinating Unit (Team Leader and Project Implementation Coordinator); International Waters Principal Technical Advisor, UNDP/GEF; and, Senior Portfolio Manager, UNOPS.

The project is implemented by UNDP and executed by UNOPS through its Global and Inter-Regional division. UNOPS is accountable to UNDP for the delivery of agreed outputs as per agreed project work plans, and for financial management and reporting as well as ensuring cost-effectiveness.

Project Coordination Unit established in the UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Center in Bangkok is directly responsible for Component 4 (Project Management). The PCU includes a part-time Team Leader and Project Implementation Coordinator. The RTA for International Waters supervises these persons. The team is responsible for oversight, monitoring and facilitate implementation of the project in both technical and operation aspect in accordance with the Agency Execution modality and for the application of all UNDP administrative and financial procedures, as well as the use of UNDP/GEF funds. Additional tasks include:

1. Timely inputs are made into the key events and related projects
2. Key stakeholders are identified and engaged in the relevant components
3. Various related information portals are linked and web-based information is kept up to date
4. Project activities are bridged into subsequent post-project events and programs, such as the third phase of IW:LEARN (expected to be linked with the GEF-funded Integrated Natural Resource Management in the Middle East and the North Africa Region project (MENARID)) and the work of the GOF.

3.5   Results expected

The project is designed to improve management of coastal/marine ecosystems through regional adaptive learning processes. Three barriers to achieving the objective are identified: (i) lack of scientific knowledge and its effective management for decision-making and actions; (ii) inadequate institutional arrangements, stakeholder participation, and sustainable financing; and (iii) inadequate strategic planning and policy development at the global and regional levels.

To remove these barriers, the project sets out to achieve four outcomes supported by four components.

Outcome One: To foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals and the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS, and in response to new ocean issues.

Component 1 will organize multi-stakeholder consultations, policy analyses, and global oceans conferences to mobilize high-level policy attention, action, and specific initiatives to advance integrated ecosystem-based oceans and coastal governance in the context of climate variability and change, in particular: (i) WOC2009 (in collaboration with the Indonesian Government); (ii) 5th Global Conference on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands 2010 at UNESCO in Paris, France (GOC2010); and (iii) policy analyses and multi-stakeholder consultations on priority areas of targeted action to support the enhancement of governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, that could be considered through GEF5.

Policy analyses and multi-stakeholder policy dialogue will review progress achieved and focus on tangible next steps for advancing the JPOI and MDG goals, in particular ecosystem management and integrated coastal and ocean management by 2010, and the global targets on preventing loss of biodiversity (by 2010), and of creating networks of marine protected areas (MPA) by 2012. These targets are scheduled for review by the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) in 2014-15. Multinational Global Ocean Forum Working Groups involving ocean leaders and experts from all sectors and regions of the world will advance strategic planning for the global oceans agenda to 2016, especially focusing on (i) the development of priority next steps for JPOI and MDG implementation of ecosystem-based integrated ocean and coastal management; (ii) SIDS and the Mauritius Strategy for further implementation of the Barbados Programme of Action; (iii) fisheries and aquaculture; (iv) biodiversity and marine protected areas; and (v) climate change and practical approaches to adaptation.

The Ocean Leadership Training Program was replaced by a significant new activity focused on addressing the ocean, coasts, and SIDS issues in the Rio+20 process as part of Component 1 activities.

Outcome Two: Improved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems. Expected learning outcomes include assessable increased GEF IW project capacity at 3 levels: (i) individual project stakeholders; (ii) organizations; and (iii) governments, fostering enabling environments for transboundary cooperation to deepen and accelerate EBM and policy reform processes.

Component 2 aims to promote adaptive learning within the GEF IW portfolio, with the 5th Biennial GEF International Waters Conference, to be hosted by the Government of Australia in Queensland in October 2009, as the pivotal mechanism in an iterative peer-to-peer portfolio learning cycle. The purpose of IWC5 is to share experience and innovative practices among GEF's global IW portfolio, deliver hands-on learning and capacity building, develop strategies to enhance stakeholder collaboration, and encourage GEF IW projects to apply evolving GEF policies and procedures during implementation. IWC5 builds on and draws from the ongoing IW: LEARN resource base established by GEF to share experience and knowledge regarding coastal and marine resource management.

Every two years, IW: LEARN convenes about 300 representatives of project leadership and their government partners to exchange practical experience, share scientific and technical innovation, and engage in a collective learning process with the entire global GEF IW portfolio. Major themes of the GEF IWC5 learning cycle address key constraints and highlight opportunities for strengthening trans-boundary water and natural resource systems management. Freshwater basin and groundwater management remain sectorally divided while climate change drives the need for improved water use efficiency in balancing multiple uses among diverse stakeholders, and downstream linkages need to be forged in order to protect investments in coastal and marine management. While water and natural resources management at the basin or LME scale is a vital foundation for sustainable development,

GEF IW projects rarely track their contributions towards achievement of MDGs in the countries they serve. To achieve MDGs with the added constraints of climate change, 'business as usual' is no longer adequate. The IWC5 provides more than a global platform for interactive and participant-driven learning to share knowledge, strengthen peer-to-peer networking, and enhance practical project implementation and leadership skills. It also consolidates the collective experience in a robust learning culture that is changing the way IW project management, implementation partners and stakeholders do business - to better apply EBM in building food security, sustainable livelihoods and sustainable ecosystem services, while also contributing to the peace and security dividends which come with transparency, trust, and regional economic benefits of trans-boundary cooperation.

Outcome Three: *Improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action through inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes.*

Component 3 is directed towards strengthening the Coral Triangle Initiative. The Coral Triangle is the global epicenter of marine life abundance and diversity on the planet, holding more than 75% of the known coral species and over 3,000 species of reef fish. These extraordinary marine biological resources directly sustain the lives of over 200 million people living within the CT, providing livelihoods, income and food security benefits (e.g., the source of the world's most valuable tuna fisheries which generate annual revenues of approximately $5 billion), and a rapidly expanding coastal/marine-based tourism industry, which is worth more than $1 billion annually in the Philippines alone. Spanning multiple political and cultural boundaries, the CT ecoregion stretches from Luzon, Philippines in the north, to the east coast of Borneo, across eastern Indonesia and Papua New Guinea to include Timor Leste and extending to the Solomon Islands.

This subregion has a biogeographic identity that is defined by its rich biodiversity and the connections of its ocean currents and species distribution patterns, such that the value of the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The diverse reef systems of the Southeast Asian side of the CT are linked to the Pacific through stepping stone reefs in Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia. However, overexploitation of coastal and marine ecosystems (from overfishing, land based pollution, erosion and sedimentation), destructive extraction practices (such as mining of coral reefs for construction), coastal and marine pollution (including discharge of ballast water, oil and solid waste), weak resource management systems and the impacts of climate change (including increased water temperatures and ocean acidification) collectively threaten the CT. Sustainable livelihoods and a significant portion of the foreign exchange earnings of the six CT countries are at stake. It is now recognized by the governments of all of these countries that urgent action is needed to conserve the CT so that its benefits may be sustained.

Outcome Four: Improved coordination and integration between the global oceans and coastal agenda, the GEF international waters portfolio, and CTI.

Component 4 focuses upon project management functions, including monitoring and evaluation and generating lessons learned for replication and upscaling. A critical result expected from Component Four activity is the effective linkage of global, regional, and national level coastal and marine ecosystem based management.

Part 4. Evaluation Methodology

4.1   Structure of the evaluation

4.1.1   Evaluation Team

Mr. Mark Johnstad has approximately two decades of global experience supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of GEF projects. He served as the evaluation specialist with primary responsibility for leading the evaluation, analyzing Components One, Two and Four and finalizing the mid-term evaluation report.

Dr. Madeline Baguio-Quiamco is the Dean of Graduate School of Asian Institute of Journalism & Communications in Manila. Dr. Baguio-Quiamco's assessment focused upon the knowledge management aspects of Component Three (ADB technical assistance for Knowledge Management, Policy, and Institutional Support to the Coral Triangle Initiative) (TA 7307-REG). The evaluation included a review of project design, implementation, progress and impact. This will include an assessment of how Component Three contributes to the attainment of overall IW:LEARN goals.

4.1.2   Guiding Principles and Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation structure followed the guidance of UNDP and GEF, including UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results" and GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures". The evaluation was guided by the comprehensive terms of reference. These TORs defined the scope and framework for the evaluation's final report.

Project performance was measured based on the quantitative and qualitative indicators. The evaluation considered issues related to management and substantive/technical implementation, including project delivery, implementation, and finances. Particular attention was given to the strategic approaches taken relevant to achievement of project objectives.

The purposes of a mid-term evaluation are to:

• Monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
• Provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
• Promote accountability for resource use; and
• Document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

The key issues addressed by the MTE should be:

• Is the project "Relevant", "Effective", and "Efficient"?
• Is this project "on-track" to achieving the objective?
• What actions should be considered to increase the likelihood of success?

This mid-term evaluation will follow the specific guidance of UNDP/GEF by:

• Identifying potential project design problems,
• Assessing progress towards the achievement of objectives,
• Identifying and documenting lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and,
• Making recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project.

4.2   Methods employed

Step 1: Draft Inception Report and Team Workplan
The evaluators first completed a detailed inception report/team work plan. The document provided guidance to the implementation of the evaluation so that all parties clearly understood the evaluation's limited scope and methodology. The project evaluators, PCU, and main project implementers each reviewed and approved this document. All parties provided very valuable and useful contributions, including detailed background information and guidance regarding project progress to date.

Step 2: List and Compile Key Project Documents
With the assistance of the PCU and project implementers, the evaluators compiled a bibliography of project related documents and websites. This included all germane reports, annual work plans, project implementation reviews, Atlas budget and discussed budget allocations etc.

Step 3: List of Stakeholders
The project team worked with the PCU to generate a complete list of project stakeholders. This included key implementation partners as well as persons benefiting from project implementation. This list will be vetted by the PCU to make certain priority stakeholders are given adequate opportunity to contribute to the evaluation's findings. The evaluators selected a critical list of these stakeholders to discuss project progress and impact.

Step 4: Stakeholder Interviews
After compiling a list of priority stakeholders and conducting a preliminary review of project documentation, the evaluators scheduled and conducted interviews as necessary with key stakeholders via Skype and/or email. The interviews will be guided by a standardized set of questions to increase efficiency, make certain pertinent topics are covered, and generate comparable data from responses.

Step 5: Field Visits
Dr. Baguio-Quiamcomet with CT regional stakeholders, including the CTI Secretariat and ADB. Mr. Johnstad visited Bangkok in February and met with the regional technical assistant and PCU.

Step 6: Assessment of Inputs and Completion of Preliminary Draft
The evaluators assessed inputs and completed a preliminary draft mid-term evaluation.

Step 7: Vetting of Preliminary Draft
The preliminary draft was submitted to the PCU, UNOPS, UNDP/GEF IW Principal Technical Advisor, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor and other stakeholders identified by the PCU for review and comment.

Step 8: Review, Amendment and Completion of Final MTE Document
Based upon the assessment of the preliminary draft, the evaluators incorporated changes and improvements as required. A final draft will then be prepared and submitted to the PCU.

<div align="center">**Part 5.**   **Findings**</div>

5.1   Project Formulation

5.1.1   Conceptualization/Design

The project identified key barriers and funded appropriate interventions to address these barriers. Each component is fairly well designed and reflects an incremental approach, strategically building upon an existing baseline. Each of the components benefits from highly capable technical support, including project management. This is very positive and reflected in the quality and effectiveness of activities completed to date.

The project's main design issuer relates to "synergy". Intra-project synergy was to be facilitated through Component Four (Project Management). The project document states: "Component 4 will provide the cohesion and coordination that will make the sum of the three components greater than the parts." However, the project in its design did not provide the clarity and tools required to achieve this task. Synergistic pathways are not clearly elucidated in the project document and/or reflected in the logical framework. Components 1 – 3 have relatively detailed outputs and activities that relate back to specific outcomes. Component Four, although included within the results framework, does not have detailed outputs and activities described for how these results are to be achieved.

The project does not benefit from a formal project steering committee as a forum to discuss synergy and capitalize upon opportunities for leveraging impacts. The project document only discusses a steering committee in the Monitoring and Evaluation section. The project currently has only an "informal" steering committee composed of key implementation partners. These representatives tend to gather opportunistically at major international meetings.

The project document does not require a strategic implementation plan to help describe and guarantee synergistic approaches. There are references for the need to coordinate some activities. There is certainly a cooperative spirit amongst the parties involved. There have also been several project activities that have linked across components. This is positive and the benefits resonate clearly from discussions. The use of the logical framework for all four components also helps project integration.

Without these or similar tools to formalize integration, the project implementation becomes an amalgamation of four loosely interwoven components. The project is global and implemented by implementation partners located in diverse locations: UNDP (Bangkok), IW:LEARN (Bratislava); ICO/GOF (USA), and ADB (Philippines). The project began later than expected and did not commence in unison. Components 1, 2 and 4 officially started in July 2009. Component 3 started in May 2010. Such a project design requires formal guidance tools if it is going to benefit from the sum of its parts, rather than operate as three separate components. Faced with these challenges and without formal integration guidance, it is impressive how well coordinated the project is and how well it seems to function and cooperate. This reflects highly upon the quality of individuals involved, including the project management team.

The project's current logical framework reflects primarily process indicators. The logical framework has very few indicators and targets to help monitor and measure impact. This makes it very difficult for project managers and other stakeholders to evaluate whether the sum of component activities implemented is actually leading to measurable progress towards the Outcome. This is particularly the case for Outcome One that receives by far the largest share of project financing (relative to 1, 2 and 4). The project is designed to move forward a global agenda, but the specific terms and expectations are not clear. The project objective

(effective, efficient management systems) is indicated simply by; "Lessons learned from previous IW projects, and from World Ocean Conference applied by the six CTI countries." There is no measurement for total number of governments that have adopted specific practices that will ultimately result in long-term ocean and coastal conservation. This makes it difficult for evaluators to gauge what actually constitutes an effective and efficient management system.

The project works under broad directives to build awareness, knowledge and partnerships. Generating indicators for issues related to policy, management, governance, coordination, awareness, etc. is challenging. However, improvements would help the project to monitor impact and, likely, help each component approach to be slightly more strategic and goal oriented. For instance, what impacts are expected from Component One activities, e.g., national governments adopting certain ocean and coastal management policies that reflect best practices.

5.1.2   Country-ownership/Driveness

Both Components One and Two are global and designed to engage over one hundred nations. Global Ocean Forum participation has been very high and diverse (e.g., governments, international agencies, NGOs, private sector, and academia). This includes the WOC, GOC and IWC gatherings supported technically and financial by the project. Together, more than 2,000 persons participated in these events. An important element of these activities is to build global knowledge of and support for oceans conservation. Literally dozens of countries have participated and benefited from component activities. The component has built substantial momentum to build broader base support for the ocean conservation. Global demand for the use of knowledge tools is considered a project highlight. The results of measuring tools such as post conference surveys are largely positive. The information exchanges sponsored through the project have had solid participation. Demand and use of the electronic information systems is growing.

Component Three also responds to and benefits from regional and national support. While seeking to bring the CT6 countries away from continued ineffective implementation of disparate sector plans, relying on their own resources, and refusal to share experiences and resources, the TA project seeks to improve CT6 capacities based on each country's realities. From August 2010 to February 2011 it implemented regional and country-based Needs Assessment workshops. While its implementation was too late to enable the National Coordination Committees (NCCs) to input to the CT6 countries' respective National Programs of Action (NPoA), the NCCs used the NPoAs in their Needs assessment and made decisions on country-based concerns such as identifying participants in capacity building activities or scheduling country implementation of activities such as meetings and workshops. The State of the Coral Triangle Report SCTR) – a major report tracking the progress of CTI – is prepared on a per-country basis, written by scientists in each country. A unique feature of the SCTR, says the 2011 Project Implementation Report, is that it must be country-owned and country-driven." While doubts had been cast whether the country groups would take on the challenge and while it would be faster and easier for the TA Team to produce project outputs, country ownership and learning takes precedence. The regional project "has to work synergistically with the pace of the Coral Triangle countries that, unfortunately, is almost always lagging behind," the PIR said.

5.1.3   Stakeholder participation in the design

The project's first two components were designed to support and build upon existing programs. These stakeholders were fully briefed and engaged during design. The design process included substantial and substantive discussions with representatives of key organizations. Many of these stakeholders now support project implementation.

The ADB component design underwent a series of changes at both the regional and country levels at several venues. A Project Scoping, Visioning, and   Teambuilding Workshop was held in Jakarta 20-21 May 2010 with 42 participants from the NCCs of the CT6, development partners (DPs) AusAID, NOAA, USAID, CI, TNC, WWF, consultants from PRIMEX and UniQuest. Here roles were established and interactions with the government representatives and development partners set. There was an Inception Workshop and First Tripartite Meeting completed at ADB 29-30 July 2010. Focus of TA was changed; project was aligned with agreed CTI regional priorities within the TA focus areas, etc. A Country-Level Needs Assessment Workshop held with every CT6 country (Aug 2010-Feb 2011), where features of the TA were matched with country's needs and adaptations made. Examples: i) Solomon Islands would not form a Science Advisory Committee (SAC) like the other countries; its NCC will perform the functions of an SAC; ii) Timor Leste NCC organized itself to integrate CTI concerns with related coastal and marine concerns through the "three in one" forum that includes 2 other entities: Arafura and Timor Seas Export Forum (ATSEF) and Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of Southeast Asia (PEMSEA). These documented processes resulted in improvement to the original project design.

