

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:		1060	Review date:	
			<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	PIMS 2220	<b>GEF financing:</b>	3.02	3.02
Project Name:	Capacity Building for Stage II Adaptation to Climate Change in Central America, Mexico and Cuba	IA/EA own:		0.05
Country:	Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, México, Nicaragua, Panama	Government:	1.28	1.28
		Other*:	0.371	0.371
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	1.66	1.71
Operational Program:	Climate Change/ Enabling Activity	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	4.67	4.72
IA:	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Water Center for the Humid Tropics of Latin America and the Caribbean; Country governments, Swiss government	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		July 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: July 2006	Actual: Nov 2007
Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36 mos.	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 51 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 15 months
Pallavi Nuka	Neeraj Negi			
Author of TE:		TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 7 months
Remi Rijs EOLOGICA		Nov 2007	June 2008	

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

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	N/A	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	S	N/A	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS	N/A	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	MS	N/A	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

While the terminal evaluation report is informative and thorough as possible (given the available information), it relies heavily on a 2006 independent consultant report, does not include information on actual project costs, and contains no

discussion of the sustainability of project outcomes.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings were noted in the terminal evaluation report.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

**a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

The global environmental objectives of the project were not explicitly stated in the ProDoc. The project was conceived as a UNDP/GEF enabling activity with the aim of supporting the countries in the region in their efforts to include *vulnerability to climate change* in their adaptation strategies to climate change. This project was supposed to serve as a pilot for testing how the Adaptation Policy Framework could be used to design and implement national adaptation strategies. The project was designed to demonstrate how climate change adaptation policy could be integrated into national sustainable development for at least three human systems: water resources, agriculture and human health.

There were no changes in the global environmental objectives during project implementation.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

As stated in the ProDoc, the development objective of this project was to “strengthen the adaptive capacity of human systems to reduce vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, including climate variability, risks, and extreme events for priority systems throughout the Central America, Mexico and Cuba region (p. 19).” The ProDoc states that measures to enhance national and regional capacities focus on two immediate objectives (p. 20-21):

- I. Strengthening the national capacity to adapt to climate change by evaluating the levels of vulnerability and adaptation, primarily focusing on the technical, social and economic analysis of the human systems.
- II. Strengthening the national capacity to adapt to climate change, primarily covering the evaluation, prioritization and review of adaptation measures.

The expected outcomes of the project as stated in the ProDoc are:

1. Eight national adaptation strategies prepared with participation by key stakeholders and endorsed by participant groups in each country.
  - i. National capacity created and/or increased to assess vulnerability and, develop and implement sound adaptation strategies, policies, and measures.
  - ii. National technical capacity created and/or increased to reduce climate risks and impacts by incorporating climate variability and extreme events.
  - iii. Pilot or demonstration adaptation projects
  - iv. Knowledge improved of the socio-economic linkages between vulnerability and climate change
  - v. Public awareness of climate risks increased.
2. The UNDP-GEF Adaptation Policy Framework elaborated and applied, including wide dissemination of the framework, methodologies and tools, and the project results within the region and elsewhere. Monitoring systems for measuring progress in the application of adaptation policies and measures, and adaptive capacity of stakeholders developed as a part of the methodology.
3. New and expanded modes of co-operation identified at the regional level on an institutionalized basis; existing national and regional institutions strengthened that are relevant to climate change programs on adaptation at the national and local levels, and joint actions identified in regional co-operation for adaptation.

Following the mid-term review, there was a substantial revision of the project. The mid-term review identified several operational problems including inconsistencies and ambiguities in the design of the initial log-frame, as well as a complicated institutional arrangement. According to the TE report, the problems were resolved “by specifying the

project’s objectives, the roles and commitments of each of the counterparts and, in a later stage, the verification mechanism.” Following the review, the project’s scope narrowed and the Adaptation Policy Framework (APF) was sidelined. The project’s focus shifted to the first of the immediate objectives. Due to these revisions, the TE report point out “there remains a discrepancy between the original goals of the project (judged over-ambitious) and the course it took in practice (p. 22).”				
<b>Overall Environmental Objectives</b>	<b>Project Development Objectives</b>	<b>Project Components</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>	
	X			
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>				
<b>Original objectives not sufficiently articulated</b>	<b>Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed</b>	<b>Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious</b>	<b>Project was restructured because of lack of progress</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>
		X		

