

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4**

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1159		Review date: <u>at endorsement (Million US\$)</u> <u>at completion (Million US\$)</u>		
IA/EA Project ID: P066065	Project Name: Agricultural Pollution Control Project	GEF financing: 5.45	IA/EA own: UA	UA
Country: Romania		Government: UA	Other*: UA	
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b> 5.65		UA
Operational Program: OP8: Waterbody; OP9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Area		<b>Total Project Cost:</b> 11.10		11.15
IA: World Bank	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved: Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MESD); Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD); Ministry of Waters and Environmental Protection (MWEP); Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forests (MAFF)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		2002 April	
	Closing Date	Proposed: 2007 June	Actual: 2007 June	
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 62 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 62 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 0 Months
Author of TE: Sustainable Development Sector Department, South Central Europe Country Management Unit		TE completion date: 2007 December	TE submission date to GEF EO: March 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 3 months

\* 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	HS	S	S	S
2.1b Sustainability	N/A	"moderate"	-	ML

of Outcomes				
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	<b>HS</b>	"adequate"	-	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	-	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?  
 While certain aspects of the report are adequate, overall the report cannot be considered a good practice. The report contains an adequate assessment of the relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and achievement of the project objectives the report did not provide a section on recommendations. Additionally report provides an unclear break-down of project costs (not per activity) and does not provide information on co-financing.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?  
 No.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project document the global environmental objective is:

"To reduce, over the long-term, the discharge of nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) and other agricultural pollutants into the Danube River and Black Sea through integrated land and water management of the Calarasi region and ecologically sustainable use of natural resources in two agricultural polders.

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

**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)?)**

The following are the original objectives that were listed in the project document:

(i) Percentage of households with livestock in project area adopting improved manure handling facilities - targeted to move from baseline of zero to 45% by 2006 and 65% by 2010

(ii) Percentage cropped area coming under nutrient management systems including crop rotation, crop nutrient management with soil testing, and use of organic manure - targeted to reach 30% by 2006 and 65% by 2010

(iii) Percentage of cropped area employing environment-friendly practices - target of 65% by 2010

(iv) Trends in water quality indicators at designated sites - flow of nitrogen and phosphate to Danube River to be reduced by 10% by 2006

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components		Any other (specify)
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

#### 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)

###### a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities)

Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

According to the project document the project "directly addresses" Romania's main development agenda of poverty reduction and EU accession. The project helps develop the legal framework to address the EU Nitrates Directive as well as a Code of Good Agricultural Practices, which according to the project document will "increase exports and foreign exchange earnings." This in turn will help to increase national growth and lead to a reduction in poverty. Additionally, the project activities will help to engage the key local and national stakeholders and build their capacity in achieving environmentally sustainable agriculture and help Romania to comply with its international commitment to reduce nutrient discharge to the Black Sea from agricultural resources.

(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

According to the project document the reduction of nutrient run-off into the Danube river and Black Sea from agriculture is an "integral" part of the country's environmental strategy as well as the Black Sea and Danube River Basin Strategic Action Plans. The project's objectives are highly relevant to Romania's development priorities due to Romania's new status as EU member nation and its environmental obligations as part of EU. The project's objectives are particularly relevant as pollution reduction is one of the key goals of the EU Water Framework Directive.

(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?

According to the project document the reduction of nutrient run-off into the Danube River and Black Sea from agriculture is an "integral" part of the country's environmental strategy as well as the Black Sea and Danube River Basin Strategic Action Plans and is designated a priority under the GEF WB UNDP Strategic Partnership for Nutrient Reduction. The project will also achieve key goals of the Danube River Basin Pollution Reduction Program which is supported by GEF.

(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

The project will help in fulfilling Romania's obligations under the Bucharest Convention, the Odessa Ministerial Declaration on the Protection of the Black Sea and the Danube River Protection Convention to reduce nutrient discharge to the Black Sea in addition to European Union Directives.

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup>

NA

###### b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

According to the TE, an assessment of the project's outputs reveals the project's global environment objective has been largely achieved with respect to the key performance indicators identified in the project

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

document:

**Indicator 1: Percentage of households with livestock in project area adopting improved manure handling facilities.**

The percentage of households with livestock in the project area using village manure storage, household bunkers and segregating waste materials reached 54.4% (compared to project target - 45%).