5.1.4   Replication approach

All of the project's operational components are designed to stimulate upscaling and replication of best practices. Efforts under all Components have included providing technical and facilitation support for a host of international learning forums designed to promote identification and replication of best practices.

Through Component One, countries are engaged to build support to improve strategic planning and governance regimes for ocean conservation.   This engagement and the accompanying series of recommendations and awareness building efforts will result in best practices being up-taken and replicated globally, particularly in terms of increased investment and improved governance policies/practices. The opportunity for stakeholders to learn of relevant approaches and to replicate these approaches is numerous and varied. The GOF website provides substantial information. GOF organization, facilitation, and participation in numerous international meetings means concepts formulated through project activities are being distributed to a wide global audience.

Stimulating stakeholder learning and replication is a major push under Component Two. This Component has a specific objective to stimulate fellow GEF projects to replicate successful approaches from comparable projects. As noted in the project document: "The project will catalyze the replication of lessons learned in the GEF IW portfolio and building on past experiences of what works and what does not will also enhance the cost effectiveness of future GEF IW interventions." Activity includes facilitating formal and informal peer-to-peer learning, a concept designed to address a specific learning/replication opportunity for the GEF IW portfolio. The project has aggressively pursued all of these activities. The result is integration of improved practices both in both the design and implementation of several GEF supported projects.

The IWC5 program supported in part by Component Two offered opportunities for hundreds of stakeholders to learn and apply new approaches through pre and post conference activities twinned with Australian centers of excellence. In addition, the IWC5 itself was used as a forum to present best global practices.

The results of Component Three's regional dialogue and cooperation will be replicated and adapted to support efforts throughout the region. As noted, IW:LEARN worked with CTI to generate a website that provides news and updates on the Coral Triangle.   The CTI project has offered knowledge management primers to other GEF-funded projects.

5.2   Project Implementation

5.2.1   Implementation Approach

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool

The project actively uses the logical framework as a management tool for all four components (Global Ocean Forum, IW:LEARN, CTI, Project Management). Component management teams are very aware of the logical framework, apply it regularly to guide and monitor implementation, and provide consistent updates. The project management team applies the APR/PIR to regularly track framework progress. Over the course of implementation, adaptive management changes (noted below) have been made. Some of these changes are not yet reflected in the logical framework. A full summary of current progress towards achievement of project indicators may be found in the annex of this report.

(ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management

Adaptive management shifts were made under all components. Several planned for activities have not and will not occur. Some of this was required due to the later than anticipated project start. The WOC 2009 was to be a keystone element, but the conference took place before the project commenced. Other activities were altered to take advantage of emerging opportunities. For instance, the global leadership training was shifted to provide support for the Rio+20 preparations. Although difficult to assess and/or compare, the impacts of some of these adaptations may not be at levels equal to original intent. Overall, however, the project has made responsible adaptive management choices.

Component One was designed to have five outputs. Output 1.1 (Strategic Planning to Advance the Global Oceans Agenda to 2016 and Organization of the 5th Global Oceans Conference in 2010) was implemented as planned. Output 1.2 (implementation of multi-stakeholder dialogues at the 2009 WOC) took place prior to project commencement. The Global Ocean Forum carried out Outputs 1.2 using its own funds and was reimbursed after project approval. Output 1.3 (Enhancing Governance of Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction) was carried out as planned. Output 1.4 (global leadership training program) was abandoned and replaced by an effort to build leadership capacity to forward an ocean and coastal area conservation agenda during the upcoming Rio+20 meetings. This is supported technically by GOF. Nausicaa and the World Ocean Network advanced the funding to start Output 1.5 (public education and outreach) in May 2009 prior to project commencement and implemented a public education and outreach program on climate change and oceans by the end of 2011.

Component Two was designed to have three outputs. Each output is further divided into several "sub-outputs". Most of these outputs and sub-outputs took place as planned. However, several others were adapted. Sub-output 2.1.1 (GEF IW collaborative IW:LEARN/GOF leadership learning program linked to IWC5) was not implemented as described. This sub-output was to build upon Output 1.4 that was altered to support the Rio+ 20 process. To adapt, IW:LEARN developed several decision-support tools and training courses for GEF IW projects. There are now hundreds of participants benefiting from IW:LEARN Community Platforms and the electronically available information and expertise.

For Component Two, the major implementation challenge stems from Output 2.3 (monitoring and evaluation). Under this Output, IW:LEARN was meant to accomplish two things. First, IW:LEARN was to facilitate participation of GEF IW projects in broader Global Ocean Forums. Several GEF IW projects were represented, but not in the manner described in the

project document. This activity as planned, however, was subsumed under IW:LEARN3 which is now in progress. Secondly, IW:LEARN was to generate and support the implementation of tracking tool for monitoring GEF IW contributions to the achievement of MDGs. This has not moved forward due to information access challenges.

The Component Three inception workshop concluded that the project should limit knowledge management and policy activities to: (i) sustainable finance (SF); (ii) environmental economics and payments for ecosystem services (EEPES); and (iii) preparation of the State of the Coral Triangle Report (SCTR). The project was re-aligned to four outputs: i) CT regional cooperation; ii) Regional learning mechanisms for CTI; iii) Communication and information dissemination plan; and, iv) Sustainable financing schemes for POAs. The logical framework was adapted. These four outputs now guide the impacts of technical assistance.

Component Three has faced implementation challenges that have demanded more adaptive approaches than the other components. Resource and capacity challenges constrained country level activities under Component Three. The Government of Australia offered to fund additional activities. The project team drafted a proposal and obtained US$167,000 to research the economics of coastal fisheries and aquaculture in the three Pacific CTI countries (E-FACT study). The team further proposed to expand the activity to the SEA CTI countries using the fund balance for the Aquaculture Fisheries Economist. The team obtained a $55,000-grant to the WorldFish Center-Solomon Islands co-financed by the Australian Government and ADB for the valuation of coral exports. The team worked with WWF to collaborate and link its communication platform for general audience with the CTI Learning Resource Network (LRN). Finally, the team identified an opportunity for KM buy-in with the appointment of Mr. Jake Meimban as Director of the Philippine Coastal and Marine Management office (CMMO), offering to conduct a KM orientation session for CMMO staff to enable them to appreciate this important process.

Component Four has conducted project management as foreseen. The second key task under Component is to support inter-component synergy. This has occurred on a largely ad hoc basis with most responsibility delegated to the individual components leaders.

(iii) The projects use/establishment of electronic information technologies

The use of electronic media is a key investment for this project and a standout achievement for all three components. The project implementers have made certain that their global stakeholders are able to access information related to various project initiatives. For instance, the project has diligently captured the outputs of various conferences supported through project investment and made these outputs readily available to a global community through a variety of sites. The project has been highly innovative in the use of electronic information technologies to build global information exchange and to catalyze global responses to a host of issues related to ocean conservation.

Examples: Project Supported Electronic Information Technology	
Global Oceans	http://www.globaloceans.org/
Oceans Day: UNFCCC COP15	http://www.oceansday.org/c-index.html
Oceans Day in Copenhagen Public Outreach Site	http://www.oceanclimate.org/
Oceans Day: UNFCCC COP16	http://www.oceansday.org/
IW:LEARN	http://iwlearn.net/
IW:LEARN "Best Practices"	http://iwlearn.net/publications/ll

CTI Community of Practice	http://community.iwlearn.net/communities/coral-triangle-initiative -cop/
CTI Facebook	http://www.facebook.com/pages/Knowledge-Management-for-the-Coral-Triangle-Initiative-KM-4-CTI/132380826820701
CTI Knowledge Management	www.primexinc.org/cti_km
CTI Learning Resource Network	http://www.coraltriangleinitiative.net/

The Global Ocean Forum responsible for Component One activity diligently made materials produced through this project available on their interactive website. This includes information related to policy discussion and Rio+20, e.g. the publication "Oceans at Rio+20, Summary for Decision Makers."

The IW:LEARN website is considered by many to be the preeminent electronic media focal point for information regarding water management and learning. The site has substantially expanded content and participation with support from this project. For example, global practitioners now benefit from information exchanges facilitated through community of practice forums. Participation is not always at levels anticipated. For instance, reporting on MDG's was lower than desired. However, the use of electronic platforms to support strengthened conservation approaches is still relatively new and experimental. This demands constant tweaking and innovation. This can be challenging when dealing with bureaucratic target groups. IW:LEARN has shown this adaptive capacity. This includes working with GEF and other to integrate tools to motivate greater use of the medium, either through prescriptive tools such as required reporting and/or un-prescribed tools such market responsive content.

Component Three implementers coordinated with IW:LEARN technicians to generate two useful electronic media tools. There is an e-group to facilitate communication and community of practice for CTI specialists using the IW:LEARN facility. The CTI generated a Learning Resource Network (LRN) www.coraltriangleinitiative.net in collaboration with IW:LEARN. This was launched at SOM7 in October 2011 with its domain paid for 10 years. Through Component Three, an online project file management system (PFMS) and project KM website were generated. There is even a very active Facebook page dedicated to CTI.

(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved

The operational relationships between implementing institutions is very positive and collegial. However, as noted, this coordination is largely informal. Regular mechanisms to identify and capitalize upon opportunities to generate synergy such as working groups and/or a formalized Steering Committee are largely absent. The project management team, located primarily in Bangkok, enjoys a strong and candid working relationship with all project implementation teams and facilitate regular communications. The main collaborators for Components One and Two work closely together and seem to coordinate well. Component Three supported primarily by ADB could be a "stand alone." This is not the case. The project implementation teams seem to communicate regularly.

For Component 3, operational relationships among the organizations involved were expected to grow around the structure designed for the implementation of the TA project, with higher-level guidance provided by involved units of GEF, ADB, and the Regional CTI Secretariat; activities in each CT6 country are done by national implementation units such as the National Coordinating Council, Focal Point, and Knowledge Integrator; mobilization, coordination,

and support provided by the TA team. Stakeholder interviews revealed a clear and functional relationship among all the entities except that with the interim CTI regional secretariat. Interviewees said this might be so because of its interim status and should improve when a permanent one is installed.

(v) Technical capacities associated with the project

The project has recruited a high caliber implementation and management team. The project benefits from a broad array of capable and motivated professionals with advanced technical proficiencies. Persons associated with both the IW:LEARN and Global Ocean Forum are internationally well respected and provide professional support. Their contributions have been substantial and represent value well beyond the relatively low project investment costs.

A project recruited consulting firm is primarily responsible for implementing Component Three. This firm has mobilized a number of experts, including individual specialists covering marine science, knowledge management, web content, financing, regional marine conservation, and environmental economics.

The TA team members are among the most qualified in their respective fields, with relevant achievements at the local and international levels. It is being directed by a highly trained marine biologist with work experience in the countries of southeast Asia and the Pacific, a fellow of FAO and consultant to projects of ADB and CIDA. The team's marine science specialist is a world-renown marine scientist who has published extensively on coral reef resources management and ecology and on the mariculture of marine invertebrates. He is the Founding Director of the University of the Philippines Marine Science Institute (UP-MSI), the leading center of excellence in marine science in Southeast Asia. The finance specialist provides technical training and technical assistance in strategic and financial planning and fund-raising. He has had 18 years of experience in setting up conservation finance trust funds and sustainable finance mechanisms in the Pacific and Africa. The KM/communication specialist is a former Dean of the College of Development Communication of the University of the Philippines-Los Banos (UPLB); for several years she headed the *Isang Bagsak* communication capacity building project of UPLB and IDRC and similar KM capacity building projects. The web content specialist is an award winning development communicator who obtained her Masters' degree from Ohio University. The team leader and environmental economist /PES specialist is an applied business economist who is looking into the application of payment for ecosystem services (PES) as a modality to raise funds and address conservation issues.

5.2.2   Monitoring and evaluation

i) Evaluate if the project has an appropriate M&E system

The project has an adequate M&E system. The project follows standard GEF and UNDP monitoring modalities. The project management team actively oversees implementation. This includes regular PIR/APR processes. The mid-term evaluation was conducted in a timely manner, albeit delayed due to the challenges associated with a multi-faceted, global initiative. As noted, the project's design and logical framework are relatively strong.   The implementation teams regularly track and report their activities. The IW: LEARN website is able to monitor users and downloads. Participants from nearly all project-learning forums such as international conferences and information exchange programs are polled to monitor activity impact and learn how to improve future activities. The Natural Resources Economist, SERD of ADB and the Project Technical Advisor of UNDP monitor Component Three activities.   The project's implementation team submits comprehensive quarterly progress

reports. At least three major project evaluation reports have been submitted, not including this mid-term evaluation of the overall project.

The project's current logical framework reflects primarily process indicators and would benefit from the inclusion of more impact indicators. This is noted in the evaluation conclusions and recommendations

ii) Evaluate if appropriate M&E tools have been used

The project actively applies a host of appropriate M&E tools. An updated results framework may be found in the evaluation annex.

iii) Evaluate if resources and capacities to conduct an adequate monitoring are in place

Adequate capacities for monitoring are in place. The initial project budget reserved funds for both a mid-term as well as project management's completion of regular APR/PIR. The project sources outside assistance for conducting major evaluations and uses project management capacities/financing for periodic monitoring. All component implementation teams are diligent about monitoring and have adequate capacity. Reports are first submitted as drafts and circulated to all concerned for comments and inputs. Additional resources for monitoring Component Three are provided through Technical Assistance Support Cost budgets and administrative facilities at ADB, including the Operations Evaluation Department (OED).

There is some question regarding availability of funds to conduct the project's final evaluation. The project may need to shift financing from component work to support a final evaluation per requirements of GEF.

5.2.3   Stakeholder participation in the implementation

(i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project

This project has produced a copious number of high quality information materials. This includes both electronic, video, and print media. Project implementers have also generated presentations and support materials for several international forums and training programs. Several are referenced in this report's annex. During the evaluation, the evaluators reviewed a majority of these materials. The materials are readily available to global stakeholders through electronic and print media.

(ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in implementation and decision making

"Local" is a relative term due to the project's focus upon international and regional governance. However, hundreds of international NGOs and resource user groups participate in the knowledge and learning programs initiated and supported by this project. Many of these groups are also active members in planning and executing the major global meetings in part supported by this project. The project has reached out to participants at all levels, including private sector, government agencies, donors, international and national NGOs, etc. For instance, numerous NGOs and foundations helped to support the IWC5. This included WWF, Project AWARE, Terrain Natural Resource Management, and Reef and Rainforest Research Centre. The private sector was also well represented. Similar high levels of cross-sectoral involvement were evinced with each of the project's major activities to date. Agencies such as the Philippine Department of Environment and Natural Resources and Bureaus of Fisheries and Parks and Wildlife, the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of Indonesia, the Ministries of Economic Development and of Agriculture and Fisheries of Timor Leste, the Ministry of Science, Technology, and Innovation of Malaysia, AusAID, the

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, the Coral Triangle Center, Conservation International, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) have all actively participated in project activities.

In terms of actual project implementation and decision-making, Component Three has been the most effective at mobilizing broad participation through diverse National Coordinating Committees membership. For the other components, NGO association with decision-making is limited primarily to participatory planning for major international events.

(iii) Partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project

Building partnerships and collaborative relationships is a major thrust of project investment. The project implementation teams work collaboratively with nearly every major player (government, donor, NGO) and most GEF IW projects involved in ocean conservation globally. This is true on the global level with the numerous policy programs, including the international conferences as well as the recent Rio+20 work facilitated through Output 1.4. IW:LEARN has used project support to help build and facilitate collaboration both electronically and through the implementation of several peer-to-peer learning opportunities. The project has also mobilized financial collaboration, working with numerous donors and NGOs to generate tangible and extensive co-financing. The Component Three technical team works to coordinate with and enhance partnerships with the multitude of Coral Triangle regional actors, including government, donor, NGO, academic, and private sector stakeholders.

As noted, the project was not designed with fundamentally strong pathways to build specific intra-project synergy. This aspect of the project is evolving. For instance, IW:LEARN assisted the CTI KM project to build the CTI website and produce knowledge products. On a broader scale, the Global Ocean Forum co-organized Oceans Day at a conference of the parties of the UNFCCC together with the Government of Indonesia (and 43 other partners) in Copenhagen in December 2009 to bring the results of the World Ocean Conference in Manado to the climate negotiations.

