

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1053	
GEF Agency project ID		1119	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Sustainable Management of Globally Significant Endemic Ruminant Livestock of West Africa	
Country/Countries		Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Senegal	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP2—Mainstreaming biodiversity; GEF Strategic objectives: BD-2 Mainstreaming Biodiversity in production. OP 13 Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS, ITC (International Trypanotolerance Centre)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency; (ITC); through consultations	
Private sector involvement		No involvement, which was a shortcoming noted by the TE (TE, p.32)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		01/30/2007 (CEO endorsement cover note)	
Effectiveness date / project start		06/29/2007 (TE, p.2)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Mid 2016 (TE, p.2)	
Actual date of project completion		06/2015 (TE, p.2)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M) (Mid-Term, PIR 2014, p.3)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.495	.495
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		10.0	10.0
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	3.84	7.6
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	32.75 (30.15 AfdB+1.07 ILRI+0.32 ITC+0.21 FAO+ 1.0 CIRDES) (PIR 2014, p.3)	31.6 (30.2 AfdB+1.1 ILRI+0.3 ITC+0.0 FAO+ 0.0 CIRDES) (PIR 2014, p.3)
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		10.495	10.495
Total Co-financing		36.58 (PIR 2014, p.3) (TE reported 36.23 M and broke the figure down, but breakdown figure didn't add up)	39.2 (PIR 2014, p.3)
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		46.58	49.2
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/17/2012 (TE, p.1)	
Author of TE		Stephanie Hodge, Roel Bosma	
TER completion date		03/04/2016	
TER prepared by		Chenhao Liu	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	HS	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	NR	ML
M&E Design		S	NR	S
M&E Implementation		HS	NR	S
Quality of Implementation		HS	NR	S
Quality of Execution		(ITC-MS) (UNOPS-HS)	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MU

3. Project Objectives

- 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environment Objective (GEO) is "the in-situ conservation of endemic ruminant livestock, their unique genetic traits, and their habitat in the four target countries within West Africa" (PD, p.8) Specifically, the project will target three breeds for in-situ conservation: N'Dama cattle, Djallonke sheep, and the West African Dwarf goat. These breeds were proven by scientific research to carry genes responsible for resisting several diseases in the humid tropics (e.g. trypanosomosis, endoparasites, and dermatophilosis), allowing them to adapt to challenging ecological conditions.

- 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is "to ensure sustainable populations of targeted endemic ruminant livestock breeds in four West African countries in order to improve rural economies and ensure the conservation of these breeds and their globally unique genetic traits." (PD, p.15)

The Project Immediate Objective is "to establish effective models for community based management of endemic ruminant livestock and their habitat at project pilot sites, and strengthen production, market, and policy environments in support of these breeds." (PD, p.15)

It worth noting that, there are two parts of the project implemented and funded respectively by the GEF and the African Development Bank (AfDB), which avails two different sets of project logic framework and therefore expected outcomes. However, based on the project development objective, the project stakeholders represented at the inception workshop merged the project result areas as defined by GEF and AfDB into 6 Strategic Lines, which, combined with project immediate objective serve as the basis for progress monitoring:

SIL-1: Preservation of genetic characterization and improvement of production and productivity of ERL (Endemic Ruminant Livestock);

SIL-2: Improvement of the valorization of the ERL and its products;

SIL-3: Sustainable management of ERL and its ecosystem;

SIL-4: Contribute to building the legal, policy, and institutional frameworks;

SIL-5: Cooperation, knowledge management, exchanges, and coordination;

SIL-6: Project management.

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

There were no changes in global environmental objectives, development objectives, and the 6 strategic lines.

However, project indicators under the development objectives and strategic lines have undergone a few changes. For example, Indicator 1: “Physical and financial execution rate of the project” and Indicator 2: “the results from evaluations and clean audits” under the strategic line 6 “Project Management” were added to the project’s logic framework only after 2010. (PIR 2014, p.52-53)

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the project’s relevance as “Highly Satisfactory”. This TER will rate the project’s outcome relevance as “Satisfactory”. The project is consistent with relevant strategic priorities for development at the national and international level.

The project supported the framework established under GEF OP13 - (Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture), in that it seeks to promote the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources important for food and agriculture, as well as the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of these genetic resources. The project also supported GEF OP13 priorities for integrating agricultural biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives in land use and natural resource use management plans, and for promoting the positive impacts, and mitigating the

negative impacts, of agricultural systems and practices on biological diversity. (PD, p.13) Finally, the project also supported the goals of GEF Strategic Priority 2 for the Biodiversity Focal Area, Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors. (PD, p.13)

The project was also consistent with respective development priorities in the four project countries, including but not exclusive to:

“1) increasing the in-situ production and productivity of livestock resources to ensure food security, income generation, and employment creation, to reduce dependence on food imports, and to diversity income sources for individuals, communities and nations;

2) establishing effective animal disease monitoring and control systems;

3) ensuring a balance between livestock and the environment, and integrate crop and livestock production systems so as to reduce environmental degradation and improve soil fertility;

4) promoting community-based resource management of livestock herds and habitat, within the framework of decentralization processes taking place in each of the countries;

5) providing linkages and coordinate policies and programs between animal genetic resources and other sectors in the economy.” (PD, p.10)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE rated the project’s outcome effectiveness as “Satisfactory”. The TE only briefly summarized the project results without comparing them with expected outcomes. Based on the evidence presented by the Final PIR (PIR 2014), which shows that some progress was made in reaching all of the project targets, but the majority of targets were not fully achieved, this TER rates the project’s outcome as “Moderately Satisfactory”. A comparison of the project’s achievements against the targets of its indicators is presented below: (PIR 2014, p.4-53)

