

GEF IEO Annual Performance Report 2020

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

- Draft Approach Paper - March 2020

Point of contact:

Neeraj Negi, Senior Evaluation Officer, nnegi1@thegef.org

Contents

1. Background and Context.....	1
2. Evaluation Questions, Coverage and Methodology	1
2.1 Performance of Completed Projects and Programs	1
2.2 Quality of reporting on GEF supported activities	3
2.3 Management Action Record	4
3. Peer and Stakeholder Feedback	4
4. Expected Outputs, Outreach and Tracking	5
5. Resources and Schedule	5
5.1 Evaluation Team.....	5
5.2 Schedule of Work Activities	5
References	7
Annex A	8
Annex B. Terminal Evaluation Report Review Guidelines.....	9

Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFDB	African Development Bank
APR	GEF Annual Performance Report
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
GEB	Global Environment Benefit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF IEO/IEO	Global Environment Facility's Independent Evaluation Office
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
LDC	Least Developed Country
MAR	Management Action Record
PIR	Project Implementation Report
SIDS	Small Island Developing State
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
STAR	System for Transparent Allocation of Resources
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WB	World Bank
WWF-US	United States World Wildlife Fund

1. Background and Context

The GEF Annual Performance Report (APR) prepared by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO) provides an overview of the performance of GEF activities and processes, key factors that may affect performance, and the quality of Monitoring and Evaluations systems (M&E). Along with regular reporting on performance of completed projects, an APR may cover issues affecting the GEF partnership that are of current interest to GEF stakeholders. Recent APRs have covered topics such as tracking tools (APR2015), progress to impact (APR2016), sustainability (APR2017) and transportation portfolio (APR2019). APR2020 will present a detailed analysis of quality of reporting on GEF supported activities. APR 2020 will be presented to the GEF Council during its June 2020 meeting.

APR 2020 will present an update of aggregated performance ratings including outcome, risks to the sustainability of outcomes, quality of M&E, and implementation of completed projects. It will contain a detailed analysis of the quality of reporting on GEF supported activities with focus on full size projects. It will assess the extent to which reporting through project implementation reports (PIRs) flag the challenges reported in terminal evaluations (TEs) in a timely manner. It will also assess the extent to which terminal evaluations of completed GEF projects are following the GEF IEO guidelines, and their strengths and weaknesses. The report will also present a summary of the Management Action Record (MAR).

The GEF IEO will pilot a post completion evaluation. The pilot addresses the request from several Council members to undertake post completion evaluations on a sample basis (GEF 2019). The post completion evaluations are aimed at assessing the long-term outcomes achievements and sustainability of projects during the post completion period. The aim of the pilot is to understand the challenges in evaluating a project several years after its completion.

2. Evaluation Questions, Coverage and Methodology

2.1 Performance of Completed Projects and Programs

Evaluation Questions

Assessment of, and reporting on, performance of completed projects and programs is a regular feature of APR. The issues that are regularly covered include an account of outcomes, sustainability, implementation, and project M&E. Broadly, the reporting on completed projects and programs will focus on following questions:

1. To what extent do the supported activities achieve their expected outcomes?

2. What is the likelihood that the achieved and expected outcomes would be sustained?
3. How well are the GEF supported activities implemented and executed?
4. What is the quality of project M&E and implementation?

Coverage

The reporting on completed projects will be based on data of 1706 completed projects. The terminal evaluations for these projects will have been submitted to the GEF IEO through December 2019. Of these, 134 projects which had their terminal evaluations submitted since the completion of the last APR will be covered for the first time. The Agencies that account for at least 10 terminal evaluations among the recent submissions include UNDP, World Bank, UNEP, UNIDO and FAO (Annex A).

As part of the APR2020 process, the GEF IEO will pilot its approach to conduct post completion evaluations. Although coverage of three GEF projects was initially planned, this was downscaled to one project given the Covid19 pandemic. APR 2020 will report on the experience gained from the pilot and observed performance on ground.

Methodology

Rating scales. APR 2020 will report on outcome achievements, risks to sustainability of outcome achievements, quality of M&E design and implementation, quality of implementation and execution of completed projects, and quality of terminal evaluation reports. Risks to sustainability of outcome achievements will be rated on a four-point scale, while all other indicators will be rated on a six-point scale. Annex B provides a detailed account on the assessment approach for rating scales.