(iv) Involvement/Support of governmental institutions in project implementation

The support and involvement of government institutions in project implementation is critical to advancing achievement of this project's objective and outcomes. A myriad of institutions and decision-makers representing governments from around the globe have participated in and benefited from project activities. This includes international forums such as the WOC, Global Oceans Conferences, Oceans Days at UNFCCC and CBD events, IWC5, etc. and relate pre- and post- forum working groups, policy meetings, round-tables, etc. Much of this effort is leading to a hoped for increase in global IW concern, particularly for ocean and coastal systems. This will hopefully resonate during the approaching Rio+20 meetings. Through the IW:LEARN Community Platform, GEF IW projects and their partner government institutions from around the world are linked. This is assisting government agencies to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of GEF project design and implementation. Component Three is designed to build support for the CT6 governments and has harnessed participation from government institutions representing each of these six nations. After the CT6 Heads of State signed the declaration at Manado, Indonesia, there was improved funding and active participation in project activities. Working groups based on thematic areas have been formed such as the Communication Working Group. The Philippine Parks and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB) hosts the CTI-KM Secretariat. In Malaysia, a government agency (MOSTI) will link an existing knowledge management system with the CTI knowledge management system. The Government of the Solomon Islands has agreed to take over implementation of their nation's CTI knowledge management system after project close.

5.2.4 Financial Planning

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

The project has a total GEF budget of US$ 1,500,000. AusAid contributed approximately US$ 73,357 to support IWC5 and associated activities. This was managed by UNOPS as part of the project. As a result, the project's total budget and workplan reflects a total of US$ 1,573,357.

It seems that the project may have overspent its budget. However, several critical budget issues were not clarified and/or information not provided during the project evaluation. As a result, evaluators did not have a complete picture of current budget status (Please see below).

The project is scheduled to close in July 2013.

GEF Funds as of December 2011 (US$)[1]

Outcome	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Outcome 1: Advancing the Global Agenda on Oceans, Coasts and Small Island Developing States					
Total Project PRODOC Budget	244,200	495,750	20,350	139,700	900,000
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	244,200	521,906	222,117	103,362	1,091,585
UNOPS/ICO Contract	483,506	224,493	16,000	116,000	839,999
UNOPS/ICO Contract Disbursed (to date)	404,803	207,850	137,139		749,792
Disbursed (to date)	212,530	552,712	156,892	0	922,134
Remaining GEF Funds	31,670	(30,807)	65,225		
Outcome 2: GEF International Waters Portfolio Learning					
Total Project PRODOC Budget	328,575	71,425	0	0	400,000
AusAid (ProDoc)	73,357	0	0	0	73,357
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	403,932	99,254	53,500	7,062	563,748
Disbursed (to date)	374,395	19,990	75,306	0	469,691
AusAid (Disbursed)	80,632	0	0	0	80,632
Remaining GEF Funds	-45,820	79,264	-21,807		-69,691
Outcome 3: Coral Triangle Initiative (Outcome Budget ADB)					
Outcome 4: Project Management					
Total Project PRODOC Budget	74,750	75,250	44,500	5,500	200,000

---

[1]Due to exchange rates, the actual AusAid contribution received was US$ 80,631.

Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	80,025	77,197	48,979	9,630	215,831
Disbursed (to date)	3,327	917	(39,791)	0	(35,546)
Remaining GEF Funds	76,698	76,280	88,770		
Grand Totals					
Total Project PRODOC Budget	720,882	642,425	64,850	145,200	1,573,357
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	728,157	698,357	324,596	120,054	1,871,164
Disbursed	670,884	573,620	192,408	0	1,436,912
Remaining GEF Funds	57,273	124,737	132,188		434,000

Summary of ADB Fund Dispersal

Outcome 3: (Outcome Budget ADB)					
Outcome	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**Total**
Total Project Budget as in Project Document	382,950	661,825	653,200	170,025	1,868,000*
Annual Work Plan	382,950	661,825	653200.00	552975.00	1,485,050
Disbursed	0	312,537	638961.66	10,267	961,766
Remaining Funds**	382,950	349,287	14,238	159,758	906,234

Revised TA amount; excludes government financing in kind
***As of 16 April 2012*

There are several critical budget issues that were not clarified during the evaluation period, such as: How much the project spent for each component; Monies shifted between components (e.g., additional spending by Component One and Two); and, Total GEF funds remaining? There is a possibility that the project has either nearly exhausted or overspent its GEF funding for Components 1, 2, and 4.

- Outcome One: the Project Document budgeted GEF funds of US$ 900,000. This entire budget was to support ICO (Global Ocean Forum). UNOPS contracted with ICO for approximately US$ 840,000, leaving a surplus of approximately US$ 60,000 in this contract. There is another US$ 90,000 remaining in the entire component, leaving approximately US$ 150,000. However, the evaluators were not privy to all accounting figures.

- Outcome Two: the Project Document budgeted GEF funds of US$ 400,000. The project has already spent US$ 469,691. The Annual Workplan calls for US$ 563,748

to be spent. This would represent an un-clarified US$ 165,000 overage. Many activities will be absorbed by IW:LEARN 3.

- Outcome Four: the Project Document budget GEF funds of US$ US$ 200,000. It is not clear from the information provided whether any of this funding remains.

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

Component One: Advancing the Global Agenda on Oceans, Coasts and Small Island Developing States

In August 2009, UNOPS entered into a contract with the International Coastal and Ocean Organization (Secretariat of the Global Ocean Forum) for approximately US$ 840,000. ICO has Special Consultative Status with UN ECOSOC. The detailed, seven-page agreement for delivery of services under the project covers the period between June 2009 and July 2013.

Component One: Support for ICO as Described in Project Document Budget Notes						
Activity/Expenditure	Int'l Consultants	Contractual Services	Travel	Publica-tions	Totals	%
1.1 Strategic planning support for Global Oceans Agenda	$52,800	$79,200	$20,000 $167,000	$64,000	$383,000	40%
1.2 Advice and organization support for Global Ocean Policy Day	$19,800	$25,300	$49,500		$144,100	15%
1.3 Policy Analysis for marine areas beyond national jurisdiction	$13,200	$16,500	$19,800		$49,500	5%
1.4 Develop Ocean Leadership training program	$23,100	$64,900	$165,000		$253,000	27%
1.5 Public Education and Outreach: Youth Forum, DVC, Youtube, etc.		$119,900			$119,900	13%
Totals	$108,900	$305,800	$421,300	$64,000	**$949,500**[2]	**100%**

Component One: Support for ICO as Described in UNOPS Contract						
Activity/Expenditure	Int'l Consultants	Contractual Services	Travel	Publica-tions	Totals	%
1.1 Strategic planning support for Global Oceans Agenda	$42,000	$78,400	177,333	$59,733	$357,466	42.6%
1.2 Advice and organization support for Global Ocean Policy Day	$18,000	$25,293	$45,000		$88,293	10.5%
1.3 Policy Analysis for marine areas beyond national jurisdiction	$12,000	$15,270	$18,480		$46,200	5.5%
1.4 Develop Ocean Leadership training program	$21,000	$61,133	$154,000		$236,133	28.1%
1.5 Public Education and Outreach: Youth Forum, DVC, Youtube, etc.		$111,907			$111,907	13.3%
Totals	$292,453	$394,813		$59,733	**$839,999**	**100%**

---

[2] The total GEF contribution was US$ 900,000. The total budget note figure was US$ 949,500.

	93,000					

By all accounts, GOF efforts under Component One (advancing the global oceans agenda) have been cost-effective. As detailed below in the description of activity, the GOF efforts under this output have helped to move the project towards the desired Outcome: To foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals and the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS, and in response to new ocean issues. The quality of outputs is high and the amount of documentation substantial. GOF has harnessed meaningful co-financing and leveraged action from several sources. GOF reports co-financing from thirty-four sources. This has further increased the cost-effectiveness of effort under Component One.

The major investment, the Global Oceans Conference of 2010, was a success. The conference engaged more than 800 global practitioners, advocates, and decision-makers from 80 countries, primarily developing nations including SIDS. This helped build significant momentum towards the adoption of positive policies and actions. GOF has also worked to advance the agenda through a number of other international forums. This includes policy briefs, arranging special events at major meetings such as UNFCC 15, 16, and 17, CBD COP 10, and taking an active role in a variety of intergovernmental consultative processes.

The Ocean Leadership program was abandoned and that 28% of the total Component budget shifted to support global leaders to bring the issue of ocean and coastal conservation to the forefront of the Rio+20 meetings. The project has managed to stimulate and organize several high-level coordination meetings.   The project plans to organize events at the Rio+20 meetings and support these with many of the policy and awareness materials generated by the project to date. The end result of this activity will hopefully be a strong push for the adoption of better global management and investment practices for ocean and coastal conservation. If this is successful, the cost-effectiveness of the investment could be substantial. With a very limited investment, the project will have successfully helped to increase awareness of ocean and coastal zone issues and, ideally, moved global leaders towards adopting policies that lead to improved conservation practices.

Output 1.5 (Public Education and Outreach) was to receive approximately 13% of the total Component budget. This output was designed around creating links between the World Ocean Conference of 2009 and the World Ocean Network (WON) and the World Ocean Observatory (WOO). The concept was that the project would generate learning tools that would involve some 250 museums and aquaria globally. The Global Ocean Forum prepared and disseminated, together with Nausicaa and the World Ocean Network, a package of public information materials highlighting global oceans issues that demonstrates how individual citizens can make a difference in achieving sustainable development of oceans.

According to the budget notes, policy analysis by GOF was to receive 5% of the total budget. This has been integrated into several parts of the ICO/GOF efforts. This includes activities under Output 1.3 (Enhancing Governance of Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction) as well as preparatory work and materials for several meetings and workshops as detailed below. Certainly in the near-term, this policy review has informed and improved the level of knowledge and understanding on the global level. However, the long-term impacts of these efforts are measured in periods beyond the scope of the mid-term evaluation.

Component Two: GEF International Waters Portfolio Learning

The total planned budget for Component Two was US$ 400,000.

Component Two: Support for GEF International Waters Portfolio Learning as described budget notes			
Budget Line	*Budget by Activity*	*Totals*	*%*
Learning Costs	Learning Exchange Program ($50,100) CTI Leadership Training WOC Manado, 2009 ($16,500) Experience notes: Global Oceans, IWC5 and CTI regional ($1,650)	$68,250	17%
ALD Employee Costs	IWC5 Coordinator($60,000) KM Specialist (52 weeks): Cross Fertilization of IW:LEARN and CTI; manage M&E ($88,400)	$148,400	37%
Travel	IW:LEARN/KM attend IWC5 IW:LEARN attend WOC 2009	$10,000	3%
Contractual Services	IWC5: Convention Center ($66,850); multi-media/KM ($30,000); Event Coordinator ($7,500); Pre-conference workshops ($50,000); Site Visit ($11,000)	$165,350	41%
Communications	IW: LEARN Support	$4,000	1%
Supplies	IW:LEARN: Workspace in Bratislava	$4,000	1%
Total		**$400,000**	**100%**

The Component Two budget can be grouped into five distinct activities:

1. IWC5($232,000 // 58% of total)
2. Knowledge Management Specialist ($88,400 // 22% of total)
3. Project to Project Learning Exchange ($ 50,100 // 13% of total)
4. WOC 2009, including experience notes ($ 21,500 // 5% of total)
5. IW:LEARN operations ($ 8,000 // 2% of total)

Component Two investments will result in global-scale amplification, making the cost effectiveness of these five investments is high.

By all accounts, the IWC5 was a success. The conference represented an investment of just over two hundred thousand dollars. The return was hundreds of professionals gathering from around the world to freely exchange their vast expertise and knowledge. Substantial co-financing was secured from a variety of sources for this activity. More than 20% of conference costs were covered by the private sector and NGOs. This further increased the cost-effectiveness of IWC5.

As noted, the WOC took place prior to project approval. However, this financing along with monies for the KM specialist was used to support other planned activities to support outcome achievement. This included development of more effective experience notes, project-to-project learning, strengthening the IW:LEARN knowledge platform, and, most recently, supporting CTI knowledge management and portal development. Co-financing from ADB, UNEP, IW:LEARN PCU and others have all extended the cost-effectiveness of these activities.

The total project costs for Component Two's learning and knowledge management activity is roughly US$ 170,000 for three years. The project-to-project learning program benefitted from the participation of dozens of professionals. IW:LEARN established fifteen workspaces for online communities of practice through IW:LEARN's Community Platform. Over 472 Community platform members are now participating in this program. By improving the capacities of project managers and decision-makers globally, the project will spend

US$ 60,000/year to increase the effectiveness of GEF IW global investments valued at tens of millions of dollars. This is an impressive return on investment and will lead to improved conservation of oceans and coastal areas on a global scale.

ADB/Component Three:

The achievements of the project to date are cost-effective. Due to the late start of the project (mid-2010), most of the outputs listed in Item 5.2.3 (i) were completed only in the last 15 months. Project situations like this would usually cause frantic activity, a mad rush for resources, and sloppy work quality. This did not happen here. The quality of the TA's knowledge products and learning events was high, as seen by this evaluator and attested to by partners interviewed. The project kept to the yearly budget allocations in 2010 and 2011 as shown by the disbursements.

(iii) Financial management

Components 1, 2, and 4

Financial management is handled jointly by the PCU and UNOPS. Budget matters are conducted according to standard operational procedures. As detailed in the evaluation report, implementation adaptations resulted in some budget lines being reassigned. These financial realignments were strategic and professionally managed.

ADB/Component Three:

Financial management is being done by ADB. Consultant firms and other providers agree to a service contract and mode of payment and bill the Bank based on their deliverables. Under ADB rules the hiring department accepts and reviews the deliverable and may request revisions. The Bank only processes payments authorized by the hiring department. Cash advances for certain expenses may be drawn by a contracted provider as pre-agreed with the hiring department, but these should be liquidated before any subsequent claims for payment on a deliverable are made.

(iv) Co-financing

The total GEF investment is US$ 1,500,000. Co-financing planned during project design was US$ 1,934,000. The total co-financing received should meet or surpass this estimate. Co-financing identified to date equals approximately US$ 2,412,884. GOF reported $895,216 in additional leveraged resources (in-kind and cash) from 34 organizations (from governments, NGOs, international organizations, and foundations).

For Component One, GOF supplied the evaluators with a comprehensive accounting of co-financing commitments equaling US$ 1,117,000. GOF accounts include both in-kind and cash contributions from twelve different international sources. Total component co-financing received to date is approximately US$ 985,884.

For Component Two, AusAid provided US$ 80,000 in cash co-financing that was managed directly by the project. Although not fully tallied, numerous donors, governments, NGOs and private organizations have provided additional co-financing. This includes UNESCO support for IWC5, contributions from a variety of sources for learning programs, and UNEP financing for several IW:LEARN project related knowledge management activities.

For Component Three, ADB support for CTI represents US$ 1,267,000 in co-financing. By responding to Australia's interest in additional activities in the Pacific CTI countries, the project team secured an additional US$ 167,000 to fund research on the economics of

fisheries and aquaculture in Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, and East Timor. The project captured an additional US$ 55,000 grant from the WorldFish Center - SI to complete an economic valuation of coral exports from the Solomon Islands.

The PMU provided summary of co-financing is attached as an evaluation annex.

5.2.5   Execution and implementation modalities

(i) Is project implementation being done in an efficient and effective manner?

Components 1, 2, and 4

Project implementation appears to be both efficient and effective. Management by the PCU, UNOPS, and component leaders is highly professional. Some activities have not materialized. Financing from these and other activities were appropriately shifted to take advantage of emerging opportunities. Although many activities were to be completed within the first two project years, including the entirety of Component 2, project implementation teams have shown a willingness to continue providing support for revised conditions. As a result of this professional support and strategic adaptive management, the project is on-track to deliver most critical outputs and appears to be making effective progress toward outcome achievement.

ADB/Component Three:

The TA is carrying on the momentum it has built since 2010. It has further engaged the CT6 countries by participating in the activities of Indonesia and Philippines NCCs, integrating the Knowledge Integrators in the project, and finalizing the appointment of country lead writers for the SCTR, and helping the NCCs develop their websites, among other accomplishments. It is now continuing its activities toward institutional and financial sustainability and greater stakeholder involvement, such as preparing for the High-Level Financial Round Table Discussion in May 2012 and working out with the Australian government the pre-conference KM symposium at the International Coral Reef Symposium (ICRS) in July 2012 in Cairns, Australia.

The June 2011 Project Implementation Report rated the TA's progress at 65% and its disbursement percentage at 43%. The PIR notes: "Overall, the milestones targeted for the TA have been achieved, and there are indications that they are likely to be surpassed."

(ii) Is there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation?

Components 1, 2, and 4

As noted throughout this evaluation, Component 4 was made responsible for "synergy". However, no tools were described to accomplish this task. In spite of this, project is marked by effective inter-component communication. A host of highly qualified international professionals implement this project. These persons are aware of each other's activities and communicate regularly. The quality and expediency of communication during the evaluation process was highly indicative.

ADB/Component Three:

Project implementers and their development partners are distributed in six countries. Communication is facilitated through regular use of conventional and new media-based communication systems such as meetings and workshops, phone and Skype conferences, the CTI News and Learning Notes, the portal coraltriangleinitiative.net or CTI's Facebook account.