**4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY**

**4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)**

<b>a. Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>The project outcomes are consistent with GEF operational program strategies. The Initial National Communications for the region on current and future vulnerability were judged inadequate for helping the countries to prepare for Stage II Adaptation to climate change. The ProDoc notes that the National Communications do not assess the “risks associated with climate change, in relation to extremes and variability...” This project has filled in the gaps by producing country vulnerability reports and a regional scenario report.</p> <p>Project outcomes have been largely consistent with country priorities. The ProDoc states that the countries of the region strongly endorsed the project development facility (PDF) project and participated actively during project development. They recognized the need to incorporate risk assessments into their adaptation strategies and address issues of climate variability, vulnerability, socio-economic conditions, and stakeholder engagement in their Stage II Adaptation assessments. This project outputs, including adaptation assessments, vulnerability studies, and training programs, contribute to the Second National Communications to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and support the countries as they move into Stage III.</p> <p>The TE report suggests that the country priorities might not have been aligned with the initial project objectives regarding application of the Adaptation Policy Framework (APF). The TE report concludes that “the working agendas of UNDP/GEF and the National Implementation Liaisons (national-level counterparts) grew apart during the preparation phase of the project: while UNDP/GEF was focused on applying and improving the APF (and on achieving results at a political level and obtaining lessons learned), the NILs were focused on the national studies and on strengthening the internal capacity.”</p>	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<p>Based on the terminal evaluation report, the project has effectively enhanced national capacities to assess vulnerability and develop adaptation strategies, but it was less successful as a pilot program targeted at the improvement and replication of the Adaptation Policy Framework (APF).</p> <p>The project has been very effective as an enabling activity. Despite difficulties in implementation, at the output level, the project has successfully achieved targeted results. According to the TE report and the APRs, the project has increased the knowledge and skills to evaluate vulnerability and adaptation at the national level. It has also enhanced individual and organizational capacity through the transfer of methodologies, direct training of 460 national experts, and the generation of eight national adaptation assessments and the regional study. The project has triggered initiation of 70 local level projects related to climate change. The technical capacity of CATHALAC on the subject of climate change and adaptation has been significantly improved. The national vulnerability assessments and the regional report are judged to be very thorough and greatly applicable in preparing for Stage III. The TE report notes “the project certainly triggered a very positive process of <i>learning by doing</i> (p.32).”</p>	

In terms of expected outcomes the project has fallen slightly short. The major indicator (in the revised log-frame) for the achievement of the development objective was the integration of adaptation strategies into policies or legislation at the national, local, or regional levels. Countries have not yet adopted strategies or policies to reduce vulnerability, but various institutions are, as a result of this project, actively pushing for the creation and implementation of such policies. The 2007 PIR notes that national Environmental Ministries have established climate change subject departments. The TE report notes that the National Liaison Units (NILs) demonstrate a clear understanding of the main barriers present in their countries to implement the proposed adaptation measures and strategies.

The project has not been effective as a pilot study testing the applicability of the APF. The project has applied the APF in assessing current vulnerability, but according to the TE report, the role of the APF “became smaller and smaller while the project worked towards its completion (p. 32).” The project has not field-tested the APF in a systematic way, nor has it collected sufficient empirical information on adaptive capacity and policy processes needed for feedback into the APF. The TE report further states: “The project has not generated relevant, accessible, input information (p. 32).” Though several National Liaison Units individually carried out fieldwork with the participation of local actors, there was no centralized system of data collection. National Liaison Units did not know what to do with the data once it was collected. The TE report notes “the lack of a uniform methodology linking the APF to local processes and actors” has been the primary obstacle to collecting data centrally and translating this data into recommendations for the APF (p. 32).

**c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)**

**Rating: S**

The TE report does not contain information on actual project costs, so it is not possible to gauge how project finances were spent.

The project faced significant difficulties in implementation during the first three years. The terminal evaluation concludes that the project’s objectives were over-ambitious and the institutional arrangement too complex to permit smooth communication between all the parties. Following the mid-term review in 2005 (two years into the project) the international project manager was replaced and the project was granted a 12-month extension. The TE report notes that by 2006 the disbursement of project funds was almost complete. Based on information in the TE report, the extension was justified, as another year was necessary to pull together the project various outputs. Despite the extension, the project has not faced any cost overruns and all the targeted outputs were achieved with the original financing. Given that most expected outcomes were met within budget and in the face of rather ambitious objectives, efficiency is rated satisfactory.