Terminal evaluation review. Data used in APR 2020 will be drawn primarily from the GEF IEO's terminal evaluation reviews including the reviews that were conducted in past.

All of the terminal evaluations used for analysis and reporting in APRs are reviewed by the GEF IEO or the Agency evaluation offices to verify that ratings are properly substantiated, and where needed, to provide additional or revised ratings (such as for quality of terminal evaluations). GEF IEO accepts the terminal evaluation review ratings provided by World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group, UNDP Independent Evaluation Office, and UNEP Evaluation Office. To track whether ratings provided by Agency evaluation offices continue to be consistent with the GEF IEO ratings, the Office will continue to conduct reviews for some of their terminal evaluations on a random sample basis. For FY2020 the random sample for projects from these Agencies will be 10 percent of their total new submissions for APR 2020.

GEF IEO procedure for terminal evaluation review is standardized. GEF IEO reviewers assess the degree to which project ratings provided in terminal evaluations are properly substantiated, and address the objectives and outcomes set forth in the project design documents approved by the GEF Council and/or GEF CEO. In the process of terminal evaluation review, a peer reviewer with experience in preparing

terminal evaluation review reports provides feedback on the draft review report prepared by a primary reviewer. This feedback is incorporated by the primary reviewer into subsequent version of the terminal evaluation review report. When a primary reviewer proposes downgrading of project outcome ratings from the satisfactory range to the unsatisfactory range, another reviewer – in addition to the peer reviewer – also examines the review to ensure that the proposed rating is justified.

There are several common elements in the review and rating approach adopted by GEF IEO and the evaluation offices of the GEF Agencies. However, these approaches are not entirely consistent. While GEF IEO's adoption of the project performance ratings provided by the agency evaluation offices (of UNDP, World Bank and UNEP) reduces the duplication of effort, it introduces another source of variation in rating and makes inter-agency comparisons difficult. Over the years the IEO has tracked the difference in the outcome ratings provided by the GEF IEO and the agency evaluation offices and has found that the difference is not statistically significant. However, it is likely that there may be variations in ratings on other parameters where differences in ratings have not been tracked.

Post completion evaluations. Post completion evaluation will use the same rating scale as used for terminal evaluation. However, in addition to the information available at the point of project completion, post completion evaluation will also gather information on the extent to which expected outcomes, including long term outcomes, were achieved and sustained during the post completion period and the causal mechanisms for it. The instrument for the post completion evaluation has been developed. The project will be selected based on criteria that ensures representation to countries where sustainability is a challenge and synergies with the ongoing work of the GEF IEO. As the number of post completion evaluations increases, in future it would be possible to present more substantive analysis on the observed performance after project completion.

2.2 Quality of reporting on GEF supported activities

GEF Agencies are responsible for reporting on GEF activities. The Agencies report on project progress and performance through Project Implementation Reports (PIR), mid-term reviews, tracking tools, and terminal evaluations. To have a realistic account of project performance and of implementation challenges candor in reporting is imperative. Similarly, it is also important that terminal evaluations provide a comprehensive account of project performance and are compliant with the GEF IEO guidelines for preparation of terminal evaluations.

Key questions

The review will seek to answer the following questions related to Agency performance:

1. To what extent do the GEF Agencies report on implementation challenges with candor?
2. To what extent do terminal evaluations comply with the GEF IEO guidelines?

Coverage and methods

Candor in reporting will be assessed based on consistency in reporting through terminal evaluations and PIRs for at-risk projects. The consistency check will be limited to the terminal evaluations of projects that were assessed to be “unsatisfactory” or “highly unsatisfactory” for outcomes and PIRs for these projects. The aim will be to assess whether the concerns related to low performance were reported in the PIRs and how. A similar approach will be applied for projects that were cancelled. The aim will be to assess whether for these cases PIRs (where applicable) and other prior communications indicated the concerns that eventually led to cancellation. In instances where gaps in submission of PIRs are noted, the evaluation team will follow up with the Agencies so that, to the extent possible, these gaps may be filled.