The project file management system (PFMS) helps them find documents and other materials on the project and its nascent Project Directory contains the information and contact addresses of TA implementers, development partners, donors, other potential contacts. By joining one of the communities of practice (CoPs) set up on the IW:LEARN platform, they can be informed of the latest in their area of specialization.

TA implementers are talking within and across organizations, specialization groups, NCCs, and between regional and country entities in connection with implementation of current and upcoming TA activities and issues that constrain them. For instance, TA is continuing efforts to communicate with a partner, CTSP, who has taken issue on the TA's portal coraltriangleinitiative.net as duplicating a portal it is building, coralttriangleinitiative.org. TA is actively seeking resolution of the issue as it is convinced that beyond being a finished product, coraltriangleinitiative.net facilitates learning and communication among CT6 countries.

(iii) Are the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?

<u>Components 1, 2, and 4</u>

This was not possible to accurately evaluate due to a lack of comprehensive budget figures. However, overall impressions are quite positive.

<u>ADB/Component Three:</u>

Administrative costs of Component Three are somewhat high, approximately 21-24% of total budget. These are within reason considering the technical skills, personal commitment, and professional network the manager – specifically the Team Leader. The efficiency of managerial and technical expertise in one person is a bonus, as well as the administrative support ensured by a whole consultant organization that she has at her disposal.

5.3.1   Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective

Status Ratings

Achieved	*A*
Partially Achieved	*PA*
No substantive/measurable progress to date	*NSMP*
Not Commenced	*NC*

Project Objective: Improved management of coastal and marine ecosystems through efficient and effective inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes.	PA

Component 1	Advancing the Global Agenda on Oceans, Coasts and Small Island Developing States	

Outcome 1	To foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals and the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS, and in response to new ocean issues.	A

Summary of outcome progress to date:

The project has delivered and/or is on-track to deliver most associated activities. The cumulative impact of implemented activities represents substantial progress towards the desired outcome.

Approximately 65% of the total GEF budget is dedicated to Outcome One. The primary output for this component was the provision of technical support for the implementation of the 2010 Global Oceans Conference. This output was achieved.

The project has not deliver a single "Global Oceans Strategic Plan to 2016". The project has created three strong policy briefs (biodiversity, climate, governance). The project has generated "Report Cards on the UNCED/WSD Commitments on Oceans, Coasts, and Island States" that contain several useful policy and action recommendations. The Rio+20 report generated by GOF is comprehensive with an annex that offers "Action Items and Recommendations from Agenda 21 and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) Related to Oceans, Coasts, and Small Island Developing States." Some of these policy efforts are built upon efforts commenced prior to project implementation. For instance, a set of policy recommendations on oceans and climate was completed for the 2009 Manado WOC.

As noted, the project's logical framework does not provide a mechanism for evaluating impact. A comprehensive review of documentation, conversations with interlocutors, and review of other project deliverables and evaluation tools indicates that the cumulative impact of activities is leading towards achievement of the outcome. The project has certainly fostered significant critical thinking, learning, and partnership building in relationship to ocean concerns. Participation and topics covered in the 2010 GOC, for instance, appears to be exemplary and represents a substantial body of work.

Output 1.1: Completed
Over one-third of the total project budget was used to by IOC/GOF to provide technical support to the 2010 Global Oceans Conference, including several pre- and post- conference related activities (Output 1.1). This output was completed.

Output 1.2: Completed
The project was to support the 2009 World Ocean Conference. The conference took place prior to project commencement. The output was achieved with GOF providing advance funding with reimbursement after project approval.

Output 1.3: Completed
The project was to support enhancement of governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction. The output was achieved through a series of ad hoc presentations made by IOC/GOF as intended at the time of project design. This work led to the establishment of the GEF/FAO new program in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction, representing a substantial investment of GEF and co-financing funds.

Output 1.4: Completed
The project was to create a $250,000 global leadership ocean and coastal conservation training program. This activity was abandoned and substituted with work to generate global leadership awareness designed to lead to substantive decisions to support ocean and coastal conservation prior to and during the Rio+20 meetings. This is a reasonable alternative and was achieved.

Output 1.5: Completed
The project was to create a substantial ocean conservation/climate change public awareness campaign stemming from the results of the 2009 WOC. This activity took place during and following the 2009 WOC with funding advanced by the World Ocean Network. The project launched a series of public

awareness programs.

#	Output	Status
Output 1.1	Strategic Planning to Advance the Global Oceans Agenda to 2016 and Organization of the 5th Global Oceans Conference in 2010	A
1.1.1	Strategic Planning to Advance the Global Oceans Agenda to 2016	A

Under this output, the GOF Secretariat was to foster strategic planning in the areas of climate change and biodiversity conservation linked to the management of freshwater, oceans, and coasts in the following major fora: (i) climate negotiations in 2009, 2010, and 2011 (UNFCCC COP-15 in Denmark, December 2009,COP16 in Cancun, December 2010, and COP17 in Durban, December 2011); (ii) biodiversity negotiations in Nagoya, Japan in December 2010 (CBD COP10); and (iii) the 5th World Water Forum (WWF) in 2009.

The ICO/GOF completed the following key activities:

- Produced Policy Briefs covering climate, biodiversity, and governance that incorporated discussions of the other WSSD topics
- Participated in negotiations leading up to and during UNFCCC COP-15, Denmark, December 7-18, 2009
- Facilitated and participated in panel discussion at the 5th World Water Forum (WWF) on March 16-22, 2009
- UN Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea, New York, June 17-19, 2009,
- Facilitated various meetings leading up to and at the Convention on Biological Diversity COP10 in Nagoya, Japan on October 18-29, 2010 (CBD COP10)

Of Note: The Global Ocean Forum organized, together with Government of Mexico and other partners, the Oceans Day in Cancun during the UNFCCC COP 16, December 4, 2010. Over 90 representatives attended the event. This satisfied a top priority under the original project design: "to bring the "oceans perspective" to the UNFCC climate negotiations, emphasizing the central role of the oceans in climate change and the 7-point agenda on oceans/climate agreed to at the Hanoi global oceans conference." This was followed with the organization of the Oceans Day at Durban in 2011.

http://www.globaloceans.org/content/oceans-day-cancun

http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/sd/ymbvol186num1e.pdf

http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/sd/ymbvol186num2e.pdf

1.1.2	Organize the 5th Global Oceans Conference, to be held April 2010 at UNESCO, Paris, France	A

The project supported co-organization and co-financing of the 2010 GOC.

More than 800 participants representing 80 countries attended the 2010 GOC. This surpassed the expectation of 500. Attendees included persons representing a myriad of international organizations, governments, NGO, and civil society organizations. The Global Ocean Forum co-sponsored the event and provided over-all technical support. The three policy briefs prepared under 1.1.1 (climate, biodiversity, governance) were center-points of the conference.

According to the project document, several innovations were anticipated including:
- A two-day policy conference;
- A 1-day high level segment;

- A 2-day technical session which would include a science and technology component of special relevance for the ocean/climate discussions; and
- Strong connections with other conferences in the field which would have an opportunity to report.

Each was implemented with very strong technical support from a wide-variety of stakeholders. This includes a series of special round-tables, multiple day technical symposia, etc. The "high level" segment included invited representation from seven major regions covering the globe. There was a round-table specifically for Ocean Parliamentarians, one for National Political Leaders, and one for Regional and Local Authorities.

A complete summary of the conference may be viewed here:

http://www.globaloceans.org/content/5th-global-conference-oceans-coasts-and-islands

http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/sd/ymbvol68num5e.pdf

| Output 1.2 | World Ocean Conference 2009, Manado, Indonesia | A |

The WOC 2009 took place prior to the commencement of this project. GOF organized the Global Ocean Policy Day, bringing together 500 high-level participants from all sectors. The GOF prepared a volume of detailed policy papers on the range of issues associated with climate and oceans, including mitigation, adaptation, financing, and capacity development.

| Output 1.3 | Enhancing Governance of Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction | A |

The project document notes that GOF had completed substantial work on building consensus on various issues related to governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction. The project document further states: "Immediate next steps are to report to the G-77 and other country groupings at the UN, to present findings at the next meeting of the UN *Ad Hoc* Group on the subject (2010), to continue the policy analyses and dialogues, and to develop a series of regional case studies for possible support by the GEF (in GEF5) and other partners."

The GOF presented outcomes of GOF activities at a side event during the Third Meeting of the UN Ad Hoc Working Group on Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction on February 5, 2010. The GOF also submitted to GEF case studies for possible GEF5 support for the following regions: Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems (East Africa/Western Indian Ocean); OSPAR Region (Northeast Atlantic); Coral Triangle/French Polynesia; and, The Arctic. Project effort ultimately led to adoption by the GEF of a new program on ABNJ in association with the FAO.

| Output 1.4 | Ocean Leadership Training for High-Level Decision Makers | A |

The activity was originally designed to broadly: "foster the development of "ocean leadership" among high-level decision-makers in developing countries and SIDS, including both the highest level permanent officials at national levels and in the UN country missions in New York." This was to be accomplished through the design and implementation of a multi-tiered training and capacity building program.

This activity was altered. The training budget (approximately US$ 253,000) was channeled to provide assistance to build capacity for high-level government decision-makers to move ocean conservation forward during the Rio+20 meetings. Although this is a divergence from the original project design, the project is remaining within the intended "capacity building" and "target audience" intentions of the original design while responding to an identified need/opportunity. This represents progress towards the desired outcome.

The major accomplishments under this activity include: 1) A major report assessing progress achieved in meeting the oceans commitments from the 1992 Earth Summit and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development; 2) Assistance to countries in their assessments and preparation

for Rio+20 through the Rio+20 Friends of the Ocean and several consultations held; and 3) Activities to promote oceans at Rio+20, including the conduct of Oceans Day at Rio+20 (co-organized with 23 other partners and which brought together 375 participants from 46 countries).

Activity to date includes:

- Preparation of detailed assessments on Oceans and Coasts for Rio+20, providing detailed analyses of the extent to which (and how) the oceans, coasts, and SIDS international goals from UNCED and the WSSD have been implemented. These supported national preparations for Rio+20 and served as a basis for a coherent list of policy actions submitted as input to the zero draft of the Rio+20 outcome document in November 2011;
- Launch of the Rio+20 Friends of the Ocean, and Internet-based effort to mobilize a broad constituency to support oceans at Rio+20
- A series of consultations with global leaders regarding how best to achieve a significant Rio+20 ocean outcome (examples: Rio+20 PrepCom2, March 8, 2011, UN, New York; Rio+20 Consultation, June 19, 2011, UN, New York; Consultations with UN Missions, New York, September 2011; Rio+20 Friends of the Ocean meetings, June 20 and 22, 2011, UN, New York; presentations at Rio+20 negotiations in 2012, etc.)
- Organization of The Oceans Day at Rio+20, on June 16, 2012, bringing together major governments and interests to coalesce around oceans during the Rio+20 conference—involving 375 participants from 46 countries. Participants at The Oceans Day at Rio+20 reviewed the emerging Rio+20 oceans outcomes, analyzed implementation challenges for the emerging ocean package, and highlighted initiatives (including Rio+20 voluntary commitments) to move forward on implementation post-Rio.
- The GOF also prepared and registered with the Rio+20 Secretariat two voluntary commitments to be carried out post-Rio: A major initiative in capacity development, and a program of tracking global commitments on oceans, coasts, and SIDS from 1992, 2002, and 2012.

Output 1.5	Public Education and Outreach	A

The 2009 WOC took place in Manado, Indonesia during May 2009. The Nausicaa and the World Ocean Network advanced the funding to start this activity in May 2009 (in time for the World Ocean Conference) prior to project commencement.

The project intended to provide direct support to GOF to create a public awareness program devoted to oceans and climate change. GOF was to build upon their on-going preparatory work for UNFCC negotiations. The effort was to include the execution of briefings at the WOC 2009. These briefings were to be collated,complimented by "state-of-the-art videos"and all materials subsequently distributed. Distributionwas to feed into the more than 250 museums and aquaria represented by the World Ocean Network and the World Ocean Observatory.

The Global Ocean Forum has prepared and disseminated, together with Nausicaa and the World Ocean Network, a package of public information materials highlighting global oceans issues and demonstrating how individual citizens can make a difference in achieving sustainable development of oceans. The Ocean Info Pack is an interactive tool that is continually updated through participant contributions. Ocean Info Pack website (in English, French and Spanish): http://oceaninfopack.worldoceannetwork.org.

The main focus of the Global Ocean Forum communications strategy is the crafting and communication of messages extracted from the output of the Global Ocean Forum Working Groups, including the Policy Briefs prepared for Global Oceans Conferences, in order to effectively provide information to the Global Ocean Forum constituency through various appropriate media so they can mobilize in carrying out initiatives to achieve the WSSD targets on oceans and coasts.

In 2009-2012, this work has been especially devoted to oceans and climate to coincide with the Global Ocean Forum's efforts associated with the UNFCCC 15th Conference of the Parties, December 7-18, 2009, Copenhagen, the 5th Global Oceans Conference, May 3-7, 2010, UNESCO, Paris, the

Oceans Day at the UNFCCC in Cancun, December 2010, and the Oceans Day at the UNFCCC in Durban, December 2011.

Oceans Day in Copenhagen:

- Promotional video for Oceans Day in Copenhagen:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zpXxTPmLKR4

- Press release disseminated via PR Newswire to all major media outlets in the US and international outlets with domestic bureaus, including all environmental trade publications; also distributed to targeted media via the media coordinator

- A Media Packet distributed to interested and attending media. The Packet included all relevant materials to Oceans Day and included new Fact Sheets produced by the Global Ocean Forum

- A New Media Outreach Initiative was put into motion: 1) A Facebook Oceans Day page and a Twitter account @OceansDay2009 were initiated; Blogging on Oceans Day.

- Media outlets present at Oceans Day to cover the event: Associated Press, Reuters News Agency, Der Spiegal Magazine, Climate Change TV, Vanity Fair Magazine, Le Development Durable TV, Le Point Magazine, Found Object Films, Solomon Star Newspaper, and Sea Change Radio. Interviews were facilitated with key representatives of Oceans Day.

- Oceans Day, in its entirety, was live streamed to the nearby WWF Arctic Tent and posted on-line across the globe to ensure the widest-possible audience - Resulting media coverage: At least 16 samples identified, including from BBC News, Boston Herald, etc.

5th Global Oceans Conference:
In collaboration with WON and the World Ocean Observatory, the Global Ocean Forum has used the Internet for public education and to promote oceans events through the development of public outreach websites. The following special websites and YouTube channels were created specifically to inform audiences across the world about the context and work of the Global Ocean Forum using rich media:

Oceans Day at Copenhagen website:
http://www.oceansday.org/c-index.html

Oceans=Climate website:
http://www.oceanclimate.org/

Oceans Day at Cancun website:
http://www.oceansday.org/

5th Global Oceans Conference Public Outreach Website:
http://www.goc2010.org/ (The recent total views was approximately 3,500)

Component 2	GEF International Waters Portfolio Learning

Outcome 2	Improved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems. Expected learning outcomes include assessable increased GEF IW project capacity at 3 levels: (i) individual project stakeholders; (ii) organizations; and (iii) governments, fostering enabling environments for transboundary cooperation to deepen and accelerate EBM and policy reform processes.	PA

Summary of outcome progress to date:

The project has delivered and/or is on-track to deliver most associated activities. Due to a later than anticipated project start, Sub-Output 2.1.1 was not implemented as planned. The project faced substantial challenges with Output 2.3. The component has made significant progress towards outcome achievement in spite of these difficulties.

Example of movement towards the outcome includes approximately 54% of all GEF IW projects now syndicating content to IW:LEARN. Nearly 100% of GEF IW projects now referencing other GEF projects in their Requests for CEO Endorsement.

Approximately 26% of the project's GEF funds were dedicated to supporting this component. The component is comprised of three main outputs.

Output 2.1 and 2.2 are linked to the execution of the IWC5. Both present a mixed bag of preparatory work, execution, and post-conference leveraged activities. This conference was held in Cairns, Australia during October 2009. Effort to date has resulted in an expansion of knowledge, information transfer, and coordination designed to catalyze more effective ocean and coastal management. The outputs related specifically to implementation of IWC5 were completed. The leadership-training program was been implemented as designed. However, reasonable alternative measures are being taken. The CTI regional learning process, stakeholder learning exchanges, and experience notes are moving forward.

Output 2.3 was to generate a robust monitoring and evaluation program for GEF IW projects to track contributions to MDGs and inform the GOF, the CTI regional learning processes, 6th GEF IWC learning cycle, and the World Water Forum processes. Funds were allocated for two persons, the GEF-IWC5 Coordinator and a Knowledge Management specialist, to complete these deliverables. The project has been slow to deliver these outputs for a number of reasons related to budget confusion, lack of specificity in the project document, and information access constraints beyond the immediate control of the project.

#	Output	Status
Output 2.1	Fifth Biennial GEF IW Conference participative learning program	PA
2.1.1	GEF IW leadership learning program	PA

The activity as described in the project document has not been implemented.