The project’s Immediate Objectives are: (i) To conserve the biodiversity of endemic ruminant livestock and improve their productivity (AfDB) (ii) To establish effective models for community-based management of endemic ruminant livestock and its habitats at project sites, and strengthen production, market, and policy environment in support of these breeds (GEF)

There are 7 targets (of 7 indicators) under the project immediate objectives. All of the targets were partially achieved or were on the track for full achievement by the project’s end. Target 1 was at least 20% increase in all project countries by the EOP from baseline levels for household food security as measured by a household dietary diversity score (HDDS). The target was partly achieved as, according to data, only Mali reached the target with an increase of 24.3%. Target 2 is the 20% increase in the quantity of meat produced by the ERL (Endemic Ruminant Livestock) in the project sites. The target achievement was 75%, as by the EOP, the level for Gambia, Senegal and Guinea all had increases up to 100% and the EOP statistics

was not available for Mali. Target 3 is a 20% increase in the volume of ERL milk produced in the project sites (litres). The target was 50% achieved, as by the EOP in the four project countries only Gambia (35.4%) and Guinea (97%) reported meeting the target. Target 4 was that critical habitat zones at each project pilot site for endemic ruminant livestock would be identified, demarcated, and conserved under community-based sustainable management structures. The target was partly achieved as by the EOP 15 POAS (Land Use and Allocation Plans/LUAP) were implemented in all countries which include relevant contents, and six (6) community forests are being properly managed and protected in the project sites. Target 5 was the populations of purebred endemic ruminant livestock herds of the 3 species specified and at the level of pilot sites in four countries remain at viable levels, with no decline at least compared with baseline surveys, and sufficiently large to ensure long-term genetic viability. A large portion of this target was achieved. According to the EOP statistics: In Gambia, the number of cattle and goats increased slightly; In Mali, the number of sheep and goat all increased significantly. In Guinea, the number of all three species of ERL increased more than 80%. Population of other species or in other countries declined. Target 6 is a 10% increase by project end from baseline levels for the annual exploitation rates of ERL population for commercialization (off-take rates) and for other uses (e.g. draught power for cattle). The target was partly achieved, as according to the EOP statistics, in Gambia the rate for cattle increased 400% and in Guinea the rate for all ERL species increased for more than 190%. The rate for other species or in other countries declined. Target 7 is an increase of 15% by the EOP for the level of average income generated from ERL and its contribution to household income. The target was partly achieved as Gambia reported a 92% increase in contribution to household income and Guinea reported a 49% increase in average income and a 158% increase in contribution to household income. Gambia's income level decreased. For Mali and Senegal both decrease was noted for both the indicators.

Apart from project immediate objectives, the project's logic framework was also organized around 6 Strategic Lines (SIL):

SIL-1: Preservation of genetic characterization and improvement of production and productivity of ERL. Two of the five targets (of the five indicators) under this strategic line were met, while the rest were partially achieved. The first target, that Mean milk production per cow in each country increase 30% by project end from baseline levels was achieved only in Guinea (an increase of 41%), with no change in the other countries. The project fully achieved the second target of at least a 25% decrease for each country by project end from baseline levels in the mortality rate of cows, with the rate exceeded in all countries. The third target, that the mortality rates for lambs decrease at least 25% for each country by project end was almost fully achieved as all the countries except Guinea have met the target. The fourth target -that the mortality rates for off springs of ERL (up to 12 months) decrease at least 25% for each country by project end from baseline levels, was achieved only by Gambia with a 61% decrease, the other countries did not show significant effects. Finally, the last target, that 4 cattle breeding programs (one in each country) and at least 4 small ruminants (sheep and goat) breeding programs (also one in each country) were established exclusively focusing on ERL by the end of year 3, was fully achieved, though not necessarily in time. The EOP 4 cattle breeding programs and 5 cattle genetic improvement programs were established and being implemented in all four countries. This indicates achievement of the project target.

SIL-2: Improvement of the valorization of the ERL and its products: There are 3 targets (of 3 indicators) under this SIL. Target 1 was an at least 15% increase by the end of the project from baseline levels in the ratio of the number of ERL producers selling live animals and livestock products over the total number of ERL producers at site level, for each country. The target was partly achieved. The ratio increased for Ndama milk in Mali, for goat and sheep in Senegal, for little cattle in Guinea, and the ratio declined for other species/countries. Target 2 is 20% increase in users of credit by year 4, and up to 50% increase by the end of the project in the percentage of ERL producers accessing selected financial and market services (credit, market infrastructure, banking services) over the total number of ERL producers at site level. The target was partly achieved, as by the EOP only Gambia and Mali clearly reported an increase of more than 50% (87% and 70.4% respectively). Target 3 was a 15% increase for values below 80% at the baseline in the percentage of the value of ERL products sold in local markets monitored by the project vis-à-vis the value of all types of ruminant livestock (endemic and non-endemic). Due to data availability, the EOP value of this target was unclear.