With regard to cost-effectiveness, the TE report does raise questions about why project funding was divided evenly between countries given that countries’ baseline capacities for vulnerability/adaptation assessment were not equal. Granting greater funding to countries with lower capacities might have been more cost-effective. Due to lack of access to financial records and in some cases simply the lack of records, the terminal evaluation could not compare cost-effectiveness across countries.

**4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.**

The project has created individual and institutional capacity in the eight participating countries to evaluate vulnerability to climate change and strategies for adaptation. The capacity created consists of extended human resources, strengthened institutions, particularly the National Implementation Liaisons’ involved and environmental ministries, the transfer of new concepts and methodologies, and the generation of spatial biophysical and socioeconomic data. The project has generated proposals for adaptation strategies, which will enable a more rapid advance in the years to come. These results will assist the countries during the preparation of the next National Communications. The project has greatly increased the capacity of CATHALAC to coordinate regional efforts to develop climate change adaptation strategies. CATHALAC has become the regional authority on climate change risk assessment and evaluation of vulnerability.

Politically, project has led to the prioritization of climate change adaptation in the environmental agendas of the participating countries. The project has also created awareness and increased understanding of the issue among authorities and local actors. National governments and some sectors in society have increasingly accepted that climate change is a relevant concern. National governments recognize the importance of climate change for the future development of their countries.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1=

Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>
In some countries the project has acquired additional funding and the creation of climate change units within ministries means that some project related activities will continue to be funded through national budgets. At the regional level the project has not acquired sustained financing. The executing agency, CATHALAC, is strengthening its working relationships with USAID, US Department of State, NASA, NOAA, CCAD, CARICOM, UNEP and initiatives such as Plan Puebla-Panama and White Waters to Blue Waters (WW2BW) and MAGCC initiative. CATHALAC is also building a training center, which will deliver courses on climate change taking this initiative into account, and these courses will fund further work at the regional level.	
<b>b. Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>
The project has good to moderate political support in the participating countries. There is no evidence or instance of political resistance to the project. The project is well supported by national environmental ministries who clearly have a strong stake in the ownership of this project. The 2008 PIR notes a gradual increase in political support at the national level. Some countries have included project results in National Development plans. Based on the TE report, and APRs, public support for the project objectives is strong. Greater awareness and support for the project is needed from key local players (private sector, NGOs, etc) and political actors (mayors, local officials), as they are responsible for ground-level implementation any adaptation strategy.	
Project outcomes at the regional level enjoy less socio-political support and face greater risks. Although the environmental ministries, and groups of experts, are committed to regional cooperation, national political leaders have not demonstrated support for sustaining or continuing the project's outcomes on a regional basis.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>
The project has spun-off 70 national and local project related to climate change adaptation. National environmental ministries have established departments dedicated to climate change issues. Climate change and adaptation topics have been added to national curriculums. There is also an attempt to harmonize the language of the conventions on biodiversity, desertification and climate change across the participating countries. All countries have developed local, municipal or state level sector guidelines, plans or strategies, taking the results of this regional project into consideration. There is no permanent institutional structure or legislation to guarantee project sustainability at the regional level, but CATHALAC has taken on the role of regional technical expert.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
N/A	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>a. Production of a public good</b>
The project has raised the level of knowledge and understanding about issues of climate risk, vulnerability, and adaptation strategies across the region.
<b>b. Demonstration</b>
The project has demonstrated the application of the APF. Project results have been widely disseminated at the local, national and regional level through print, conferences and training workshops, and television. In all the countries the project has promoted public debate about adaptation to climate change at the national level.
<b>c. Replication</b>
The project has not supported replication outside of the region.
<b>d. Scaling up</b>
Significant potential for scaling up exists. The national environment ministries have created dedicated climate change departments. There is no pending legislation, but all countries are developing adaptation strategies and are at the policy proposal stage.