According to the project document, this activity was to result in a learning program linked to IWC5. This was to benefit GEF IWC participants and, as stated in the project document pay "particular attention… to bridging integrated ocean and coastal management and IWRM, including integration of groundwater management, by involving the freshwater portfolio of projects in relevant CoPs or Working Groups of the GOF."

The activity was to be collaborative between IW:LEARN and GOF. The activity was to build upon Output 1.4 (Ocean Leadership Training for High-Level Decision Makers). As noted, Output 1.4 was altered to become a Rio+20 preparatory activity and the Ocean Leadership training program was not created.

Although the activities were not conducted exactly as foreseen, IW:LEARN has engaged in the development of several decision-support tools and training courses covering germane issues to support IW Leadership Training. This included supporting a final workshop in May 2011 in Sweden to test and develop the tools. Fifteen GEF IW project managers were in attendance. Six received funding from this project to attend.

The project description can be found here:

www.governance-iwlearn.org

A description of the Stockholm activities is here:

http://governance-iwlearn.org/workshops/stockholm/

IW:LEARN also increased GEF IW project interaction. The project first used LinkedIn with little success. The project shifted the approach and fostered Community Platforms through the IW:LEARN network. There are now hundreds of participants benefiting from electronically available information and expertise.

2.1.2	Collaborative website development	A

The project was to develop a collaborative website to support IWC5. This was to include: online communications platform including registration mechanism, multimedia project profiles, virtual Innovation Marketplace, IWC Reflections videos, regional and thematic CoPs, including GOF Working Groups.   IW:LEARN generated this website, supporting materials, and a "conference tracker".

The IWC5 website and "tracker" may be viewed here:

http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events/iwc5/gef-iwc5

http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/pct/sc/iwc5/iwc5-tracker

2.1.3	IWC5 Pre-conference targeted workshops	A

As planned in the project document, IW:LEARN organized a series of pre-IWC5 conference workshops at Cairns, Australia. This was accomplished with UNESCO co-financing. Approximately 56 presentations were given by in both the marine/freshwater workshops with over one hundred professionals participating.   Feedback and reviews reflect a high-level of both participation and performance. This may be credited to IW:LEARN and their partnering with eight separate Australian centers of excellence.

A full list of pre-workshop activities may be reviewed here:

http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events/iwc5/iwc5-agenda-and-presentations

2.1.4	Organization of IWC5	A

The IWC5 workshop was completed with IW:LEARN support as planned. Approximately 300 global professionals attended representing over seventy nations, sixty GEF IW projects. The outputs from the workshop were substantial: 95 challenges of mainstreaming climatic variability and change were identified, 108 recommendations to governments provided, and 95 recommendations to program GEF5 were furnished.   Four key projects (Coral Reef Targeted Research, Hai River, East Asian Seas, Pacific Wastewater) and one strategic partnership (Coral Triangle Initiative) hosted the IWC5. Each presented achievements to date and future plans.

IW:LEARN conducted "post-conference" evaluation with 77 of 293 participants responding.   The results are informative, both in terms of evaluation of the IWC5 and recommendations for future activities. From a possible score of 5, participants reported the following cumulate scores:

- Consider the event a success: 3.84
- Directly applicable to work functions: 3.7
- Allowed sufficient time for networking: 3.6
- Enhanced their understanding of results-based management: 3.2

	Communicated strategies for mainstreaming climatic variability and change: 3.2	

The final IWC5 report may be down-loaded here:

http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events/abt_iwlearn/events/iwc5/iwc5_finalreport.pdf

The IWC5 evaluation summary may be down-loaded here:

http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/events/abt_iwlearn/events/iwc5/iwc5_evaluation_report.pdf

2.1.5	CTI regional learning process	PA

The ProDoc describes three activities under this sub-output:

- CTI was to feature within the IWC5 learning program;
- IW:LEARN was to "facilitate integration of the CTI regional learning portal" within IW:LEARN's website; and,
- IW:LEARN was to facilitate a climate change and environmental security bridging workshop during the Manado Conference (WOC 2009).

The first was accomplished. CTI was a featured prominently during the IWC5. This included playing "host", providing formal presentations regarding on-going and proposed activity, and persons associated with CTI actively participating in numerous conference events.

The second, facilitation of the CTI portal, has been slow to mature. Traction is now being gained. The CTI KM group is using IW:LEARN. Numerous CTI/IW:LEARN news items were posted on IW:LEARN between June and November 2011. The IW:LEARN technical team was engaged in on-line training as well as two on-site training programs for CTI focal points: one during May 2011 in Thailand and a second in March 2012 in the Philippines.There is also agreement to utilize IW:LEARN (both a toolkit website as well as the community platform) to generate a regional plan of action and broad CTI knowledge integration.

The third activity was to support the 2009 WOC. Again, this conference took place prior to project implementation.

The IW:LEARN CTI knowledge hub may be viewed at:

http://www.coraltriangleinitiative.net/knowledge-hub/images-1/IWLEARN_logo.gif/view

The IW:LEARN CTI learning resource network may be viewed at:

http://www.coraltriangleinitiative.net/

Output 2.2	Post-IWC5 learning exchanges and GEF IW Experience Notes	PA
2.2.1	Stakeholder Learning Exchanges	PA

The project document calls for five to tenproject-to-project exchanges. IW:LEARN has conducted four "project to project" exchanges to date involving twelvedifferent GEF IW projects.

- Nutrient reduction (Mediterranean, Skadar Lake; Serbia, Oct 2010);
- Mariculture practices (GCLME and YSLME; Ghana, Feb 2010);
- IW Leadership training (Dnipro, SWIOFP, Caspian, Volta, Timor Arafura; Sweden, May 2011);
- Knowledge management for the CTI countries (CTI, PEMSEA and CTI Sulu Celebes; Philippines, March 2012);

IW:LEARN will organize three more exchanges prior to project close. These will likely include:

• Agulhas Somali; • African Freshwater projects; • Lake Victoria A description of these exchanges, including participants, topics and links to many presentation and background materials, may be found here: http://iwlearn.net/abt_iwlearn/history-of-iw-learn/pns/learning/activityb3		
2.2.2	GEF IW Experience Notes	PA
Under this sub-output, IW:LEARN is to produce at least thirty GEF IW experience notes. The notes were not completed prior to the GOC 2010 due to the later than anticipated project commencement. To date, IW:LEARN has generated twenty-one experience notes and will complete at least nine more prior to project close. The experience notes are quite excellent and cover a wide variety of topics and ecosystems. IW:LEARNhas also created a useful compendium with abstracts and link to all experience notes. The experience notes compendium may be viewed at: http://iwlearn.net/publications/experience-note		
Output 2.3	Monitoring and evaluation	NA
2.3.1	Inclusion of GEF IW projects in global fora	NA
IW:LEARN is to facilitate participation of GEF IW projects and include their priority issues, experience and accomplishments in wider global fora such as the GOF and World Water Forum. This sub-output has not been addressed. The project document's budget notes state that approximately US$ 88,400 of project financing will be used to support a knowledge management specialist. This includes the tasks of ensuring "delivery of knowledge products and outputs from the component, as well as to ensure cross-fertilization with CTI and GOF component activities and manage M&E, in particular linking the outputs of these components to IW:LEARN activities and services". This may have been meant to include facilitating participation of GEF IW projects within GOF and the World Water Forum. Regardless, there was confusion and perception that no money was allocated to support the output. Although there are no plans to continue this activity with the IW:LEARN/CTI project, several GEF IW projects and associated activities have been represented at the World Water Forum and their representatives have attended GOF roundtables with IW:LEARN support. In addition, the overall activity was subsumed under IW:LEARN3/MENARID.		
2.3.2	Tracking contributions to MDGs	NA
A preliminary mechanism for tracking GEF IW project contributions towards MDGs was to be established under this sub-output with the support of the IW:LEARN knowledge management specialist. The mechanism was to be developed in consultation with the GEF IW Task Force. A distinct set of indicators was to be developed and included in the results framework for new projects. The idea is to create a comparable set of data to help inform global progress. There has been no progress to date. The challenges stem from project reporting information access limitations. The issue was raised with the GEF International Waters Task force and will continue to be pursued, ideally as a GEF IW tracking tool.		

Component 3	Coral Triangle Initiative

Outcome 3	Improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action through inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes.	PA

Summary of outcome progress to date:

The TA seeks to achieve improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action by developing KM support to a) sustainable financing, b) economic research in support of policy, and c) preparation of the State of the Coral Triangle Report. The following knowledge products have been developed/ conducted by the TA as of April 2012: i) 7 issues of the newsletter CTI News; ii) 11 Learning or Experience Notes on the 3 focus areas; iii) 8 other knowledge outputs, including a final Communication Strategy, draft Financial Architecture for the CTI, and several materials containing preliminary results of the E-FACT study.

Four (4) learning systems were completed during the period: i) Online project file management system (PFMS) and project KM website using the IW:LEARN website tool kit; iiFacebook page to promote CTI in social media; iii)An e-group to facilitate communication and CoPs for focus area specialists using the IW:LEARN facility ; iv) CTI Learning Resource Network (LRN) developed in collaboration with IW:LEARN

Learning activities included 18 workshops and seminars at regional and country venues, including needs assessment and planning workshops at regional and CT6 levels and workshops on the 3 focus areas. Eight major meetings also were held, including the 1st Tripartite Meeting, project inception meeting, and meetings on the E-FACT study and the SCTR preparation activity.

Major outputs that remain to be done are the High-Level Financial Round Table discussion in May, the pre-conference on KM at the ICRS in July, institutionalization of the Payment for Environmental Services (PES), financial resource mobilization for the NPoAs, and learning exchange and knowledge sharing.

#	Output	Status
Output 3.1	Stakeholder participation and consultation	*PA*

The structure for stakeholder participation and consultation has been set up (KI, NCC, SAC, Regional CTI Secretariat, TA Team) and the venues initiated (NCC meetings, Senior Officials' Meeting, consultations on different topics), although its sustainability is not ensured pending the setup of the permanent Regional CTI Secretariat.

Output 3.2	Institutional capacity strengthening	*PA*

Activities to develop capacities related to the 3 focus areas and KM have been done – workshops, online conferences, mentoring, etc. The portal on the CTI coraltriangleinitiative.net provides information and learning activities on the focus areas. Stakeholders need to be encouraged to use it for information and interaction. Applications have to be added to raise its capacity to the Transaction level.

Output 3.3	Communication plan and information dissemination	*PA*

The dissemination end of the KM continuum is still largely at the Information level: CTI News, Learning Notes. These have to be raised to the Interactive or Transaction level to optimize benefits. Non-web complement also has to be set up to reach those who are outside the Internet loop.

Output 3.4	Setting up the foundation for pilot projects	*NA*

An Output dropped when project design was changed at Inception Workshop July 2010 to focus on knowledge management in 3 areas: sustainable financing, payment for environmental services, and preparation of the SCTR.

Output 3.5	Innovative financing of coastal and marine projects	*PA*

This has been brought to the awareness of TA implementers and partners. This difficult content needs to be made more understandable using KM and communication tools .

Component 4	Project Coordination and Management

Outcome 4	Improved coordination and integration between the global oceans and coastal agenda, the GEF international waters portfolio, and CTI.	PA

Summary of outcome progress to date:

Component Four is to provide management, M&E and, inter-component synergy.

The project has benefitted from very professional management provided primarily by the project coordination unit located in Bangkok with excellent support from IW:LEARN, IOC/GOF, and UNOPS. Project M&E follows standard UNDP and GEF procedures.

The third task to be undertaken through this component is somewhat challenged.   The project coordination unit is to generate synergies to enhance portfolio learning with an emphasis on integrated management in regional processes as well as transboundary cooperation themes. This element is critical to outcome achievement, has received substantial as hoc support from the non-formalized steering committee, the project coordination unit, and project implementers. The logical framework simply states as measurement of progress towards the outcome: "At least 1,000 CTI practitioners effectively linked to global best practice through IW:LEARN by December 2011." This has not yet been achieved, but may be achieved if the IW:LEARN/CTI coordination efforts move forward aggressively.

#	Output	Status
Output 4.1	Effective linkage of global, regional, and national level coastal and marine EBM	PA

As noted above, this output has certainly received attention. Linkages between the GOF and CTI components, although they exist, are not formal and/or strategic. IW:LEARN is linked to CTI activities. As described under Component 2, this includes providing assistance with portal development and other knowledge management activities. Again, nearly all of this work is ad hoc and an ancillary benefit of action taken under each component.   The project has not benefitted from a clear coordination strategy designed to build synergies between the three components. Unfortunately, the project document does not describe such a requirement.

Output 4.2	Efficient, transparent, and effective results-based management of all project components.	PA

This output is on-track. Regular financial and implementation reporting and monitoring take place. The mid-term evaluation was conducted at an appropriate time in the project cycle. A final evaluation is planned prior to project close.

5.3.2   Sustainability

Ratings	
Likely (L)	There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Sustainability Factor	Rating	Comments
Financial Resources	L	*Components 1, 2, and 4* Most project activities will not be financially self-sustaining. This is indicative of the nature of the effort and does not reflect any project inadequacies. Activities are dependent upon inputs from international donors. However, it is very likely that donors will continue support. IW:LEARN has a proven track record and is on an upward trajectory. The catalytic work of GOF will continue to be relevant.
	ML	*Component 3* The project is likely to be adequately funded to complete its deliverables, but there are moderate risks of the sustainability of its activities at the country level.
Sociopolitical	L	*Components 1, 2, and 4* Representatives of global organizations, governments, and civil societies tend to be highly supportive of the project's activities. Although long-term and sustainable uptake is difficult to gauge, commitment to participate in forums such as IW:LEARN, IWC, and GOC seems to be stable and/or growing.
	L	*ADB/Component Three:* Partners and stakeholders have now been suitably sensitized about the importance of knowledge and information on the 3 focus areas and KM, having learned their lesson on the environment as the bigger concern. With the proper approach, sociopolitical support is likely.
Institutional Framework and Governance	L	*Components 1, 2, and 4* The project is geared towards building international capacity to improve governance of oceans and coastal areas. Although there is no specific institutional and/or governance framework

| | | established by the project, many project results such as policy improvements, knowledge improvements, etc. will be integrated within international and national management frameworks.

The project is working towards building momentum for decision-makers to adopt improved policies during the Rio+20 summit. In addition, the project has worked with GEF as an institution to improve the IW portfolio monitoring, management, and cross-fertilization. |
| | L | *ADB/Component Three:*

Where there is sociopolitical impetus, there also will be a will toward building an institutional framework and governance. |
| Environmental | L | *Components 1, 2, and 4*

The project is specifically designed to motivate improved management of IW, particularly oceans and coastal areas. This includes reference to key issues such as biodiversity conservation and climate change. |
| | L | *ADB/Component Three:*

This project is primarily capacity building and its output is knowledge and information. Its content will impact on the environment by promoting more effective coastal and marine resources management. |

Part 6. Lessons learned

This project provides positive lessons that may be applied to future programming.

1.   *Investing in high-caliber international expertise can be cost-effective.*

        The project has recruited and mobilized top experts. This is reflected in the quality and efficiency of deliverables produced. High-caliber technical support may be costly, but may ultimately be more effective than cheaper alternatives in terms of providing service value for recipient stakeholders.

2.   *Investing in multi-layered programs with international perspective can be effective*

        At first glance, the complex design of this project may mask the potential effectiveness. However, this program responded well to an important global need (degradation of ocean and coastal integrity) that can only be addressed through a coordinated global response. The project has not always been effective at catalyzing synergy between the components, but overall the project has shown that this sort of investment has merit and can provide benefits well beyond the relatively low cost.

3.   *Complex initiatives with multiple activity tracks may benefit from project design documents that integrate and align components to maximize synergy.*

        The project document would have benefitted from a separate section specifically describing how inter-component synergy would be achieved. This would be reflected in the management structure, results framework, and/or with the generation of a brief project integration strategy completed at project inception.

        Cross-fertilization was certainly an element of the initial project design. The project's objective is: "Effective, efficient management systems drawn from targeted learning from the GEF international waters (IW) program applied in the Coral Triangle and other areas by 2010."   The project implementers are carrying integration forward. Several examples are noted in this evaluation.

        With slightly more strategic and creative integration, this project would have likely achieved much higher-impacting levels of synergy.   With more strategic harmonization, GOF could have identified improved management approaches. CTI would trial these approaches. The IW:LEARN would capture and disseminate best-practices to global GEF IW partners. Likewise, lessons generated via CTI could directly inform GOF activity. This same three-tiered, learning loop approach could be subsequently shifted to other regions.   This would eventually create stronger regional cohesion and, ultimately, global collaboration and learning.

4.   *Projects designed to catalyze governance and management improvements may benefit from target improvements defined at project inception and reflected in results frameworks.*

        This project's objective and each of the components are directed towards improving management of oceans and coastal areas.   However, the project's monitoring framework does not create parameters to describe those improvements. For instance, the objective level indicator measures access to learning, not improved management. In the future, it may be useful to consider defining what constitutes "improved" management and providing specific indicators and monitoring protocols to gage adoption of these defined improvements and determine "impact".