SIL-3: Sustainable management of ERL and its ecosystem: There are two targets (of 2 indicators) under this SIL. Target 1 was that there were 30% by the end of year 3, and 60% by the end of year 6, of producers adopting/participating in the community-based sustainable management of Natural Resources practices promoted by the project as a share of the total number of producers. This target was fully achieved, as by mid-2011 (year 6) approximately 60 % to 75 % of producers of all project countries were adopting/participating in the community based sustainable management of Natural Resources practices promoted by the project. Target 2 was the number of uncontrolled rangeland fires decreases by at least 50% by the EOP. This target was on track to being fully achieved, as based on statistics available by mid-2014, Guinea and Mali achieved more than 50% reduction, and Gambia and Senegal were on the track to meet the target.

SIL-4: Contribute to building the legal, policy, and institutional frameworks: There are two targets (of two indicators) under this SIL. Target 1 was at least 70% “yes” to the questions across the board for all countries in the indicator of the Policy and Regulatory SO2 tracking Tool measuring the level of the enabling environment for the conservation, production, and marketing of ERL in the four targeted countries. This target was on the track of being fully achieved, as by the Mid-2014, Senegal (83%) and Mali (94%) reached the target, and Gambia (61%) and Guinea (50%) were on the track to meet the target. Target 2 was at least 80% realization of the contributions pledged by governments. This target was partly achieved, as all the countries except Gambia (30%) have met the target.

SIL-5: Cooperation, knowledge management, exchanges, and coordination: There are 2 targets (of 2 indicators) under this SIL. Target 1 was some establishments of platforms/networks by the EOP, for information exchanges, cross fertilization and coordinating purpose on genetic, NRM (Natural Resource Management), animal production and marketing with the participation of all significant stakeholders (institutions and actors) at local, national, and regional levels. The target was fully achieved, as innovation platforms established in Guinea and Mali, the Sub-Regional Focal Point for the Management of Animal Genetic Resources in West and Central Africa established, and breeders’ associations established in project countries, were having positively impacts positively appreciated by all stakeholders. Target 2 was that local association would be fully involved in information sharing at the information platforms

established through the project by the end of year 3 and coordination mechanisms would be established by end of the project. The target was partly achieved, as according to information reported at the EOP, there has been a significant involvement of information sharing at the platforms, and various coordination mechanisms were formed, but it is still difficult to determine the “full involvement” of local associations as expected in the target.

Overall, by the end of the project target was achieved substantially for some indicators, although for several others target achievement was less than expected. Thus, a rating of “Moderately Satisfactory” for the project’s effectiveness is justified.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE rated the project’s outcome efficiency as “Satisfactory”. This TER will rate the project’s outcome efficiency as “Moderately Satisfactory”. The project was implemented efficiently in terms of both cost and time, but some shortcomings still existed.

The TE reports an effective financial mobilization and management for achieving the project objectives. Analysis of delivery throughout implementation in the TE confirmed a strong and balanced execution of funds. (TE, p.39) Materialization rate for financial resources committed by donors was also close to 100%. At the time when TE was conducted, the average implementation rate of the outputs was 152%. (TE, p.39) By October 2014, the global physical execution was at 95%, the execution rate for RCU (Regional Coordination Unit) was 95% (TE, p. 40) Results from financial audits by the time of TE has indicated a sound financial management. This, combined with the project’s timely completion, confirms that the project was able to translate its financial resources into project results efficiently.

The project’s initial expected duration was 10 years for the GEF part and 6 years for the AfDB part. The project implementation officially started in 2007 after the signature of project document, but the actual effective implementation started in early 2008. The expected closing date was December 2016 for the GEF component and December 2013 for the AfDB component. A revision occurred in the later stage of project implementation, which advanced the closing date for the GEF part to December 2015, and extended the closing date for the AfDB component to December 2014 (June 2015 for AfDB Senegal loan). (TE, p.20) The TE also pointed out that there was a long delay between project conception (2004) and start (2007), and there has been a number of cases of implementation delays such as the project delays in Mali and Guinea due to political unrest. (TE, p.26) A lack of appropriate technical skills and personnel required by some technical partners to implement the partnership protocols efficiently and in a timely manner have led to significant delays in the implementation of the project. (TE, p.56)

Overall, a rating of “Moderately Satisfactory” for the project’s efficiency is justified.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE rated the project's overall sustainability as "Satisfactory" based on its assessment of four sub-categories of sustainability in a 4-point scale: Financial resource sustainability (Likely); Socio-political sustainability (Moderately Likely); Institutional sustainability (Moderately Likely); Environmental sustainability (Moderately Likely). This TER will rate the project's sustainability as "Moderately Likely" after assessing the four sub-categories of sustainability below. Based on the evidence presented by the TE, the project received direct follow-up financial support from participating states for use of scaling-up. Besides, it shows a promising sign of socio-political, institutional, and environmental sustainability.

Financial Resource Sustainability- Likely

The TE rated the project's financial sustainability as "Likely", and this TER will adopt the same rating. After project completion, three countries committed further budgets to support the extension of project activities for consolidation and further capacitating local actors. Specifically:

- "1. The government of Mali has approved a new additional budget to cover the project activities until the end of 2015 (one year after the project end) and included Madina Diassa in its general budget;
2. The government of Guinea reserved 500,000 USD to support the finalization of over 20 water points;
3. The government of Senegal has endorsed the sustainability strategy into the national budget;" (TE, p.50)

Socio-political Sustainability-Moderate Likely

The TE rated the project's socio-political sustainability as "Moderately Likely", and this TER will adopt the same rating. The TE presented relevant evidence of socio-political sustainability. Particularly, the implementation support at project sites was well supported by the extensive participation of local residents, in the form of steering committees (TE, p.28), a fact that promoted the national ownership and the long-term social and political support of the local communities. The TE also concluded that "project scaling-out is feasible as demonstrated by observed political will gained and project-generated learning and capacity building at all levels." (TE, p.51) But in order to further strengthen the project's political sustainability, the TE notes that more policy advocacy is still required, including model documentation supported by a financial and economic cost benefit analysis at the household, local, national, and regional levels. (TE, p.51)