**Indicator 2: Percentage cropped area coming under nutrient management systems including crop rotation, crop nutrient management with soil testing, and use of organic manure.**

The percentage of area under nutrient management systems including crop rotation, crop nutrient management with soil testing, and use of organic manures was 34% (compared to the project target - 30%).

**Indicator 3: Percentage of cropped area employing environment-friendly practices.**

The total percentage of area under environmentally friendly practices was 33.9% exceeding the project target of 30%.

**Indicator 4: Trends in water quality indicators at designated sites.**

There was decrease in nutrient discharge into surface and ground waters of about 15% for nitrogen and 27% for phosphorus in 2006 (compared to the target value of 10% for 2006) with overall the trend in water quality found to be positive.

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

**Rating: S**

The TE indicates the project experienced no delays in the project implementation and an assessment of project's performance indicators reveal that much of the project objectives were achieved to satisfaction as most were achieved beyond initial targets. According to the TE, the project's estimated incremental cost is consistent with the incremental cost analysis (ICA) found in the project appraisal document which predicted that the project would "introduce and demonstrate more sustainable and environmentally benign technologies and practices at an estimated incremental cost of US\$ 5.15 million over the baseline scenario". The TE provided the following cost effectiveness (CE) ratios, defined as the cost of reducing one kg of nitrogen or phosphate leakage into surface and ground waters for individual environment-friendly practices in Romania: nutrient management \$10/kg; strip crops and cover crops \$12-15/kg; manure management \$30-40/kg. The TE provides an assessment of CE ratios for similar projects in Poland and the US and concludes Romania's CE ratios are "broadly in line with international experience".

Additionally, according to the TE the project's financial management system was "effectively maintained". Quarterly financial monitoring reports and annual audit reports, which revealed minimal issues, were submitted in a timely manner to the Bank.

d. To what extent did the project result in tradeoffs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

No such tradeoffs were specified in the TE.

**4.1.2 Results / Impacts<sup>2</sup> (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)**

**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.

**a. Financial resources**

**Rating: ML**

<sup>2</sup> Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

<p>According to the TE the financial sustainability of the system is contingent upon a) user fees by households b) cost sharing by buyers of composted materials c) <i>comuna</i> budget allocations to cover the operations and maintenance of the comuna facilities. The financial sustainability of the operations of the water laboratory of the Calarasi County Water Management Service and the soil laboratory of the Calarasi DGA is adequate as fees charged for their services cover operating and management costs. For the two <i>comunas</i> that the evaluation team visited fees covered between 30-40% of operation and management costs. Presently commitment by mayoralties is “strong” and mayoralties intend to gradually increase user fees which the TE asserts provides “reassurance for financial sustainability in the short and medium terms”. However, the TE indicates more time is necessary to further develop “user fee based financing modalities” to finance the continuation of project activities.</p>	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>According to the TE the social survey conducted during the spring of 2007 indicated a “significant uptake” of several environment-friendly agricultural activities amongst households and other local stakeholders. The designation of Calarasi as a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ), made the implementation of Code of Good Practices (GAP) compulsory in Romania. Farmers now have a significant incentive to adopt some CGAP practices such as the use of “shelterbelts, windbreaks and riparian buffers” which can help prevent crop losses due to erosion which according to the TE is highly prevalent in Calarasi. In terms of policy, the TE asserts the “environmental cross-compliance requirement” under the <i>EU CAP Pillar 1</i> area payment system provides a “strong incentive” for agricultural households to continue to “properly manage” their manure. The TE indicates there is also a high likelihood for the sustainability of the afforestation program as farmers “benefit significantly” from the trees' erosion prevention benefits.</p>	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>The project assisted Romania in meeting its EU obligations regarding the Nitrates Directive and has enabled it to incorporate the Directive's provisions within Romanian legislation. Also, now that Romania is a member of the EU, the TE concludes that the preparation of Code of Good Agricultural Practices (CGAP) may be sustainable. Both the passage of the CGAP and the integration of EU ND into Romania's legislation help to promote the continuation of the project's objectives. For instance, approximately 250 comunas have been designated as Nitrate Vulnerable Zones (NVZ) where CGAP implementation is compulsory.</p> <p>According to the TE project provided “local information and significant technical assistance” to replicate the project's activities throughout Romania and has helped build capacity among “agricultural extension agents” to advise those farmers interested in replicating the project's practices. The TE also indicates the project has had “positive consequences” at the institutional level due to the “improvement in relations between mayoralties and comuna citizens and in local capacity to access and manage community development”. Furthermore, the TE indicates further institutional capacity building for the implementation and enforcement of the current project activities will be continued under the subsequent “Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project” in Romania.</p>	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>No environmental risks were identified.</p>	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>According to the TE the technical approach to manure management was “relatively new and untested” when it was designed for Romania. The previous technical approach which focused on building larger on-farm manure storage facilities where farmers would take manure to their plots themselves did not suit Romania. Additionally Romanian households were mixing regular household waste with manure. However the project addressed these problems by “introducing segregation at source and separate platforms for different waste types at the village facility” and revising the manure management system to suit Romania's smaller farms with dispersed plots.</p>	