The project is to comply with GEF IW Objective 1 (foster cooperation) and Objective 2 (catalyze transboundary action). The project is moving this global agenda forward. The work of GOF, IW:LEARN, the CTI implementation team, and other project stakeholders is effective in this regard. However, there is not a clear guiding statement in the project document and/or implemented activities that describes the desired "end of project scenario," including a description of the global cooperation or action to be achieved. The effectiveness of the project would likely have been enhanced had it, from the beginning, identified even broad policy and governance objectives and designed indicators to measure project success at reaching the intended objective and related outcomes.

5.   *Global projects benefit from the support of a formal Project Steering Committee.*

This relatively small project is large in terms of potential global impact and reach. The project is supported by a diverse group of professionals spread across numerous institutions and located in three distinct global regions (North America, Europe, and Asia). By all accounts, they have provided excellent technical, co-financing, and strategic consultation. The evaluators believe, however, that the project would have been even more effective had it benefitted from a formal Steering Committee tasked with acting as a board of directors to help ensure alignment and synergy. This could have been accomplished for very little investment simply by organizing formal electronic meetings.

6.   *Projects generally benefit from completing a detailed work plan at project inception.*

Every project should generate a very comprehensive and detailed work plan during the inception phase. The work plan should cover the entire project duration. The work plan should be vetted with key stakeholders, including the implementing agency, executing agency, project steering committee, and other key stakeholders. The work plan should be time bound and have solid lines of responsibility. The work plan should be linked to the project's logical framework (results framework) and show how the completion of activities and achievement of outputs will lead to achievement of success indicators and the overall project objectives/outcomes. The completion of a project workplan should be an executing agency's pre-requisite for the release of project implementation funds. The work plan should be reviewed and revised regularly during project implementation. The full project work plan should inform both the AWP and the PIR.

7.   *Projects benefit from actively involving the project designer/drafter in project inception and implementation.*

This project is one of the few that retained their project designer to provide support for project implementation. This was a very useful approach that should be replicated by other GEF projects. They offer background information regarding design and expectations. The person has also been able to assist project management address any immediate implementation challenges and help make necessary adaptations. Most importantly, this person is able to bridge and ensure effective transition between the project design, inception, and implementation phases.

Part 7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

Overall Conclusion:

This is a well-designed and implemented project. Although several planned for activities have not and will not be undertaken, strategic alternatives were identified and are being implemented. The evaluators were not able to adequately assess budget matters, including cost effectiveness, due to a lack of information. The project certainly appears to be delivering critical elements and is on-course to achieving desired outcomes. Most importantly, the project benefits from an incredibly talented and dedicated cohort of global professionals. These persons have delivered exceptional quality.

Because Components 1, 2, and 4 are "front loaded" with nearly all financing expended and major activities completed prior to the mid-term evaluation, no substantial course corrections are required. If the project had substantial resources and activities remaining, several course corrections and/or improvements would be recommended. This includes creation of a formal Steering Committee and completion of a detailed component integration/synergy strategy. These recommendations are mostly relegated to the "lessons learned" category.

As for Component Three, the TA on Knowledge Management, Policy, and Institutional Support to the Coral Triangle Initiative has succeeded in focusing the attention of the region's policy makers, marine science institutions, and development partners on the need to strengthen regional policy dialogue and cooperation in the Coral Triangle. Despite a late start, small original funding, and the difficulty of implementing several activities over a large archipelagic area among six countries with disparate information and communication capacities, the project was able to mobilize and obtain the commitment of Coral Triangle governments for a system of knowledge exchange and dialogue, design and produce knowledge products and learning systems with stakeholder participation, and establish learning systems in about 15 months of operation. The critical tasks that remain include that of ensuring the sustainability and augmentation of the project's gains beyond its lifetime. Key to this sustainability is the installation of a permanent Regional CTI Secretariat that will be committed to carry on the country-driven nature of the undertaking and protect it from donor- or implementer-driven agendas that will negate the gains it has attained so far.

7.1.1 Relevance

The project remains highly relevant. The project is attempting to address major international issues pertaining to the conservation of global oceans and coastal areas. This includes attempts to generate fundamental management and governance improvements on the global level, project level, and within the vastly important coral triangle.

7.1.2 Effectiveness

The project is effective in terms of impact and appears to be cost-effective. The project has achieved a substantial amount of effort with a relatively low budget. The project is reaching hundreds of intended stakeholders. Many of these stakeholders are high-level decision makers and/or responsible for implementing major GEF IW programs. The project is catalyzing partnerships and awareness of global ocean and coastal area issues amongst these stakeholders. The CTI efforts are effectively creating a participatory structure for strengthening regional policy dialogue from the organizational to the country and regional level. The research efforts are generating knowledge on the less understood economies of

coastal and marine resource management and developing effective knowledge management systems.

7.1.3   Efficiency

The project is efficient. The PCU is effective and professional. Most major activities are being implemented as designed. Activities that are not being implemented have morphed into reasonable alternatives designed to move the project towards desired outcomes.

7.2   Recommendations

As noted, components 1, 2, and 4 are "front-loaded" with most budget allocations and activities already nearing completion prior to the mid-term. There is little latitude remaining to make substantial recommendations and/or course changes.

1.   Complete a full assessment of the project budget and allocations by activity prior to project close

Prior to close, the project should complete a full financial accounting of GEF expenditures. This should be provided to the evaluators so they may discern funds allocated to particular activities. The accounting should provide insights into project co-financing.

2.   Compile a summary of best and most urgent governance and management approaches

Prior to project close, the GOF should be encouraged to work with IW:LEARN and CTI to compile a brief summary (15 - 20 pages) encapsulating best and most urgent policy and management practices for conservation of global ocean and coastal resources. This summary would refer to best practices developed and/or adopted internationally. It would also reflect experience and knowledge gained from project activities, including those generated through the CTI initiative. This would facilitate "lessons learned" from CTI being scaled up to global level. This would follow the ecosystem based management objectives as described in the project document. It would help to build a platform the generation of the "Global Oceans Strategic Plan to 2016".   This document would help future projects, including GEF IW projects, establish achievement benchmarks for their investments and activities.   The document would also inform the activities of the on-going, project support "Rio+20 Friends of the Ocean" initiative.

3.   Create an action plan for operationalizing Rio+20 recommendations

The GOF has generated a useful 2-page briefing "Recommendations for Oceans and Coasts at Rio+20". This is a good starting point for discussions, but does not yet provide details as to how these good wishes will be practically operationalized. Although the specific content of discussions held during round-table discussions held to date is beyond the purview of the evaluation team, it is hoped that this initial list of recommendations will be accompanied by two things: a desired outcome from the Rio+20 specific to conservation of oceans and coastal areas; and, a detailed action plan for how these recommendations will be operationalized. Ideally, this in turn will be used as a lever to catalyze increased global financial support for programming. This may include a review of the current scope and opportunities represented by donors as well as the GEF IW platform.

The current GOF recommendations may be viewed here:

4.   Generate comparable indicators for GEF IW projects

There was discussion under Output 2.3 regarding the generation of comparable indicators for all IW projects. These indicators were to be developed in consultation with GOF to match the pursuit of ocean and coastal conservation actions. It would be quite useful to generate comparable data sets on a program wide level, particularly those that help to indicate movement towards a global agenda for improved ocean and coastal management. These could be linked through the IW: LEARN portal and could even morph into a tracking tool to inform global policy.

5.   Mobilize funding to build upon commenced global programming

Although not perfect, the project has shown that a multi-tiered and global approach is required to help catalyze international policy and action responses to ocean and coastal area degradation. This is a vital niche and one well suited to GEF with its global network of projects and expertise. Hopefully before momentum is lost project implementers are commencing the process of capturing continued funding. Any program continuation should benefit from safeguards to enhance strategic intra-project collaboration, e.g., a formal steering committee. The program should continue to improve the horizontal and vertical flow of knowledge between a full spectrum of stakeholders (e.g., global platforms, international donors, national decision-makers, and local project implementers). Better learning, increased collaboration, and tangible conservation improvements should be the measure of investment results.

6.   Provide full-time funding for IW:LEARN

The evaluators do not fully understand the funding mechanisms for IW:LEARN. However, it seems that this platform is at least in part passed between projects. There seems to be merit in GEF exploring opportunities to simply providing full-time funding for IW:LEARN.

7.   Provide an extension for Component 3

ADB should allow an extension of the TA in time to enable it to accomplish its remaining targets. Some supplementary activities may be necessary to attain them. For instance, one target at the country level that still needs to be accomplished is to drum up support for the implementation of the CT6 countries' National Program of Action (NPoAs) on coastal and marine resources conservation. This calls for a general public understanding of CMR management and therefore will require education and communication activities beyond information exchange among scientists and CMR technical people. Activities should be implemented to increase involvement of local government and other community sectors and to demystify CMR management information for non-scientist decision-makers.

8.   The permanent Regional CTI Secretariat needs to be installed and be more closely engaged in ensuring the sustainability of the project's successful activities.

Closer engagement does not mean an additional layer of supervision and control but nurturing support and promotion of identified project goals. The project has achieved most of its targets through an approach that encourages collaboration and resource sharing among the government, non-government, and other development partner

organizations. That this has been done validates the appropriateness of the approach to the stakeholders in the region; reinforcing this approach could help sustain the gains attained so far.

Hosting the Regional CTI Secretariat may be done by a regional entity such as ADB or by a CT6 government that is willing and able to provide administrative support and facilitative assistance in the critical areas of knowledge management, communication, and information technology. In either arrangement, long-term commitments must be secured.

9.   Successful and promising activities in sharing and exchange of CMR management practices should be sustained.

The project has developed KM systems and tools for knowledge sharing in CMR management. These should be sustained and even enhanced by embedding them in relevant Pacific projects of ADB. Before project close in October 2012, these systems and tools should be identified and documented in an audit and placed in formats for access and use by CT6 organizations looking to improve their knowledge sharing processes. An accompanying capacity building activity may also be designed.

Through collaboration, this activity should involve minimal costs that the project will be able to absorb. Yet this could help CT6 countries benefit from each other's experience and promote the use of effective methods of knowledge management in CMR management – yet another beneficial outcome of the project.

10.   Focus final evaluation efforts on Component 3

The project will require a final evaluation. At this point, most of Components 1, 2 and 4 are finished. The project might be best served if the final evaluation: (a) completes a rapid review of Components 1, 2, and 4, including a budget assessment; and, (b) completes a detailed review of Component 3, including site visits to CTI countries.

Annex: Results Framework Progress

Objective: **Improved management of coastal and marine ecosystems through efficient and effective inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes.**

Objective Level Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Effective, efficient management systems drawn from targeted learning from the GEF international waters (IW) program applied in the Coral Triangle and other areas by 2010.	Establishment of information sharing and targeted learning in previous IW:LEARN project.	Lessons learned from previous IW projects, and from World Ocean Conference applied by the six CTI countries.	Required country level reporting.	• Attendance at WOC in 2009 • Hits on IW:LEARN website • CTI Regional Plan of Action and country action plans • CTI monitoring and evaluation system.	**Risk**: Among the many environmental and natural resource crises globally, marine and coastal ecosystems may remain relatively neglected. **Assumption**: Development partners, including the private sector, will substantially increase external funding of coral reef management, along with increased funding from national governments.

Outcome 1: To foster critical thinking, creativity, learning, and partnership building towards the achievement of WSSD goals and the MDGs related to oceans, coasts, and SIDS, and in response to new ocean issues.

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Strategic plan and program of work for 2010-2014 addressing the WSSD targets on oceans, coasts, and SIDS, prepared by Global Ocean Forum Working Groups completed by December 2009, in the following areas: - Climate, oceans, and security - Achieving progress markers on EBM and ICM 2010 goals - Large Marine Ecosystems management - Marine biodiversity and networks of MPAs - Fisheries and aquaculture - SIDS and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy - Linking the management of freshwater, coasts, and oceans	Disparate plans and programs implemented by various organizations to address each of the WSSD targets on oceans, coasts, and SIDS.	Seven Strategic Plans and Program of Work that incorporate ongoing plans and programs as well as new projects to address weak areas/gaps in each. Drafts completed for presentation at GOC2010 in April 2010.	The Global Ocean Forum prepared three Policy Briefs (on climate and oceans, marine biodiversity, and improving ocean governance) for presentation at the 5th Global Oceans Conference (GOC5) (May 3-7, 2010) and a volume of panel summaries for sessions held during the Policy, Science and Technical Symposium for presentation at the Global Oceans Conference (May 3-4, 2010).* Meetings by the Global Ocean Forum Working Groups on the three conference themes and other issue areas covering the WSSD targets (i.e., capacity development, public education, marine biodiversity and networks of MPAs, management of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, and fisheries and aquaculture) were held at the GOC5 on May 5, 2010, where next steps were discussed, in particular, preparations for Rio+20, where new targets are expected to be set. The GOC5 also produced the Co-Chairs' Concluding Statement which laid out next steps for the global oceans community on the three major themes of climate, biodiversity, and improving governance. Following the Global Oceans Conference in May 2010, the Global Ocean Forum brought the substantive results of the conference for further elaboration and action to: 1) the Convention on Biological Diversity's Conference of the Parties in Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010, and 2) the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) negotiations in Cancun, Mexico in December	Seven Policy Briefs/Planning Documents	**Assumptions:** The process will engage adequate representation from major stakeholders. The approach and methods used by the Working Groups capture relevant knowledge and insights and apply best practices. The strategic planning process will run in support of existing formal processes. The strategic plan and program of work will be adopted, supported and carried out by stakeholders involved in the process. **Risks:** The planning process is carried out with excessively optimistic assumptions and expectations regarding goals, objectives, activities, timing, and resources that could be accessed to implement the plan.

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			2010 and in Durban, South Africa in December 2011. As well, the Global Ocean Forum organized to participate in and contribute substantive information on progress achieved (or lack thereof) in the attainment of both the 1992 UNCED and the 2002 WSSD goals on oceans, coasts, and islands to the Rio+20 process (UN Conference on Sustainable Development, June 20-22, 2012). The Global Oceans Conference 2010 Report has been prepared. * Following the advice of the Global Ocean Forum Steering Committee, the three major themes of the Conference were focused on the three issues of climate, biodiversity, and governance, incorporating discussions of the other WSSD topics under these three major themes. This was thought to be more effective in terms of attracting wide high-level involvement and media and public attention. Consequently, the number of Policy Briefs was reduced from 7 to 3.		
Tangible recommendations from multi-stakeholder dialogues at WOC2009, on the following issues: (i) Ocean/climate issues included in the climate negotiations and vice versa (ii) Understanding and developing policy responses to global ocean changes – ocean warming, acidification, changes in currents, changes in polar regions	Broad recommendations on areas that need further progress in research and policy development.	Specific recommendations on action in each area that could be further pursued by stakeholders and included in the strategic plan and program of work for 2010-2014, prepared by end-June 2009.	Specific recommendations emanated from the Global Ocean Policy Day held on May 13, 2009 at the World Ocean Conference, which were submitted to the UNFCCC as a statement on June 5, 2009 by the Global Ocean Forum together with collaborating organizations (see http://www.globaloceans.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/GOPD-FinalStatement.pdf). A volume of papers on all aspects of the climate/oceans issue was prepared, including scientific aspects of oceans and climate interactions, mitigation issues, adaptation issues, financing, capacity development and public outreach. This volume of papers is being revised as a special issue of a journal (This is an "add-on" to the GEF project).	Report of the World Ocean Conference/Global Ocean Policy Day. Manado Ocean Declaration. 500 participants in the Global Ocean Day at the Manado World Ocean Conference (organized by the Global Ocean Forum)	**Risks:** The Conference could be perceived as too government-dominated which could jeopardize the adoption/application of the Manado Ocean Declaration. If multi-stakeholder dialogues during WOC2009 are not well managed, stakeholder confidence and trust, and participation in future multi-stakeholder meetings will be at risk. **Assumptions:** WOC2009 will draw wide participation from governments, NGOs, intergovernmental

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
(iii) Promoting international commitment and funding to respond to the differential effects of climate change on different regions (iv) Encouraging adaptation in the context of EBM/ICM (v) Properly managing mitigation efforts that use the oceans, e.g. carbon storage and sequestration and iron fertilization (vi) Encouraging alternative forms of energy using the oceans (vii) Managing air pollution from ships.				Oceans and Climate Change: Issues and Recommendations for Policymakers and for the Climate Negotiations, Policy Briefs prepared for the World Ocean Conference, Manado, May 2009 http://globaloceans.org /globaloceans/sites/ude l.edu.globaloceans/file s/Policy-Briefs-WOC2009.pdf Statement Emanating from the Global Ocean Policy Day, World Ocean Conference, Manado, May 2009 Submission to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC, 6th Session, At the Frontlines of Climate Change—Oceans, Coasts, and Small Island Developing States: The Need for Action Now in the Climate Negotiations, Bonn, June 2009 http://unfccc.int/resour	organizations, the science and business communities. WOC2009 adapts an open and transparent stakeholder process to ensure stakeholder support and adoption of the Conference outputs, especially the Manado Ocean Declaration.