Institutional Sustainability- Moderately Likely

The TE rated the project's institutional sustainability as "Moderately Likely", and this TER will adopt the same rating. The TE concluded that "Within institutional aspects, consolidation of infrastructure activities and strengthening community organization were significant."(TE, p.51) The project's institutional sustainability was also augmented through extensive participation of local communities at project sites, in the form of steering committees.(TE,p.28) Upon completion of the project, governments of project participating countries provided additional institutional support to ensure the sustainability of the project. For instance, "The Government of Mali has constructed a permanent office for the project (the project has been institutionalized in Mali); In Guinea the national ERL technical committee for the revitalization

process of the livestock research centers established by the Ministry of Livestock has developed a proposal on breeding center revitalization within the ministry of livestock for approval.”(TE, p.52) At the same time, the TE identified the weakness of ITC as the executing agency in promoting regional cooperation after project completion as it did during the project period, which is a fact requires further support from project participating states (TE, p.51)

Environmental Sustainability-Moderately Likely

The TE rated the project’s environmental sustainability as “Moderately Likely”. Given the evidence of financial, social-political, and institutional sustainability, plus a satisfactory outcome, it is likely that the project could have environmental sustainability as well. But the TE did mention a number of potential environmental hazards led by the project, such as the usage of non-recyclable plastic packages at mini-dairies, which may potentially become threats to Endemic Ruminant Livestock in case of ingestion. Also, the TE pointed out the ineffective disposal of waste water at project cites can be a potential environmental threat. (TE, p.53)

Overall, this TER’s rating of “Moderately Likely” for the project’s sustainability is justified.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

- 5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Co-financing was provided by national governments of participating states, ITC (International Trypanotolerance Centre), ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), FAO, CIRDES (International Center for Livestock Research and Development in Sub-humid Zones) and AfDB. The co-financing reported by the TE at project endorsement was 36.23 million USD, but was corrected by the PIR 2014 to the level of 36.58 million USD. The TE didn’t report the end of project materialization of total co-financing, but it reported that the disbursement rate of GEF funding will be close to 100% by the end of the project, and disbursement rate of AfDB funding will be 93% (TE, 39). In addition, the PIR 2014 reported the mid-term materialization of co-financing at the level of 39.2 million USD, indicating a materialization rate of 108% (PIR 2014, p.3). Relevant project documents didn’t specify the linkage between the level of co-financing and project outcomes/sustainability.

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

The project’s initially expected duration was 10 years for the GEF part and 6 years for the AfDB part. The project implementation officially started in 2007 after the signature of project document, but the actual effective implementation started in 2008. The expected closing date was December 2016 for the GEF component and December 2013 for the AfDB component. A revision occurred in the later stage of project

implementation which advanced the closing date for the GEF component to December 2015, and the extended the closing date for the AfDB component to December 2014 (June 2015 for AfDB Senegal loan). (TE, p.20) The TE also pointed out that there is a long delay between project conception (2004) and start (2007), and there has been a number of cases of implementation delays such as the project delays in Mali and Guinea due to political unrest. Relevant project documents didn't specific the linkage between delays and project outcomes/sustainability.

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

The project's country ownership was at a high level. During the Terminal Evaluation, national-level stakeholders interviewed in all countries visited expressed and validated the project's high-level country ownership. The project clearly supports the countries' programs and policies aimed at increasing rural productivity, including that of endemic livestock. The project also seeks to attain food security, to generate foreign exchange through the export of livestock and its products, and to increase employment in rural areas, all of which are either part of the project outcomes or have positively contributed to the project outcomes. (TE, p.27) The participation the local beneficiaries in the project's management committees enhanced the project's ownership and might contribute to the sustainable use of the built infrastructure and the project's political and institutional sustainability.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the M&E design at entry as "Satisfactory". This TER will rate adopt the same rating. The project's initial M&E design was specific and comprehensive.

The project's two implementing agencies, UNDP and AfDB, developed two different project logic frameworks. But the two project log-frames were later integrated into an overall project logic framework organized around project immediate objectives plus the six strategic lines (SIL)s, which was fully adopted for project monitoring after the MTR (TE, p.40.) The AfDB M&E plan and project logic framework were not available, but the UNDP version was clearly presented in the UNDP project document. The UNDP project logic framework includes five (5) expected project outcomes, with each measured by a number of SMART indicators. For example, "establishment of self-supporting structures for the dissemination of improved

management techniques and genetic/breeding material for cattle, sheep and goats in place, with the participation of endemic livestock producers at each site” was identified as an indicator for “Outcome 1: Production and productivity of endemic ruminant livestock is sustainably improved”. Its end of project target was set to “12 local, 4 national, and 1 regional structures for information sharing; with 25% participation by end of year 4, 50% by end of year 7, and 75% by end of year 10”. The source of verification for achievement of targets, and assumptions for these indicators/targets were also specified. The UNDP version of the project document also rolled out a detailed M&E implementation plan, in which relevant executing parties, key events and deliverables, arrangement for PIRs/APRs, MTR and TE were specified. An M&E budget of US\$300,000 was provisioned. (UNDP project document, p.31-33)

The TE didn’t present the integrated project logic framework and M&E plan, but the PIR presented a significant part of it including the indicators under each SIL, their baseline/target values, as well as the timeline to achieve the targets. For example, under the project immediate objective “To establish effective models for community-based management of endemic ruminant livestock and its habitats at project sites, and strengthen production, market, and policy environment in support of these breeds”, “Quantity of meat produced by the ERL in the project sites” was identified as one of the project indicators. The end of project target was “At least 20% increase by project end from baseline levels” (PIR 2013, p.3) Overall, the indicators, in the majority, are consistent with the SMART principle.