#### 4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The TE report does not present a project budget or cost breakdown making it difficult to assess to what extent cofinancing materialized or was essential to project outcomes. The TE report mentions "no records have been found concerning the use of cofinancing from the national governments (in kind or in cash), nor the cofinancing committed by CATHALAC (p. 25)." Country co-financing was supposed to be in-kind. <i>Based on information in the ProDoc, the TE report and APRs, country co-financing does not seem to have been critical for the achievement of objectives.</i> The NILs were supported through the GEF grant and much of the technical work was contracted to national experts through



<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation?</p> <p>The IA did provide funding to revise the M&amp;E plan during implementation, but this was over 2.5 years into the project and after many activities had been completed.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</p> <p>The revised M&amp;E system was useful for measuring outputs. It did provide real time feedback about progress made relative to <i>indicators</i>, but as the M&amp;E system was implemented at a late stage in the project timeline, the information was not very useful.</p>
<p>b.3 Can the project M&amp;E system (or an aspect of the project M&amp;E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.</p> <p>No, the revised M&amp;E system was implemented after many project activities had been completed and did not provide good measures of progress towards objectives.</p>

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS</b></p> <p><i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i></p> <p>The implementing agency (IA) for this project was UNDP. The UNDP country offices administered national contracts and disbursements and had a verifying role. Based on the TE report, the IA faced several issues in the project’s initial years. The project design was the product of a participatory process involving the National Implementation Liaisons (NILs) and GEF. The TE notes that the design was inadequately operationalized and unclear regarding the roles of UNDP/GEF New York, the regional office for UNDP in Latin America and the Caribbean, and the UNDP country office in Panama. Additionally, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was assigned a significant role in overseeing M&amp;E, and supervising the activities of the CATHALAC, the EA. The TAC failed to fulfill its responsibilities. A survey carried out by the mid-term review found that countries were not satisfied with the support they received. Despite these operational difficulties, the project managed to produce most of its outputs in the first years of the project.</p> <p>Following the mid-term review, the project was revised to streamline the organizational arrangement and establish monitoring protocols. In a good example of adaptive management, IA supervision and inputs during the last year of the project were increased and the TE report states that countries were satisfied with the final project results.</p> <p>Financial oversight of the project by the IA was disorganized. UNDP-Panama did oversee project audits, but the TE reports that financial records regarding consulting contracts disbursed by the executing agency and UNDP country offices could not be accessed.</p>
<p><b>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>1</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale) MS</b></p> <p><i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.</i></p> <p>The executing agency for this project was the Water Center for the Humid Tropics of Latin America and the Caribbean (CATHALAC). An entity in each national government, the so-called Enlace Nacional de Implementation (ENI or NIL), was in charge of the national-level execution and coordination of the project. Project execution during the first years was marked by inconsistency and confusion. CATHALAC did not have much experience in climate change adaptation and it did not have a presence in the eight participating countries, but, as stated in the ProDoc, it was expected that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) would play an active role in advising and steering project activities. As described earlier in this review, and in the TE report, this institutional arrangement led to much confusion over management processes, project support to countries, and the leadership of project activities.</p> <p>According to the TE report, the original institutional arrangements compromised CATHALAC’s position as the</p>

<sup>1</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

executing agency. The substantial revision to the project following the mid-term review resolved the institutional conflicts by assigning the full responsibility for the project execution to CATHALAC. Based on the TE interviews, this yielded positive results. CATHALAC has delivered the high-quality outputs in the project's final years. Throughout the project timeframe, reporting by CATHALAC has been detailed and reliable.

## 5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

#### Lessons from implementation:

1. The organization of a regional project is a special challenge for UNDP/GEF. It is important to put in place a consistent institutional set-up with well-defined roles and a clear hierarchy between the various levels involved of the UNDP system. The executing agency must have the mandate and the faculties to take full responsibility for the project; it is not recommendable to share the final responsibility among various entities. The use of ad-hoc committees must be limited to a minimum; the faculties of each entity in the organizational set-up must be defined during the preparation phase of the project.
2. The weaknesses in the project design and institutional arrangements were not detected in the early phases of the project. The first moment of reflection is usually the mid-term review, when it is already late to put through important modifications and there exists a pressure to deliver the envisaged outputs on time. By consequence, design failures turn into a permanent burden throughout the execution of the project, causing weariness and frustration among the counterparts and negatively affect the cost-effectiveness and quality of the project results. Therefore, effective institutional arrangements are of utmost importance; as part of the approval process of a project, UNDP/GEF should take the required steps to verify that adequate arrangements are indeed in place. A guide of best practices, including possible organizational set-ups for different situations, might contribute to the success of future interventions.
3. The Project Document is the basis of the agreement between UNDP, the executing agency and the other counterparts to carry out the project, and it should specify the goals and objectives, and the expected outcomes and outputs. Therefore, its contents must be clear, consistent and sufficiently operationalized; the objectives and indicators must be specific, feasible and preferably quantifiable and measurable. Generic qualifiers such as "key actors" and "processes" should be avoided.