The assessment of extent to which terminal evaluation reports comply with the GEF IEO guidelines will be restricted to the reports of FY2020 cohort that were prepared at least six months after issuance of the GEF IEO guidelines in April 2017. Compliance will be assessed based on the requirements specified by the guidelines. These include requirements such as adequate reporting of project outcome and sustainability, implementation, M&E, involvement of Operational Focal Points in project M&E, implementation of safeguards, gender analysis and its implementation.

2.3 Management Action Record

The GEF Management Action Record (MAR) tracks the level of adoption of GEF Council decisions and underlying GEF IEO recommendations by the GEF Management. The MAR serves two purposes: (1) to provide Council a record of its decisions based on the evaluation reports presented by the GEF IEO, the proposed management actions, and the status of these actions; and (2) to increase the accountability of GEF Management regarding Council decisions based on GEF IEO’s evaluations. To assess progress on adoption of a Council decision, relevant actions undertaken by the management are considered. MAR was first presented in APR2005, and thereafter it has become a regular feature of APRs.

MAR2019, presented in APR2019, tracked adoption of Council decisions based on seven GEF IEO evaluations. Of these, a recommendation related to tracking tools contained in APR2015 has been graduated due to substantial level of adoption by the management. MAR2020 will track the decisions based on the remaining six evaluations. The number of new GEF IEO evaluations and related Council decisions to be tracked in MAR2020 will be clear after the December 2019 Council meeting.

3. Peer and Stakeholder Feedback

In addition to quality control mechanisms within the terminal evaluation review process, APR2020 will benefit from two peer reviewers – one external and one internal. Nancy Bennet, Results Management and Evaluation Advisor at UNDP, will be the external peer reviewer. Gabriel Sidman, Evaluation Officer at the GEF IEO, will be the internal peer reviewer. The peer reviewers will provide feedback on the draft approach paper, the intermediary products, and the draft report of APR2020.

The preliminary findings of the APR2020 will be shared with the key stakeholders through an interagency meeting. The meeting will provide an opportunity to the key stakeholders such as the GEF Agencies (operations and evaluation), the Secretariat, STAP, and the CSO Network, to provide feedback on the emerging findings of the APR. The draft report of the APR will be shared with the key stakeholders to get their feedback on the emerging conclusions, and to identify errors of analysis and of omission and commission.

4. Expected Outputs, Outreach and Tracking

The APR is primarily intended for the GEF Council and a GEF corporate audience, including the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Partner Agencies, STAP, and the CSO Network. The report will be delivered at the June 2020 Council meeting. The report will be published on the GEF IEO website and distributed via email among the GEF Council members, GEF country focal points, GEF Secretariat, Partner Agencies, and the CSO network. Its ratings data may also be accessed through an interactive dashboard, which has been used to share the data for past APRs as well. A four-page summary of the findings will also be prepared for circulation among a wider audience.

5. Resources and Schedule

5.1 Evaluation Team

APR2020 will be developed by a team including Neeraj Kumar Negi, Senior Evaluation Officer; Molly Sohn, Evaluation Analyst; and consultants.

5.2 Schedule of Work Activities

The report will be delivered in May 2020, in time for the June 2020 GEF Council meeting. Table 1 shows the schedule of work activities for completion and presentation of the findings of APR 2020. The schedule of work has been prepared keeping in mind the GEF Council meeting schedule.

Table 1. Schedule of work activities for completion and presentation of APR 2020

Project milestone	Work period or completion date
Approach paper	November 20 th 2019
Review of terminal evaluations	Nov 2019 to 28 th Feb 2020
Analysis of terminal evaluation data	31 st March 2020
Analysis of Agency Performance	Nov 2019 to Feb 2020
Analysis for GEF-7 STAR	December 2019 to 31 st March 2020
Presentation of draft APR	31 st of March 2020
Draft report of preliminary findings	20 th April, 2020
Council information document of APR 2020 uploaded	15 th May, 2020
Publication of the finalized report of APR 2020	June to September 2020

Preparation of the four-page flier

June to September 2020

References

GEF. "Highlights of the Council's Discussions: 56th GEF Council Meeting" Global Environment Facility. 2019. Available from:

http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.56_Highlights_0.pdf

GEF IEO. "Mid-Term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework" Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2009. Available from:

<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/raf-mtr.pdf>

GEF IEO. "Midterm Evaluation of the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources." Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2014. Available from:

<http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/star.pdf>

GEF IEO. "GEF Annual Performance Report 2015." Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2015. Available from:

<http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/apr%202015.pdf>

GEF IEO. "GEF Project Performance and Progress to Impact (APR 2016)." Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2018. Available from:

<http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/project-performance-2017.pdf>

GEF IEO. "GEF Annual Performance Report 2017." Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2019. Available from: http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/apr-2017_0.pdf

GEF IEO. "Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects." Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2017. Available from:

<https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-guidelines-te-fsp-2017.pdf>

GEF IEO. "The Evaluation of the GEF's System for Transparent Allocation of Resources" Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2018. Available from:

http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/star-2017_0.pdf

GEF IEO. "GEF Annual Performance Report 2019." Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2019. Available from: <http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/apr-2019.pdf>

GEF IEO. "The GEF Evaluation Policy" Global Environment Facility Independent Evaluation Office. 2019. Available from: <http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-me-policy-2019.pdf>

Annex A

Terminal evaluation submission for the APR 2020 cohort

Terminal evaluation submissions	Submitted
Past submissions up to APR 2019	1566
Submissions for APR 2020	
<i>ADB</i>	3
<i>AfDB</i>	1
<i>EBRD</i>	1
<i>FAO</i>	10
<i>IADB</i>	2
<i>IFAD</i>	3
<i>IUCN</i>	1
<i>UNDP</i>	39
<i>UNEP</i>	26
<i>UNIDO</i>	11
<i>World Bank</i>	36
<i>WWF-US</i>	1
Total for APR2020 cohort	134
Pre-2005 terminal evaluation added to the data	6
Cumulative total	1706

Annex B. Terminal Evaluation Report Review Guidelines

The assessments in the terminal evaluation reviews will be based largely on the information presented in the terminal evaluation report. If insufficient information is presented in a terminal evaluation report to assess a specific issue such as, for example, quality of the project's monitoring and evaluation system or a specific aspect of sustainability, then the preparer of the terminal evaluation reviews will briefly indicate so in that section and elaborate more if appropriate in the section of the review that addresses quality of report. If the review's preparer possesses other first-hand information such as, for example, from a field visit to the project, and this information is relevant to the terminal evaluation reviews, then it should be included in the reviews only under the heading "Additional independent information available to the reviewer." The preparer of the terminal evaluation review will consider all the independent relevant information when verifying ratings.

B.1 Criteria for Outcome Ratings

Based on the information provided in the terminal evaluation report, the terminal evaluation review will assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved¹, relevance of the project results, and the project's cost-effectiveness. The ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance on the following criteria:²

- a) **Relevance.** Were project outcomes consistent with the focal area/operational program strategies and country priorities? Explain.
- b) **Effectiveness.** Are project outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (that is, the original or modified project objectives)?
- c) **Efficiency.** Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost-effective? How does the project's cost/time versus outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative, or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?

An overall rating will be provided according to the achievement and shortcomings in the three criteria ranging from highly satisfactory, satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, moderately unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, highly unsatisfactory, and unable to assess.

The reviewer of the terminal evaluation will provide a rating under each of the three criteria (relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency). Relevance of outcomes will be rated on a binary scale: a 'satisfactory' or

¹ *Objectives* are the intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other development results to which a project or program is expected to contribute (OECD DAC 2002).

² *Outcomes* are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Outputs are the products, capital goods, and services that result from a development intervention; these may also include changes resulting from the intervention that are relevant to the achievement of outcomes (OECD DAC 2002). For the GEF, environmental outcomes are the main focus.

an 'unsatisfactory' rating will be provided. If an 'unsatisfactory' rating has been provided on this criterion, the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than "unsatisfactory".

Effectiveness and Efficiency will be rated as following:

- **Highly satisfactory.** The project had no shortcomings. The actual outcomes were significantly higher than the ex-ante expectations.
- **Satisfactory.** The project had minor shortcomings. The actual outcomes were commensurate with the ex-ante expectations.
- **Moderately satisfactory.** The project had moderate shortcomings. The actual outcomes were slightly lower than the ex-ante expectations but with several area areas where performance matched the expectations.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory.** The project had significant shortcomings. The actual outcomes were lower than the ex-ante expectations, with a few area areas where performance matched the expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory.** The project had major shortcomings and the actual outcomes were substantially lower than the ex-ante expectations.
- **Highly unsatisfactory.** The project had severe shortcomings and actual outcomes were negligible or absent compared to the ex-ante expectations.
- **Unable to assess.** The reviewer was unable to assess outcomes on this dimension.