Overall, given the project’s initial well-rounded M&E plan, a rating of “Satisfactory” is justified.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the M&E implementation as “Highly Satisfactory”. This TER will rate the M&E implementation as “Satisfactory”. Evidence presented by relevant project documents is drawing a picture of a strong and successful M&E implementation, but the quality of TE could be improved by adding more relevant information and details as the support for its ratings.

The most significant success of M&E implementation is the consistent use of the project logic framework in measuring the project progress toward achieving expected outputs. All project PIRs since the midterm review have utilized the same integrated project logic framework (for both the GEF and AfDB part) in tracking the project’s process toward its targets by comparing the current status of each indicator against its status in previous years, baseline level and the target level. The 6 strategic lines which form the backbone of the project’s logic framework, have been consistent since their establishment after the MTR. Some modifications to these indicators did occur during project implementation, such as the indicator 8a “Mean milk production per cow” under SIL 1 was further broken down by rainy/dry seasons after project implementation started (PIR 2013, p.10). PIRs were consistent with the standard UNDP format. A MTR was conducted in 2011, followed by a comprehensive study on specific issues. The Terminal Evaluation was detailed and comprehensive in the key topics covered, but it could have provided more specific and relevant evidence in supporting its ratings.

Overall, a rating of “Satisfactory” for the project M&E implementation is justified.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The project's implementing agency is UNDP. The TE rated the "AfDB/UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/execution, coordination, and operational issues" as "Highly Satisfactory". This TER will rate the quality of project implementation as "Satisfactory." Based on the evidence presented by the TE, UNDP has played an important and successful role as the project's implementing agency.

The regional technical support provided by UNDP and GEF was of high quality. The role of UNDP/GEF has been particularly important in the overall design and monitoring of the regional project. UNDP/GEF has a much stronger role in regional coordination than in national coordination. (TE, p.37, p.42)

At the national level, UNDP has been involved in the national steering committees and has been a partner to national coordinators in all four countries visited. Its role has been important for synergy and political traction, especially for developing communication around the overall strategy and its significance for regional and national development, and the importance of linking Endemic Ruminant Livestock and Natural Resource Management in national development planning. It has also been important for signaling opportunities for out-scaling issues, and its involvement across the four countries in this regard was and remains particularly important. (TE, p.37)

The TE found excellent communication ongoing between UNOPS, one of the project's executing agencies, and UNDP national offices, in particular with the UNDP national office in Mali as the lead national office. The majority of interviewees stated that the technical and strategic support provided by UNDP local offices was good, but that during end of project activities, it could have been more proactive in identifying national follow-up activities to scale up the project's approach and build national capacity for cross-sectoral work involving endemic rural livestock and natural resource management. The UNDP-Mali lead office began to participate actively in project meetings (RSC and NSC) and was kept informed about all important project activities (interview with the UNDP office in Bamako).

Thus, considering both the success and limits of UNDP's performance as the project's implementing agency, a rating of "Satisfactory" for the project's quality of project implementation is justified.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

Based on the GEF’s business model, the project has two executing agencies: UNOPS as the executing agency for the UNDP/GEF component, and the ITC (International Trypanotolerance Centre) as the executing agency for the AfDB component. The TE rated the quality of UNOPS execution as “Highly Satisfactory”, and it also rated the quality of execution by ITC as “Moderately Satisfactory”. Considering the evidence presented by the TE regarding the project’s overall execution process, this TER will rate the project’s overall quality of execution as “Satisfactory”. The project’s overall execution has been successful based on existing evidence, but the ITC has some shortcomings in fulfilling its role.

The role of UNOPS in this project as custodian and implementer of the GEF funds was satisfactory. “It did a very professional job, in particular delivery and management for results within the many constraints and to deal with barriers for implementation that needed to be overcome. The complex arrangements were the single biggest risk and major barrier early on. UNOPS dealt with this and led this project to a useful completion.” (TE, p.41)

The AfDB selected the ITC (International Trypanotolerance Centre) as its executing agency, but it did not hold ITC 100% responsible for delivering on the project. An unforeseen reduction in capacity at ITC during implementation left them unable to integrate the breeding program network set up by the project, a fact that hampered its capacity and role in promoting the regional cooperation after the project end. (TE, p.38)

According to the reports (PIR, stock taking, etc.) at the end of the project, the overall cumulative delivery by June 2014 was 93%, which is at a highly satisfactory level. By the End of Project (EOP), the materialization rate for project finance committed by donors was close to 100%, and the average implementation rate of outputs was 152%. (TE, p.39 Results from financial audits by the time of TE has indicated a sound financial management. The M&E of the project was up-to-date (see above). In terms of work planning, quarterly and annual reports were prepared at national and regional level and shared with 42 key stakeholders (steering committees’ members, donors, technical partners, etc.), and National and Regional Steering Committees met annually during the first quarter of the year. Project execution at local and national level was regularly monitored and supported by NCU (National Coordination Unit) and the RCU (Regional Coordination Unit).