#### General lessons:

1. *Need for ownership of adaptation strategies and measures by at a community and individual level, including the private sector.*
2. *Need for input data (geographic, climatic, socio-economical) and professional skills to use them.* It is mentioned that the creation of regional human capacity (a group of experts that might work on the subject in the region) was not achieved and as a result, each country remains dependent on the presence of national experts, which is different for each country. To improve this situation, ongoing investment in data collection and the training of professionals in adaptation and related fields, is needed.
3. *Need to integrate the subject adaptation to climate change in the relations between institutions (and no longer between individuals).* The institutionalization of the subject is fundamental in order to consolidate the created capacity and to enable the expansion to other sectors and priority areas. It is also a basic condition for improving the coordination between the involved institutions.
4. *Need for multi-disciplinary focus.* The countries recognize that the subjects vulnerability and adaptation are complex and require a multi-disciplinary approach that cannot be performed by specialists only.
5. *Need for a communication and dissemination strategy.* The countries highlight the importance of a dissemination strategy to reach local actors and the general public.
6. *Observations concerning the design and implementation of adaptation strategies. The experiences in the participating countries have yielded the following observations:*
  - i. The adoption of an adaptation strategy requires the involvement of several institutions and is therefore always complicated.
  - ii. Spatial planning is a useful instrument in the preparation process.
  - iii. The local perception of the factors causing vulnerability to climate change is usually not in correspondence with the results of analysis to support development policies at the international or national level. This gap should be closed in order to achieve acceptance of adaptation measures.



- iv. It is necessary that adaptation projects be jointly prepared together with the communities. Adaptation strategies must include indicators to assess the feasibility and viability of adaptation measures that are understandable for the involved actors. At present, such indicators have not been identified yet.

**b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

1. An additional study to collect and classify the experiences obtained in the countries is recommended. This would contribute to the replicability of the project in other regions and produce important input data to enhance the APF. This study could be carried out by UNDP/GEF, making use of information provided by CATHALAC and the NILs, and should depart from a methodology to interpret the local experiences in terms of the processes and actors of the APF. The end products would be a compilation of best practices for the preparation of adaptation strategies, and a manual to apply the APF in an accessible language, differentiated according to the level of operation and the kind of actors addressed. Depending on the scope, this study could take about a year with an estimated budget of US\$ 200,000 - US\$ 350,000.
2. An analysis of the viability and structure of a project (on operational aspects) in the design phase is necessary. A project can be innovating and scientifically sound, but its implementation must also be viable and efficient. In case a project is initiated by UNDP itself, it might be appropriate to contract an external consultancy to review the design from a different and independent perspective. If UNDP would improve the operational aspects of this kind of projects, this would help the counterparts to focus on the contents.
3. The distribution the project over a large number of counterparts (UNDP Panama, CATHALAC, UNDP/GEF and the UNDP country offices) caused the project files to become dispersed. By consequence, the Evaluator has not been able to verify the consistency of all products with the terms of reference, in particular the experts contracted by UNOPS and the studies contracted in the countries. Although the Evaluator believes that the activities were carried out with commitment and responsibility, this is not a desirable situation. For future projects, it is recommended to implement a management mechanism that gives access to this information from a central point.

**6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.**

The project ratings in the TE report are based on the revised log-frame and much of the evaluation of outputs relies on the 2006 consultant report concerning the project's M&E system.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The project contains a thorough assessment of relevant outcomes and project impacts.</p>	S
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> The report is internally consistent and the IA ratings have been substantiated. The only major evidence gap is in regard to finances and the project costs.</p>	MS
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The report rates sustainability, but there is no discussion of risks that might affect the sustainability of outcomes.</p>	MU
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The lessons learned are fairly comprehensive and well supported by evidence from the project experience.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> No, there is no information on actual project costs or actual co-financing used in the TE report. The evaluator was unable to obtain the relevant records from the IA. The information provided in this review is from the PIRs.</p>	MU
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The report provides a very detailed evaluation of the M&amp;E system.</p>	S

**7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION**

<b>REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.</b>