In providing a rating, a reviewer will look for the description that best fits the achievements of a project. The calculation of the overall outcomes score of projects will consider all three criteria, of which relevance criterion will be applied first - the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than "unsatisfactory". The second constraint that is applied is that the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than the "effectiveness" rating. The third constraint that is applied is that the overall rating may not be higher than the average score of effectiveness and efficiency criteria calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Outcomes} = (b + c) \div 2$$

In case the average score is lower than the score obtained after application of the first two constraints, then the average score will be the overall score. The score will then be converted into an overall rating with mid values being rounded up upwards.

B.2 Impacts

Has the project achieved impacts, or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts? Impacts will be understood to include positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention. They could be produced directly or indirectly and could be intended or unintended. The terminal evaluation review's preparer will take note of any mention of impacts, especially global environmental benefits, in the terminal evaluation report including the likelihood that the project outcomes will contribute to their achievement. Negative impacts mentioned in the terminal evaluation report should be noted and recorded in section 2 of the terminal evaluation reviews

template in the subsection on “Issues that require follow-up.” Although project impacts will be described, they will not be rated.

B.3 Criteria for Sustainability Ratings

Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after completion of project implementation (GEF 2000). The outcomes that are considered are both achieved outcomes and expected outcomes. To assess sustainability, the terminal evaluation reviewer will identify and assess the key risks that could undermine continuation of benefits at the time of the evaluation. Some of these risks might include the absence of or inadequate financial resources, an enabling legal framework, commitment from key stakeholders, relevant environmental factors, and an enabling economy. The following four types of risk factors will be assessed by the terminal evaluation reviewer to rate the likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes: financial, sociopolitical, institutional frameworks and governance, and environmental.

The following questions provide guidance to assess if the factors are met:

- **Financial resources.** What is the likelihood that financial resources will be available to continue the activities that result in the continuation of benefits (income-generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes)?
- **Sociopolitical.** Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership is insufficient to allow for project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?
- **Institutional framework and governance.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how, are in place.
- **Environmental.** Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The terminal evaluation should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of project outcomes. For example, planned construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project.

The reviewer will provide an overall risk rating after assessing the overall level of risks (taking into account risks related to financial resources, sociopolitical, institutional, environmental factors, and other risks as applicable) as follows:

- **Likely.** There are no risks affecting that criterion of sustainability.
- **Moderately likely.** There are moderate risks that affect that criterion of sustainability.
- **Moderately unlikely.** There are significant risks that affect that criterion of sustainability.

- **Unlikely.** There are severe risks affecting that criterion of sustainability.
- **Unable to assess.** Unable to assess risk on this dimension.
- **Not applicable.** This dimension is not applicable to the project.

B.4 Criteria for Assessment of Quality of Project M&E Systems

GEF projects are required to develop M&E plans by the time of work program inclusion, to appropriately budget M&E plans, and to fully carry out the M&E plan during implementation. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project to changing situations. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that measure results (such as environmental results) after project completion. Terminal evaluation reviews will include an assessment of the achievement and shortcomings of M&E systems.

- a) **M&E design.** Project should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress in achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, and so on), SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and reporting and evaluation at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should be specified. Dedicated funding for M&E should be provided in a project's budget. Responsibilities for undertaking M&E activities should be specified. Questions to guide this assessment include: In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient (sufficient and practical indicators identified; timely baseline; targets created; provisions made for the effective use of data collected; analysis systems specified including studies and reports; practical organization and logistics set forth in terms of responsibility for, and scheduling of, M&E activities)?
- b) **M&E plan implementation.** An assessment will be made on the quality of M&E implementation over the project's lifetime, as well as the extent to which provisions were made for continuing M&E following project closure where warranted. Such an assessment will cover whether the M&E system was in place and allowed the timely tracking of results and progress toward project objectives throughout the project; whether annual project reports were complete, accurate, and with well-justified ratings; whether the information provided by the M&E system was used to improve and adapt project performance; and whether proper training was provided for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Question to guide this assessment include: Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress toward project objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