Overall, considering the demonstrated success of project execution, a rating of “Satisfactory” in this area is justified.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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

The project aimed to ensure sustainable populations of targeted endemic ruminant livestock breeds and the conservation of these breeds and their globally unique genetic traits, for which capacity building and institutional building were adopted as the main implementation approaches. Thus, the project led to no immediate environmental change. But the TE did mention a number of potential environmental hazards led by the project, such as the usage of non-recyclable plastic packages at mini-dairies, which may potentially become threats to ERLs in case of ingestion. Also, the TE pointed out the ineffective disposal of waste water at project sites can be a potential environmental threat. (TE, p.53)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project led to the following socio-economic changes, as reported by the TE: (TE, p.48)

The project brought about improvements in commercialization and marketing systems for endemic ruminant livestock and livestock products. After appropriate training, associations of professionals were given the responsibility of managing the use and maintenance of 19 livestock markets, 17 slaughter areas/houses, 14 well equipped small dairy processing units, and over 90 constructed water points with drinking troughs. The increased quality of technologies, infrastructures, as well as knowledge has facilitated the ERL-related business run by the local communities of participating countries, and therefore contributed to their income generation.

The project implemented Natural Resource Management (NRM) by the participatory establishment of 15 POAS (Land Use and Allocation Plans/LUAP) in the primary and secondary project sites. The POAS included the creation of livestock roads, firewalls, and brigades fighting bush-fires and committees for management and monitoring. This reduced conflict notably across all project sites, bush-fires. The effect on wildlife and flora (RN) is yet to be quantified, but the communities increased their income, through the sale of products, such as honey, after the introduction of new technologies.

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

a) Capacities

The TE reported the following change in capacities: (TE, p.48)

- The project built up breeding programs of total five for cattle, four for sheep, and four for goats aiming at presenting genetic characteristics of ERL and their production and productivity.
- Appropriate trainings associations of professionals were given the responsibility of managing the use and maintenance of 19 livestock markets, 17 slaughter areas/houses, 14 well equipped small dairy processing units, and over 90 constructed water points with drinking troughs (one third with borehole and solar powered pump).
- Natural Resource Management was implemented by the participatory establishment of 15 POAS Land Use and Allocation Plans/LUAP) in the primary and secondary project sites. Apart from benefiting the livelihood of local communities, the Plans have led to a reduced number uncontrolled rangeland fires in project pilot sites.
- The Sub-Regional Focal Point for the Management of Animal Genetic Resources in West and Central Africa was established positively appreciated by all stakeholders. ERL-NRM innovation platforms were established in Guinea and Mali have led to a number of positive changes at the individual level and the community level especially with respect to income and attitudes.

b) Governance

- National studies on policy, legislation, and legal frameworks related to ERL were undertaken in all project participating countries and were appropriately documented with national sharing and validation workshops held. The activities had influence on national regulations in four countries at the start of a regional network for ERL. (TE, p.48)

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

“The project generated some additional and unanticipated outputs and outcomes. These contributed to the more generic impacts on food security and improved income, but they contributed also to the specific impacts on improving ELR and NRM.

1. The reduced conflicts due to the devolved NRM (Natural Resource Management) were among the most appreciated project impacts, due to the integration of marked livestock roads and fire-breaks in the POAS (community land use plan).
2. The auxiliaries in some countries included vaccinations against poultry. This was very successful and registered a high adoption rate. As poultry are often kept by women, this contributed strongly to improved resilience and their empowerment.
3. The trainings in the production of mineral blocks evolved in some places into small enterprises for vulnerable women (associations) which allowed them to increase their resilience while contributing to improving livestock production and productivity. This activity was left in the hands of livestock owners who had already accumulated wealth.

4. The training in beekeeping using Kenyan hives and the processing and marketing of honey and wax improved income, health, biodiversity, and the awareness on the importance of NRM.
5. The training in improved processing, packaging, and marketing of non-timber forestry products, such as soap (from tree in Guinea), tamarind (*Tamarindus indica*) and shea butter (*Vitellaria paradoxa*) improved income and the awareness on the importance of NRM.
6. Training of farmers in training of bulls for animal traction, thus linking the herd to the traditional main component of their livelihood (crop farming) and strengthening their motivation to take care of the cattle themselves, instead of letting a herder take the benefits.
7. The training on the production of the cane-rat (*Thryonomys swinderanus* or *gregorianus*) in Guinea promotes diversification and alternative livelihood options.” (TE, p.54)

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

Upon the finishing of project, three of four project countries committed additional budgets to support extension of project activities for consolidation and further capacitating the local actors. Specifically: “

1. The government of Mali has approved a budget to cover project activities until the end of 2015 (one year after the project end) and included Madina Diassa in its general budget;
2. The government of Guinea reserved 500,000 USD to support the finalization of over 20 water points;
3. The government of Senegal has endorsed the sustainability strategy into the national budget;” (TE, p.50)

Also, the project’s approach and strategy is being scaled up at the secondary sites as planned and being adopted by new projects (such as WB CORAF regional project) (TE, p.48)

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE provided its recommendation in detail: (TE, p.10-13)

Relevance

- Livestock project design: linking endemic ruminant livestock to natural resource management, while giving responsibility to the users of resources and creating groups for management and production,

contributes to positive impact on animal production and natural resources (i.e. conservation of ERL and its habitat), economic development, food security, and poverty alleviation in the four countries

- **Livestock improvement:** In herd monitoring, it is demonstrated to be the right strategy to improve ruminant production and farmers' incomes. However, the free provision of fencing material for fodder gardens and community forests, as well as the focus on the survey, instead of supporting all farmers with appropriate herd management tools, reduces chances for autonomous replication and scaling-out.
- **Project funding:** Linking investments in infrastructure to the capacity building of the professional organizations under these four contexts contributes to improve the value chains of animal products and to increase volumes of marketed animals, meat, and milk.
- **Project structure, implementation, and evaluation:** The MTR of GEF and AfDB recommended creating an ad hoc technical steering committee to advise the Regional Steering Committee and the RCU.