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
				ce/docs/2009/smsn/ngo/156.pdf Special Issue on Oceans and Climate Change: Issues and Recommendations for Policymakers and for the Climate Negotiations submitted to the international journal Ocean & Coastal Management	
5th Global Oceans Conference successfully accomplished in April 2010.	Policy recommendations towards achieving the WSSD targets emanating from the Hanoi Conference. 400 participants from various sectors	Strategic Plan and Program of Work for 2010-2014 for each of the WSSD targets endorsed by GOC2010 participants, completed by end June 2010. 500 participants from various sectors Over 850 participants from 80 countries	The Global Oceans Conference 2010 exceeded expectations-in terms of number of participants (859 from 80 countries, with 64% of countries represented from developing countries and SIDS); high-level attention-at least 80 high level leaders from all regions, including 2 heads of state; co-financing (as noted in the co-financing report); and results in terms of outlining next steps for advancing the global oceans agenda. The Global Oceans Conference incorporated a number of innovations: --A Policy, Science, and Technical Symposium involving 53 panels and 350 presenters; --The High-Level segment involving high-level national and international leaders from all regions; --The National Ocean Officials Roundtable; --The first-ever Ocean Parliamentarians Roundtable; --The Roundtable of Regional and Local Officials. As noted, in lieu of Strategic Plan and Program of Work for 2010-2014 for each of the WSSD targets, working groups on each topic covering the WSSD targets	5th Global Oceans Conference Summary Report, Paris, May 2010 http://www.globaloceans.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/GOC5_Summary.pdf 5th Global Oceans Conference International Institute for Sustainable Development Earth Negotiations Bulletin (IISD ENB) Summary Report (in English and French), Paris, May 2010 http://www.globalocea	**Assumptions:** Stakeholders will be adequately represented in the dialogue and engage in effective interaction. Adequate resources are made available for effective stakeholder participation and representation. Expectations among stakeholders are articulated and clear objectives and outcomes are categorically conveyed. **Risks:** Proliferation of loud/strong voices during the dialogue could lead to inaction or fragmentation of efforts. Disengagement of disappointed stakeholders if dialogue outcomes are not achieved, expectations are unmet, and no follow on activities are developed.

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			discussed next steps at the 5th Global Oceans Conference, in particular, preparations for Rio+20, where new targets will be set.	ns.org/sites/udel.edu.gl obaloceans/files/GOC 5IISDENBReport.pdf Volume of Symposium Session Summaries, Paris, May 2010 http://www.globalocea ns.org/sites/udel.edu.gl obaloceans/files/symp osium_4web.pdf Co-Chairs' Concluding Statement, Paris, May 2010 http://www.globalocea ns.org/sites/udel.edu.gl obaloceans/files/Co-Chairs-Concluding-Statement.pdf Policy Briefs prepared for the 5th Global Oceans Conference, Paris, May 2010: - Marine Biodiversity and Networks of Marine Protected Areas http://www.globalocea ns.org/sites/udel.edu.gl obaloceans/files/Biodi versityPB_4web.pdf - Ensuring Survival: Oceans, Climate, and Security http://www.globalocea	

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
				ns.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/Policy Brief-Climate-Oceans.pdf - Improving Governance: achieving Integrated, Ecosystem-Based Ocean and Coastal Management http://www.globaloceans.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/Policy Brief-EBM-ICM.pdf Reports of the Working Group Meetings at the 5th Global Oceans Conference, Paris, May 2010: 1) Biodiversity and Marine Protected Areas and issues related to ABNJ; 2) Ecosystem-Based Management and Integrated Coastal Management by 2010; 3) Fisheries and Aquaculture – Sustainability and Governance; 4) Education/Outreach/Media	
Recommendations towards the development	There is no program on	Governance of marine areas	Under GEF5, a new International Waters objective on implementation of pilot efforts at preventing degradation	Concept proposals for regional case studies	**Assumptions:** GEF Council will accept that the IW

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
of a new IW program area on governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction (MABNJ) for consideration in the next GEF replenishment process (GEF5) produced by June 2009.	governance of marine areas beyond national jurisdiction under the GEF IW focal area.	beyond national jurisdiction officially becomes part of the IW focal area under GEF5, as a new program by completion of the GEF5 replenishment process.	of valuable ocean areas beyond national jurisdiction is now included. Input to this process came from a Global Ocean Forum activity under the PPG for the current project, a Workshop on Governance of Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ): Management Issues and Policy Options, held on November 3-5, 2008, Singapore. Work under Activity 3 of Component 1 was intended to result in a proposal on regional experimentation on ecosystem-based management in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction to be submitted to GEF under this new IW objective. A project proposal under the GEF/FAO program on improving management of fisheries and marine biodiversity in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, titled "Global Coordination and Knowledge Management for ABNJ Governance," was developed by the Global Ocean Forum together with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), with guidance from the GEF Secretariat. The proposed project, to be co-executed by the Global Ocean Forum and FAO, will promote effective global coordination, knowledge management and exchange of information on Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) to ensure sustainable fisheries and other uses and conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the oceans.	prepared Document for discussion submitted to the GEF Council and Technical Advisory Committee for the GEF5 replenishment. New Objective 4 on Promote Effective Management of Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction adopted under GEF-5 Approved PIF on Strengthening Global Capacity to Effectively Manage Areas Beyond National Jurisdiciton under the GEF-FAO ABNJ Program, approval by GEF Council, November 2011	focal area should include governance of MABNJ and that measures of impacts could be formulated. **Risks:** Because of the sub-optimal level of data and information available in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction, their remoteness and other confounding factors, success and performance measures may be difficult to formulate and apply; attribution to present and future interventions will be more difficult to establish
Ocean leadership training program for high-level decision-makers developed and implemented at least twice for the following groups of countries by 2012. - CTI countries and SIDS	No such training program exists.	An ocean leadership training program for high-level decision-makers (with 25-30 participants per session)	Activity 4 has been adjusted to re-focus the Ocean Leadership Training Program towards providing assistance to government leaders in their involvement in the Rio+20 process. Progress to date includes: 1) Policy analyses: a) Report on "Oceans at Rio+20," which tracks progress on major ocean-related goals and commitments of UNCED and the WSSD and puts forth recommendations for the Rio+20 process (Summary for Decision Makers); b) Substantive submission to the	Training Package and Report of Implementation. A Summary for Decision Makers of the Report on Oceans at Rio+20: How Well Are We Doing on the Major Ocean	**Assumptions:** The Ocean Leadership Training will be institutionalized under the sponsorship of the Global Ocean Forum and other main collaborators. Sustainability will rely on good feedback from inclusion of an M&E program. **Risks:** Diverse backgrounds of

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
- East Africa and CPLP As a strategic move, and upon the suggestion of Al Duda, Senior Advisor, International Waters, GEF Secretariat, the Global Ocean Forum has refocused Activity 4 on Ocean Leadership Training towards providing assistance to government leaders in their involvement in the Rio+20 process: 1) Nine assessments on Oceans and Coasts for Rio+20 on assessing progress towards global ocean commitments have been carried out and the report distributed in Rio+20 preparatory and other meetings; 2) Consultations with governments and other stakeholders were conducted; 3) A major all-day oceans event (with many partners) has been mobilized; 4) An intensive public outreach effort, the Rio+20 Friends of the Ocean, was mobilized		institutionalized under the sponsorship of a lead institution (GOF and partners) implemented in 2 sessions, with the first in September 2010. As noted, this aspect was changed to focus on decisionmakers in the Rio+20 process	Rio+20 Compilation Document; c) Analysis of submissions to the Rio+20 Compilation Document, which has shown that all major political groups and more than 67% of the Member States have highlighted oceans and coasts in their formal input to the Rio+20 Conference; d) Suggestions for the Rio+20 zero draft, making it more actionable and targeted, sent to government delegations for their consideration in crafting the Rio+20 outcome. 2) Consultations with government and other leaders on how to achieve a significant ocean outcome at Rio+20: a) Informal Dialogue and Information-Sharing Session at Rio+20 PrepCom2, March 8, 2011, UN, New York; b) Strategic Planning Meeting and Rio+20 Consultation, May 24-25, 2011, World Bank, Washington DC; c) Strategy Meeting and Rio+20 Consultation, June 19, 2011, UN, New York; d) Rio+20 Friends of the Ocean meetings, June 20 and 22, 2011, UN, New York; e) "Oceans at Rio+20 Workshop—Discussions with UN Delegations," September 12, 2011; f) Side event on "Oceans at Rio+20" at the 2nd Rio+20 Intersessional Meeting, December 15, 2011; g) Facilitating NGO input into the Rio+20 Conference: The Global Ocean Forum, along with the International Ocean Institute, the Pew Environment Group, and Greenpeace, has been designated as a co-facilitator for the "Ocean Cluster" of the NGO Major Group in the Rio+20 Conference, tasked with facilitating input of the NGO community on oceans in the formal Rio+20 process, and coordinating ocean-related activities of the NGO community in the Rio+20 process. 3) A major ocean event at the Rio+20 Conference, "Advancing Oceans and Coasts at Rio+20 and Beyond," to be held on June 16, 2012, which will gather ocean leaders from around the world to: (1) continue to push for a strong oceans outcome at the negotiations of the UN	Commitments from the 1992 Earth Summit and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development?, October 2011, containing the following assessments: 1. Ecosystem-Based Integrated Ocean and Coastal Management 2. Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Basec Activities (GPA) 3. Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) 4. Biodiversity and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) 5. Small Island Developing States and Oceans SIDS 6. Fisheries and Aquaculture 7. Critical Uncertainties 8. Coordination of UN Activities on Oceans 9. Global Marine	potential clients will require a combination of content and pedagogic techniques. A faulty training needs assessment could result in an ineffective training program.

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			Conference on Sustainable Development, building on the priorities for Rio+20 that have been articulated by the oceans community; (2) Showcase major funded initiatives to spur action on oceans, coasts, and small island developing States in the post-Rio+20 world; and (3) Consider the opportunities and challenges for implementation of the "oceans package" emanating from the Rio+20 Conference, and a side event to be held on June 21, 2012 are being organized. 4) The Global Ocean Forum launched the Rio+20 Friends of the Ocean, which: 1) supports governments participating in the Rio+20 Conference to achieve a significant ocean outcome; 2) provides a "rallying point" and unified voice for ocean and coasts at the Rio+20 Conference; 3) provides a multi-stakeholder platform by which the needs, interests, and concerns of all sectors of the ocean community can be voiced in the Rio+20 process, including through critical policy assessments and recommendations, Internet services and information dissemination, consultations, and an Oceans Day at Rio+20; and 4) raise the global profile of ocean and coastal issues, both within the high-level political community and the general public, on the importance of the world's oceans and coasts to the three pillars of sustainable development.	Assessment 10. Capacity Development http://www.globaloceans.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/Rio20SummaryReport.pdf The above report has been widely disseminated and utilized by national delegations to the Rio+20 process. It was also sent to all UNDP country contacts by the UNDP Administrator Summary of the Workshop on Oceans at Rio+20: Discussions with UN Delegations, New York, September 2011 http://www.globaloceans.org/sites/udel.edu.globaloceans/files/Rio20SummaryReport.pdf See other materials produced under Activity 4 in Component 1 List of Materials for Review (attachment)	

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Public education and outreach program on climate change and oceans developed and implemented by end of 2011.	No such program currently exists.	A collaborative public education program that effectively communicates the importance of integrating ocean considerations in the climate agenda and vice versa.	A Global Ocean Forum Communications Strategy (2009-2013) was developed in association with the World Ocean Network and the World Ocean Observatory, which was especially devoted to oceans and climate to coincide with the Global Ocean Forum's efforts associated with the UNFCCC 15th Conference of the Parties, December 7-18, 2009, Copenhagen and the 5th Global Oceans Conference, May 3-7, 2010, UNESCO, Paris.	Program document and Report of Implementation. Global Ocean Forum Communications Strategy: *Advancing the Global Oceans Agenda through Public Education and Outreach,* 2010 Oceans Day at Copenhagen Website http://www.oceansday.org/c-index.html Ocean=Climate Website (public outreach site) http://www.oceanclimate.org/ Oceans Day in Copenhagen Press Release, December 2009 Oceans Day in Copenhagen Media and Outreach Report, December 2009 5th Global Oceans Conference Website (globaloceans.org) 5th Global Ocean Conference Public Outreach Site	**Assumptions:** Collaborators can raise matching resources to augment the seed money provided by the GEF grant. The key ocean information to be used in the public education program will emanate from the insights gleaned by the GOF Working Groups during their deliberations in the strategic planning process.

Outcome One Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
				http://www.goc2010.org/ 5th Global Oceans Conference Media Advisory, April 2010 5th Global Oceans Conference Press Release, Paris, May 2010 5th Global Oceans Conference Media Fact Sheets on: Ensuring Survival: Oceans and climate; Preserving Life - Biodiversity and MPAs; Improving Governance - Governance of the Oceans Media Report of the 5th Global Oceans Conference, Paris, May 2010 Oceans Day at Cancun website http://www.oceansday.org/video.html Global Ocean Forum News (# of issues) http://www.globaloceans.org/content/global-ocean-forum-newsletters	

Outcome 2:   Improved adaptive management of transboundary marine, coastal and freshwater systems.

Expected learning outcomes include assessable increased GEF IW project capacity at 3 levels: (i) individual project stakeholders; (ii) organizations; and (iii) governments, fostering enabling environments for transboundary cooperation to deepen and accelerate EBM and policy reform processes.

Outcome Two Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
GEF IW projects actively exchanging knowledge and expertise in regional, thematic, institutional or EBM-related Communities of Practice	Some GEF IW projects participate on *ad hoc* basis in regional, thematic, institutional or EBM-related CoPs.	GEF IW Portfolio 75% active (average one content uploadand one download per week) in at least 4 CoPs by Q2 2010.	'At this point no less than 15 workspaces (for online communities of practice) have been established at IW:LEARN's Community Platform. There are now over 472 members of the Community platform overall. Signficant online CoP's include those for the nutrient reduction community, areas beyond national jurisdiction, coral triangle initiative and transboundary waters assessment programme. Activity is still relatively light on average, with 309 items uploaded overall in the last year, but the usage is set to increase.	Discussion threads, posted content, resources downloaded, profiles created, and/or news posted;active participation in IWC5 online collaboration website before the conference and in CoP sites post-meeting.	**Assumptions**: Participative peer learning is perceived as valuable for all GEF IW projects.

Project stakeholders are encouraged to utilize IW:LEARN services at all levels of implementation and execution

Participants are sufficiently aware of GEF IW:LEARN and know how to both engage its services and provide their own experience to peers (via CoP participation, IWEN production IWC engagement and information syndication)

GEF IW:LEARN and partners can obtain sufficient post- |
| GEF IW projects in IWC host region showing ownership and engaging actively in IWC5. | One host region project showcases key learning at GEF IWC. | At least 3 Asia/Pacific IW projects commit by Q2 2009 to co-host IWC5; host region projects prepare achievements and contribute to leadership on SIDS, oceans and climate impacts | 4 projects (Coral Reef Targeted Research, Hai River, East Asian Seas, Pacific Wastewater) and 1 strategic partnership (Coral Triangle Initiative) hosted the IWC5, and presented acheivements to date and plans for the future | Host projects make plenary presentations at IWC on their key results | |
| Alignment of GEF IWC with cycles of WWF & GOF in order to better feed GEF input into global processes. | GEF IWC not linked with global freshwater & ocean meeting cycles or processes. | Mechanisms for linking GEF portfolio learning cycle with GOF and WWF6 agreed by Q4 2010. | No formal mechanism is agreed, however IW:LEARN will support project's presenting and building partnerships at the World Water Forum. In addition, several GEF IW projects have attended roundtables of the GOF | GEF projects featured in WWF and GOF session proceedings and IW:LEARN involved in planning process for WWF6; Integration workshop at WOC2009. | |

Outcome Two Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
GEF IW projects advance application of EBM to integrate participatory natural resource systems management (e.g. improved stakeholder engagement to integrate freshwater and marine, land and water, and adaptation to climate variability and change).	Surface and groundwater and coastal management are not integrated; Climatic variability and change not mainstreamed	At least 50% of new GEF IW projects by Q4 2010 ProDoc: demonstrate integration of freshwater and marine, land and water, and adaptation to climate change. Inception: Include actual activities related to or at least referencing integrated ecosystem based management and the mainstreaming of climatic variability and change: (II) 10 recommendations to GEF produced ate IWC5 on mainstreaming climatic variability and change	-Integration/CC adaptation was explicity part of the IWC5 in sessions and pre-conference workshops. Not to mention it is part of official guidance and preparation of projects. Projects since Q42009: Alexandria (YES, cc, l/w), Kenya Coastal (YES, int, ccm), Shanghai Agro (yes, both), Tunisia 2nd NRM (yep, both), Tunis wastewater (n/a, cc yes), Groundwater Gov (yep, both), CTI SE Asia CMR (yep, both), CREW (not so much, but n/a), West Af Fisheries (cc only), Bravo River (yep,both), Atlantic/Indian SIDS (yep, both)	Project documents, PIFs, and CEO endorsement forms.	intervention feedback on effectiveness through participant evaluation Organizers of key international and regional dialogues are willing to engage the GEF portfolio Given IW project experience is replicable by other projects Projects possess the means to report on progress vis-a-vis MDGs **Risks:** Not all GEF IW projects are willing to engage in various types of portfolio learning activities or to expose any weaknesses in project implementation to