A number rating 1–6 will be provided for each criterion according to the achievement and shortcomings with highly satisfactory = 6, satisfactory = 5, moderately satisfactory = 4, moderately unsatisfactory = 3, unsatisfactory = 2, highly unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = no rating. The reviewer of the

terminal evaluation will provide a rating under each of the three criteria (M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and M&E properly budgeted and funded) as follows:

- **Highly satisfactory.** There were no shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system. The presented or implemented M&E approach is appropriate for the given project.
- **Satisfactory.** There were minor shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system. Overall the presented or implemented M&E approach is appropriate for the given project.
- **Moderately satisfactory.** There were moderate shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system. Although there are a few area where the presented or implemented M&E approach could be improved further, it is appropriate for the given project.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory.** There were significant shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system. There are some areas where the presented or implemented M&E approach could be improved further. Despite some areas where the M&E approach is adequate, overall the M&E plan is inappropriate for the given project.
- **Unsatisfactory.** There were major shortcomings in that criterion of the project M&E system. There are several areas where the presented or implemented M&E approach is weak. Overall the M&E plan is inappropriate for the given project.
- **Highly unsatisfactory.** There was no project M&E system or implementation of M&E approach was very poor. It is unlikely that the M&E system provided any information of value.

B.5 Criteria for Assessment of Quality of Terminal Evaluation Reports

The ratings on quality of terminal evaluation reports will be assessed using the following criteria:

- a) The report presents an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable.
- b) The report was consistent, the evidence presented was complete and convincing, and ratings were well substantiated.
- c) The report presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes.
- d) The lessons and recommendations are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the portfolio and future projects.
- e) The report included the actual project costs (totals, per activity and per source) and actual co-financing used.
- f) The report included an assessment of the quality of the M&E plan at entry, the M&E system used during implementation, and whether the information generated by the M&E system was used for project management.

A number rating 1–6 will be provided for each criterion according to the achievement and shortcomings with highly satisfactory = 6, satisfactory = 5, moderately satisfactory = 4, moderately unsatisfactory = 3, unsatisfactory = 2, highly unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = no rating.

Each criterion to assess the quality of the terminal evaluation will be rated as follows:

- **Highly satisfactory.** There were no shortcomings in the terminal evaluation on this criterion. The report is comprehensive and provides credible, systematic, and detailed information on this criterion.
- **Satisfactory.** There were minor shortcomings in the terminal evaluation on this criterion. Overall, the report is comprehensive and provides credible, systematic, and detailed information on this criterion.
- **Moderately satisfactory.** There were moderate shortcomings in the terminal evaluation on this criterion. Overall, the report is comprehensive and provides credible, systematic, and detailed information on this criterion although some information gaps were also noted.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory.** There were significant shortcomings in the terminal evaluation on this criterion. Overall, despite some areas of adequate reporting, the report is not comprehensive and has several information gaps on this criterion.
- **Unsatisfactory.** There were major shortcomings in the terminal evaluation on this criterion. The report is not comprehensive and has many information gaps on this criterion.
- **Highly unsatisfactory.** There were severe shortcomings in the terminal evaluation on this criterion. The reporting on this criterion is inadequate and has severe information gaps.

The first two criteria (of all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives and report consistency and substantiation of claims with proper evidence) are more important and have therefore been assigned a greater weight. The quality of the terminal evaluation reports will be calculated by the following formula:

$$\text{Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report} = 0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f)$$

The total number will be rounded and converted to the scale of highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory.

B.6 Assessment of Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Outcomes and Sustainability

This section of the terminal evaluation review will summarize the factors or processes related to implementation delays and co-financing that may have affected attainment of project results. This section will summarize the description in the terminal evaluation on key causal linkages of these factors:

- **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, what were the reasons for it? To what extent did materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability? What were the causal linkages of these effects?
- **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there were delays, what were the reasons for them? To what extent did the delay affect project outcomes and/or sustainability? What were the causal linkages of these effects?

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