Effectiveness and Efficiency

- **Natural Resources Management:**

A. Linking communities to extension services through community-based facilitators and collaborative and participatory planning approaches supports the conservation of ERL habitat in the four countries.

B. The project provided a local planning platform mechanism (created trust and collaboration) for community and government dialogues through facilitators called 'animators' for creating local rules and committees for managing NR (Natural Resources), monitoring NRM, and transhumant reception.

C. The approach using (female) village-level animators as facilitators between community-based user groups are building trust for constructive collaboration for ecosystem and land management. It is also a good practice for low technology sharing and supporting technology uptake.

D. Accompanying measures, such as improving beekeeping, local production of mineral licks, creating, or improving water points and making these accessible by livestock roads, are important tools for successful local conventions on NRM.

E. Focus on creating or supporting national institutions with capacity to carry along the implementation of POAS and ERL breeding may be a next step. A good practice noted by TE in the region is the code for the agro-silvo-pastoral system of Senegal which links all these aspects. However, this code also lacks appropriate financial and institutional instruments. The project has developed partnerships and synergies with relevant national institutions to implement POAS (Land Use and Allocation Plans/LUAP) and ERL breeding related activities and contributed greatly to their strengthening.

F. GEF global might promote investments in research and the creation of enterprises able to produce both high quality dry toilets and decomposable material and adapted equipment for packaging of milk and forestry products in Africa, Asia, and South America.

G. Support for ERL breeding by the project included also training of citizens at postgraduate levels in overseas universities. Rehabilitation and support to the operations of Breeding Centers of ITC in the Gambia, Madina Diassa in Mali, CRZ and N'Dama Cooperative in Senegal and Boke and Famoïla CAEs are good examples in this regard.

- **Endemic Livestock Resources**

Improving livestock through selection and breeding is a long term initiative. The non-allocation of funding to CIRDES (International Center for Livestock Research and Development in Sub-humid Zones) for the ex-situ conservation through storing male sperm in-cryo was in agreement with the ProDoc's goal of in-situ conservation. The project did not do a molecular genotypic characterization that combined with the herd

monitoring and progeny recording, at medium term could have accelerated the genetic improvement of the trypanotolerant ERL (Gibson, 2003). This is valid in particular for ERL's aimed sustainable management which is more than conservation. Accelerated breeding supports sustainable management. For N'dama accelerated breeding would strengthen their competitiveness with Zebu and exotic breeds and thus avoid that farmers replace the N'dama. According to the AfDB-PAR, ILRI should have done the genetic characterization. Thus, one of the expected results according to the ProDoc (i) endemic livestock classified and inventoried using genetic markers (supplemented by indigenous systems of classification)" (ProDoc page 13), was not achieved, while according to ProDoc and TE this inventory should have started. Based on the results of the phenotypic characterization which has shown that more than 95% are ERL type and are not at risk based on all existing standards, the project has decided that phenotypic characterization and herd monitoring were sufficient at present and that genetic characterization will not be of added value.

- **Cost Benefit Analysis**

Financial and economic evidence is needed to convince policy and decision makers to support consolidation and out scaling of the pilot. Such policy advocacy for out scaling the POAS and the herd management needs a financial Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) as the basic qualitative analyses that has been provided by ILRI does not convince evaluators of quality.

- **Project design**

Having a scientific implementing partner may strengthen a project but only if that partner can also focus on the ongoing capacity building needs of the regional and national experts, on supporting the latter with appropriate resources (bi-lingual experts), and on being a partner for dynamic monitoring and sustainability of the efforts. The learning is about the role of science, policy and practice and how the design considered the intersection of the three for long-term sustainable results. The UNOPS management made corrections in this regard and actively monitored the involvement of the national technical institutions (TE meet with the local technical implementing partners in Mali, Senegal and Gambia) to ensure scientific integrity, learning and efforts towards sustainable local monitoring systems.

- **Implementation of infrastructure and works**

The design and implementation has been done according to relevant standards, national and AfDB rules and regulations and based on communities' needs and full involvement but engineering and architectural standards still apply.

Although it is normal that infrastructure development and design cannot be uniform: the countries have different eco-physical conditions. There are differences in soil, climate, rain etc. Kolda and Guinea forestry for instance is quite different. For future UNDP/GEF project involving large focus on infrastructure and 'works', the learning is to include in the project management unit a supervisory role of either an engineer and/or lead project architect for quality assurance and to guidance on request to all local design processes including to give contractor's and consider develop a regional basic standard.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation**

During the lengthy period that transpired between the time the project was conceived to the beginning of implementation (2003-2006), significant events transpired that affected the overall results and design architecture, including the role of ILRI as a scientific-based executing partner (declined), the decision to locate the project base from Mali to Gambia, and the addition of ICT as execution agency. The initial project assumptions were thus challenged by these events, and it was the approach taken by the RCU to deal with significant challenges and develop an ME system to deal with change and build consensus and a common results culture in a highly disperse group of implementing partners, including national and local counterparts across four unique country contexts. The ME system developed was based on the consensus and the development of an integrated log frame with targeted and persistent capacity building to support management, partners, and donor sensitization to using the integrated log frame in day-to-day work. It became a management tool at all levels, which helped to build a common understanding of the overall project results from regional down to the village level.