Outcome Two Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Key lessons transferred through peer-to-peer learning.	No self-sustaining mechanism for GEF IW inter-project exchange, global portfolio learning and assessment.	ProDoc: At least 90% of GEF IW portfolio provides input for participative portfolio learning cycle and testing improvements by Q4 2009; 50% of IWC5-attending GEF IW project managers attend a project management training session at IWC5; At least 95% of participant evaluations in at least 3 pre-IWC technical workshops confirm increased capacity vs. individual baselines, and/or indicate changes to personal or institutional work plans.50% of IWC5-attending GEF IW projects exhibit at least one top innovation and/or replicable experience. Inception: 1) At least 50% of GEF IWC5 attending projects provides input for participative portfolio learning cycle and testing improvements by Q4 2009; II) 50% of IWC5 attending GEF IW project managers attend a project management training session at IWC%; At least 95% of participant evaluations from at least 3 pre-IWC technical workshops confirm increased	8 Australian centers of excellence (plus UNESCO and IAEA) put together workshops prior to the IWC5. -Well unfortunately only close to 30% of participants actually submitted evaluations, however I consider this a success nonetheless as a representative sample. From this, participants rated the event 3.7/5 in terms of relevance to work functions and by extension increased capacity. This evaluations also contained input for the participative portfolio learning cycle. We organized four project management workshops during the IWC5 which were collectively Well-attended, with half the portfolio PM's in attendance at IWC5. 50% of the portfolio exhibited their innoviations and experiences during the IWC5, both in the pre-conference workshops and during the innovation marketplace (exhibit area).	Project multimedia content featured on IWC5 website; Learning Exchange reports, virtual Innovation Marketplace, IWC5 report and participant evaluation. Pre-conference workshop and working group reports, IWC5 proceedings, on GEF-IWC website or www.iwlearn.net.	external scrutiny. Geopolitical and economic conditions enable full participation in the IWC5 Online/virtual services are inaccessible to some stakeholders for technical reasons

Outcome Two Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Successful scientific and technical innovation and lessons from GEF IW project experience shared across global portfolio.	Partial resource base for transferring key lessons learnt from GEF IW project implementation, with room for improvement.	All GEF IW projects report on their contributions to EBM and MDGs as part of regular reporting and on iwlearn.net profiles by Q4 2009.	No progress yet…this is a political issue with getting access to project PIR data thru the GEF Secretariat	Participant evaluations; participant lists; workshop reports.	
GEF IW projects reporting on EBM and MDGs. Worldwide dissemination of IW project success, contribution to MDGs, and media support for expansion of IW projects.	Projects do not regularly report on progress vis-à-vis EBM and MDGs. GEF IW projects report on immediate objectives only.	At least 30 GEF IWENs produced for GFOCI and WWF6, by Q1 2011.At least 1 IWEN from each region and from each ecosystem-type per year.	Some 21 notes have been produced, and soon the rest will be produced.	Project multimedia content featured on IWC5 website; Learning Exchange reports, virtual Innovation Marketplace, IWC5 report and participant evaluation.Pre-conference workshop and working group reports, IWC5 proceedings, on GEF-IWC website or www.iwlearn.net.	
Project designs based on IW best-practice learning.	Approximately 30 IWEN's produced, but do not sufficiently cover a suite of thematic areas	At least 10 inter-project exchanges document learning by Q4 2011, including at least one new GEF IW project per region, each featuring at least 2 stakeholders.	'4 exchanges have been conducted involving 12 (GEF IW projects), a regional exchange on nutrient reduction (Mediterranean, Skadar Lake), an exchange on mariculture practices in Q12010 between GCLME and YSLME, an IW Leadership training workshop (Dnipro, SWIOFP, Caspian, Volta, Timor Arafura) and an exchange on knowledge management for the CTI countries (with CTI as well as PEMSEA and CTI Sulu Celebes in attendance). We owe one exchange to Agulhas Somali and one to African Freshwater projects. That leaves three more to organize (Lake Victoria is one possibility).	Reporting on project profiles at www.iwlearn.net also via gefonline.org, and PIR-APR processes.	

Outcome Two Indicators	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Projects replicate successful approaches of comparable projects.	Projects are designed independently of previous IW project experience and common errors are repeated.	25% of new GEF IW projects emulate an experience from an existing GEF IW project.	Some 17 (or nearly 100%) of GEF IW projects since the 2009 IWC5 make reference to other GEF IW projects in their CEO endorsements, with research to be conducted on the remaining new IW projects.	IWENs produced and posted to iwlearn.net covering process and stress reduction themes. Project design documents, post-evaluation of IW projects.	
Projects disseminate key information and share progress with the portfolio.	Less than 10% of the portfolio regularly shares their news, events, announcements and releases broadly.	50% GEF IW portfolio syndicates their news, events, announcements and report releases via www.iwlearn.net.By 2010, 75% of active GEF IW projects report annually on their efforts to address MDGs.	at this point we have 37 GEF IW projects officially syndicating content to iwlearn.net, given the roughly 73 active projects this about 54%.	Media reports, RSS feeds to iwlearn.net, website content, and independent reviews of IW portfolio.	

Outcome 3 **Improved management system for CTI strategic planning and implementation of the CTI program of action through inter- and intra-regional adaptive learning processes.**

Design Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators	Mid-term Status	Data Sources/Reporting Mechanisms	Assumptions & Risks
Outputs 1.Strengthened CTI regional cooperation	Final RPoA with clear defined targets endorsed by CT6 leaders in May 2009 NPoAs with clear defined targets endorsed by CT6 senior officials in 2009 Regular review and update of PoAs from 2010 to 2012	Results of decision support and KM systems workshops held in Manila in Mar 2009 were utilized in needs assessment TA organized i)Regional Inception Meeting Jul 2010; ii) kickoff activity for E-FACT study Jun 2011 2 CT6 countries had organized their KM teams as of Jun 2011 – Malaysia and Indonesia At Inception Workshop Jul 2010, it was agreed that TA will not cover the entire RPoA's 5 goals given investments there by other partners. TA focus shall be: SF, EEPES, and SCTR preparation, on KM systems design	Proceedings of CTI leaders' summit and SOM Reports of CTI regional secretariat, NCCs, development partners, and CTI Working Groups Minutes of CTI regional and national meetings	**Assumption** All CT6 governments agree on the RPoA **Risk** Uneven resource base and technical capabilities of CT6 to carry out their respective NPoAs
2. Established regional learning mechanisms for CTI	At least 3 working group meetings conducted to identify CTI information needs and gaps, undertake capacity needs assessments, and develop knowledge management strategies for the RPoA by June 2010 At least 3 regional training workshops on information management, M & E systems, and data analysis in the refinement of the PoAs by June 2011 At least 6 knowledge integrator reports, with translation by 2010	NA Workshops included discussions on information management and data systems TA participated in the KM Workshop in Ayutthaya conducted by IW:LEARN May 2011; hosted a Knowledge Exchange Workshop for GEF IW projects in Manila March 2012 E-group was created to facilitate communication and CoPs using the IW:LEARN facility Facebook account for CTI has been created CTI portal coraltriangleinitiative.net built with help from IW:LEARN; launched in Indonesia 27 Oct 2011 Prior to the CTI portal TA had a Project File Management System (PFMS) and a KM website through which it could be accessed	GEF reports on IW:LEARN Evaluation reports on participants following learning events	**Assumption** CT6 will release key staff to participate in vital learning opportunities Staff will remain in their positions after training for continuity **Risk** Lack of coordination among CTI development partners may lead to duplication and inconsistent learning mechanisms

		TA collaborates with CT6 in building their own country websites, providing technical inputs Knowledge Integrators completed for all CT6 countries; they are now integrated into the TA		
3. Implemented communication and information dissemination plan	Technical Working Group to prepare the state of the coral triangle report to be established by 2010 At least 3 working group reports published each year from 2010	Communication strategy was finalized June 2011 consistent with agreements on the 3 focus areas Appointment of lead writers for SCTR for CT6'; Writers' Workshop for SCTR held Aug 2011 at Motupore Marine Station, PNG funded by TNC TA produced 7 issues of CTI News, 10 issues of Experience/Learning Notes, 7 other information materials TA organized 18 workshops on different topics between March 2009 and March 2012 Regional and country Needs Assessment (NA) Workshops completed between Oct 2010 and Feb 2011. All country-level NA workshops featured breakout meetings on the 3 focus areas	Progress reports on the CTI from development partners and the CT6 Online database linkages to all relevant coastal and marine portals, including the US	**Assumption** Governments and stakeholder groups in CTI participate actively in formulating the communication strategy **Risk** Low priority is ascribed to communication and information dissemination by CTI governments and stakeholders
4. Established sustainable financing for POAs	Study on innovative financing and options for a PES scheme for CTI completed by 2010	TA supported activity to determine required resources for NPoA implementation, assess funding level, gaps, sources of financing Draft report on a Financial Architecture for the CTI was prepared SF workshops were organized for the Philippines and Solomon Islands TA is facilitating organization of the High-Level	CT6 National budgets Proceedings of CTI meetings, (e.g., SOM, ministerial meetings, financial mechanisms working groups, etc.)	Assumption Governments, donor agencies, and the private sector show continued interest in funding CTI program Risk Global financial crisis affects development priorities of CTI

		Finance Round Table discussion scheduled for May 2012 5 E-FACT abstracts accepted to the International Coral Reef Symposium (ICRS) in Cairns, Australia July 2012		governments and partners, reducing the priority given to the CTI.

Outcome 4 Project Coordination and Management Improved coordination and integration between the global oceans and coastal agenda, the GEF international waters portfolio, and CTI.					
Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Mid-Term Status**	**Sources of verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Effective linkage of global, regional, and national level coastal and marine EBM.	Separate activities at global, regional and national level, missing opportunities for portfolio learning.	At least 1,000 CTI practitioners effectively linked to global best practice through IW:LEARN by December 2011.	Requires IW:LEARN and CTI reporting	IW:LEARN website. US CTI Program Integration Portal. IWC5 participant evaluation and IWENs.	**Risk**: The challenges of integrated management and a coordinated approach may overwhelm project participants and cause them to fall back into a reliance on disparate sectoral and national approaches. **Assumption**: Results-based management will be adopted by all components.
Efficient, transparent, and effective results-based management of all project components.	Separate project component management.	Mid-term and final project evaluations fully satisfactory.	Mid-term was completed. Final is planned.	Project progress reports by PCU.	

Summary of Co-Financing Provided by PMU

Project Component	Name of Co-financier	Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US$)		Government (mill US$)		Other* (mill US$)		Total (mill US$)		Total Disbursement (mill US$)		Remark
			Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	
1	Lighthouse Foundation	Grants					0.10	0.08			0.10	0.08	
1	Ministry for Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia	Grants			0.05	0.05					0.05	0.05	
1	Ministry for Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia	In-kind			0.20	0.20					0.20	0.20	
1	World Ocean Observatory	In-kind					0.10	0.10			0.10	0.10	
1	Nausicaa and World Ocean Network	In-kind					0.10	0.08			0.10	0.08	
1	UNESCO-IOC	Grants					0.01	0.01			0.01	0.01	
1	UNESCO-IOC	In-kind					0.09	0.09			0.09	0.09	
1	EPOMEX	In-kind			0.03	0.03					0.03	0.03	
1	University of Delaware	In-kind					0.10	0.08			0.10	0.08	
1	The Nature Conservancy	In-kind					0.05	0.05			0.05	0.05	
1	DFO Canada	Grants			0.10	0.04					0.10	0.04	
1	DFO Canada	In-kind			0.05	0.05					0.05	0.05	
1	FLAD, Portugal	In-kind					0.03	0.03			0.03	0.03	
1	WIOMSA	In-kind					0.03	0.03			0.03	0.03	
Additional Co-finance	Dept. for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), UK	Grants				0.06					-	0.06	
(data from PIR 2011)	FAO	Grants					-	0.02			-	0.02	
1	FAO	In-kind					-	0.01			-	0.01	

No.	Organization	Type										
1	Center for Ocean Solutions	Grants					-	0.004		-	0.004	
1	Oceana	Grants					-	0.005		-	0.005	
1	UNEP	Grants					-	0.025		-	0.025	
1	European Environment Agency	Grants					-	0.004		-	0.004	
1	European Environment Agency	In-kind					-	0.020		-	0.020	
1	French Marine Protected Areas Agency	Grants					-	0.070		-	0.070	
1	Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs	Grants	-	0.180						-	0.180	
1	Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs	In-kind	-	0.005						-	0.005	
1	Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and the Sea	Grants	-	0.07						-	0.07	
1	Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and the Sea	In-kind	-	0.01						-	0.01	
1	Government of Republic of Korea	Grants	-	0.08						-	0.08	
1	Government of Spain	Grants	-	0.02						-	0.02	
1	Ocean Policy Research Foundation, Japan	Grants					-	0.04		-	0.01	
1	Ocean Policy Research Foundation, Japan	In-kind					-	0.02		-	0.02	
1	Government of Japan	In-kind	-	0.003						-	0.003	
1	Gerard J. Mangone Center for Marine Policy, University of Delaware	In-kind					-	0.04		-	0.01	
1	Gerard J. Mangone Center for Marine Policy, University of Delaware	Grants					-	0.03		-		

1	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	In-kind					-	0.01			-	0.01
1	Secretariat of environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT), Mexico	In-kind					-	0.004			-	0.004
1	Secretary of Environment and Natural Resources, Campeche	In-kind					-	0.001			-	0.001
1	World Bank, Washington DC	In-kind					-	0.013			-	0.013
1	Government of South Africa	Grants				0.01					-	0.01
1	GEF-UNDP Algulhas and Somali LME	Grants				0.008					-	0.008
1	World Meteorological Organiztion (WMO)	Grants				0.002					-	0.002
1	Plymouth Marine Laboratory, UK	Grants				0.001					-	0.001
1	State Oceanic Administration (SOA), People's Republic of China	Grants			-	0.03					-	0.03
1	GEF	Grants					-	0.025			-	0.025
1	UNDP	Grants					-	0.025			-	0.025
1	UNESCO-IOC	Grants					-	0.012			-	0.012
1	International Maritime Organization (IMO)	In-kind					-	0.005			-	0.005
1	Forum do Mar, Brazil	In-kind					-	0.005			-	0.005
1	Pacific Islands Forum	In-kind					-	0.010			-	0.010
1	Republic of Seychelles	In-kind			-	0.005					-	0.005
1	Vietnam	In-kind			-	0.005					-	0.005
1	World Ocean Network	In-kind					-	0.010			-	0.010
1	Korean Ocean Research & Development Institute (KORDI)	Grants					-	0.005			-	0.005

#	Organization	Type									Comments
1	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Grants					-	0.005			-	0.005	
1	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	Grants					-	0.002			-	0.002	
1	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	In-kind					-	0.003			-	0.003	
1	Caribbean LME Project (CLME)	In-kind					-	0.010			-	0.010	
1	Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)	Grants					-	0.003			-	0.003	
1	UNDP	In-kind	0.09	0.09							0.09	0.09	
1&2	UNDP	Grants & In-kind	0.22	0.22									
2	Australian Government	Grants			0.10	0.08					0.10	0.08	
2	ICPDR	In-kind					0.11	0.11			0.11	0.11	
2	UNESCO	Grants					0.10	0.01			0.10	0.01	
2	UNITAR	Grants					0.09	0.09			0.09	0.09	
2	EC	Grants					0.08	-			0.08	-	The grant has not been realized
2	Red Cross/Red Crescent	In-kind					0.01	0.01			0.01	0.01	
2	LMGM	In-kind					0.10	0.10			0.10	0.10	
Additional Co-finance	Project AWARE	Grants					-	0.002			-	0.002	
(data from PIR 2010-11)	SKM	Grants					-	0.006			-	0.006	
2	Quicksilver	Grants					-	0.006			-	0.006	
2	Cleaner Seas Alliance	Grants					-	0.002			-	0.002	
2	Terrain NRM	Grants					-	0.011			-	0.011	
2	James Cook U	Grants					-	0.006			-	0.006	
2	SKM	In-kind					-	0.002			-	0.002	
2	University Queensland	In-kind					-	0.057			-	0.057	

#		Type											Comments
2	James Cook U	In-kind					-	0.004			-	0.004	
2	World Wildlife Fund Nature	In-kind					-	0.011			-	0.011	
2	Reef and Rainforest Research Centre	In-kind					-	0.011			-	0.011	
2	Project AWARE	In-kind					-	0.011			-	0.011	
2	University of Wollongong	In-kind					-	0.033			-	0.033	
4	UNDP	In-kind	-	0.007							-	0.007	Staff time from UNDP APRC contribute as Project coordinator
		TOTALS	0.30	0.31	0.53	0.92	1.09	1.44	-	-	1.70	2.37	