- **Executing Agency/implementation agency**

In view of the management arrangement, the scale of the time of project implementation, partnerships undertaking across the domains of science, development, policy and individual behavior changes, ideals and the numbers of staff (at three levels) was extensive and adaptive management and good project leadership has been very important in this project. The lessons on adaptive management can be taken forward.

- **Sustainability**

Sustainability of this project is addressed at regional, national and local levels. Regionally, the vision embedded in the project's design toward regional economic and sustainable development through the investment in and the formalization and growth of regional cooperation, and a market for ERL and NRM (Natural Resource Management) can be realized with the support of a strong regional scientific institution. Institutional support for launching and operation of WALIC (an updated institutional establishment from ITC) will help in filling up the regional institutional gap (to lead on ERL breeding program and ERL market valorization support) identified. This is elaborated upon in this report.

All countries have their own research centers and departments in charge of livestock and environment and so nationally. There are national efforts needed to continue to strengthen national and local capacities and to more aggressively review the institutional policy frameworks with a view towards sustainability and national and regional sustainable economic development.

The implementation journey and the results documented show that adaptive management was absolutely critical to the success of the pilots.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided the following recommendations: (TE, p.14-15)

- **Out scale the PROGEBE Results for Optimal Regional Development.** Scaling-out is feasible as demonstrated by observed political will gained and project-generated learning and capacity building at all levels. The TE concludes that not realizing the scaling out of the integrated approach for ERL-NRM will increase risks for both biodiversity and social peace and ultimately sustainable development and that realization of the local level organizational capacity and scope and

mandates of the host institutions at national and regional level are critically needed to be in place in order to take these results forward. Also notable has been that the PROGEBE approach and strategy is being scaled up at the secondary sites as planned and that new projects are adopting the PROGEBE planning approach in their monitoring and evaluation (WB CORAF regional project) (PROGEBE Project Manager). The need is now for this all to be strengthened and sustained by the governments

- **Branding of ERL.** Branding is important in breeding because of the related market value, and therefore choosing the fawn color of N'dama, as for the Zebu Maure and Azaouak, is crucial even if there's no hard evidence for the superiority of the color. Physical arguments: white skin is more sensitive to sunlight and therefore demonstrates skin diseases more often, and black accumulates more from the sun, while red seems to be a good intermediate; reason for which it's the branding color for many breeds globally. Most trypanotolerant ERL were held by crop farmers little aware of the importance of breeding and selection in livestock and mostly selling the fastest growing males first because of the better price they fetch. Therefore selection of bulls using genetic characterization can bring fast progress and make the N'dama and other trypanotolerant ERL competitive.
- **CBA assessment possibility for autonomous adoption of technologies.** Cost Benefit Analysis, or even just partial budget analysis, should be done on all technologies before proposing them to farmers. The project failed to do this, and to prevent mistakes in the consolidation phase by the national teams, the TE recommends to tender short term assignments for four national experts and an international team leader to collect reliable data for a partial budget analysis of the proposed package of technologies. Together with the qualitative information already gathered. This may provide valid arguments toward decision makers on budgets for consolidation and multiplication of the PROGEBE approach. Further advocacy of the value of CBA as the key project implementation modality 'approach' should be brought forward to the partners and to GEF global in particular as a key lesson learned for future ERL –NRM projects.
- **Economic CBA for advocacy among policy and decision makers.** A key positive result felt by a majority of the beneficiaries interviewed has been the reduction of conflicts between herders and crop farmers. The POAS for NRM management will also have positive effects on biodiversity and the availability of timber and non-timber products. The TE recommends to do a preliminary assessment of the aggregated benefits using the "willingness to pay" method in order to compose financial arguments for advocacy towards policy makers.
- **Resilience in the Sahel.** Historically, investments in recovery or maintenance of land productivity have demonstrated a high cost recovery rate. TE recommend GEF, UNDP and AfDB to advocate with the implementing agency of the project Resilience in the Sahel, which funding has been approved in October 2014, to learn from PROGEBE the experience especially in terms of the coupling of the conservation of ERL and its habitat through the participatory land-use management plans (POAS/PAT). Not replicating the integrated ERL-NRM approach will not only increase the risk to biodiversity and social peace, but also for regional food security and economic development.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE only briefly summarized the project's outcome achievements, with no comparison between expected results and actual achievements.	Unsatisfactory
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report has a sound structure, but usage of language is ineffective. Evidence for supporting its ratings is vague and irrelevant sometimes (such as its assessment of efficiency is not well supported by relevant evidence)	Moderately Unsatisfactory
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE gave a thorough assessment of project's sustainability, but it didn't mention the project's exit strategy	Moderately Satisfactory
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	"Lessons Learned" section is specific and thorough, but sometimes usage of language ineffective (too lengthy) which make it not easily comprehensible	Moderately Satisfactory
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE didn't examine this area except listing a few indicators such as disbursement rates. The level of project co-financing presented by the TE was incorrect.	Unsatisfactory
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE's assessment of M&E system is thorough. However, separate assessment of M&E design and implementation will be preferable.	Satisfactory
		Moderately Unsatisfactory

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

In the preparation of this TER, no additional documents were referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, and PD.