### 4.3 Catalytic role<sup>3</sup>

**a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders**

<sup>3</sup> Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

According to the TE the social survey conducted during the spring of 2007 indicated a “significant uptake” of several environment-friendly agricultural activities amongst households and other local stakeholders. The following are the findings from the survey:

- Number of associations involved in the project increased from 2005 to 2006
- Crop rotation and seed selection were the most frequently used environment friendly practices among households that work the land themselves
- Households used crop rotation and expert-guided chemical fertilizer application more frequently in 2006 than in 2005
- Improper utilization of individual platforms and euro-bins was lower in 2007 than in 2005 and 2006

The designation of Calarasi as a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ), made the implementation of Code of Good Practices (GAP) compulsory in Romania. Farmers now have a significant incentive to adopt some CGAP practices such as the use of “shelterbelts, windbreaks and riparian buffers” which can help prevent crop losses due to erosion which according to the TE is highly prevalent in Calarasi. The TE indicates there is also a high likelihood for the sustainability of the afforestation program as farmers “benefit significantly” from the trees’ erosion prevention benefits.

**b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors**

The beneficiary survey revealed the project had “positive consequences” at the institutional level with “mayoralties being the main beneficiary”. According to the survey the relationship between mayoralties and comuna citizens improved and there was an improvement in the “local capacity to access and manage community development projects”. Additionally the TE indicates further institutional capacity building for implementation and enforcement of the project activities will be carried out under the subsequent “Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project”.

**c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?**

The project assisted Romania in meeting its EU obligations regarding the Nitrates Directive and has enabled it to incorporate the Directive’s provisions within Romanian legislation. Also, now that Romania a member of the EU, the TE indicates the preparation of Code of Good Agricultural Practices (CGAP) are expected to be sustainable. According to the TE the “key policy factor” is the designation of Nitrate Vulnerable Zones (NVZ), which makes the implementation of CGAP compulsory.

**d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)**

A follow-up operation has been designed to replicate the project in other parts of Romania. In 2007 the World Bank approved the "Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project" (INPCP) which will cost US\$ 81.20 million which builds upon the “positive experience” of the existing project.

**e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?**

The TE emphasizes the PMU as playing a critical role in the achievement of the project objectives. According to the TE this was due to the fact the PMU Manager “excelled in relations” with relevant stakeholders by gaining their trust and respect. The TE also credits PMU’s technical staff for the “smooth implementation” of project activities, procurement, and financial management and the M&E plan.

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

**a. Co-financing.** To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE does not provide information on the actual level of co-financing for the project. Based on the limited information provided in the TE it is difficult to assess if the co-financing was essential to achievement of GEF objectives.

**b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The TE indicates there were no delays in the project implementation.
<b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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 TE indicates the government was highly involved during the project design phase. The TE asserts there was "full ownership by Government agencies at all levels", especially at the county and comuna- levels. According to the TE, the central, county and community governments "facilitated, co-financed and participated" in project activities during the project implementation. County and <i>comuna</i> governments managed and provided co-financing for communal waste management facilities and afforestation. Overall, project activities complement the national agenda as they support Romania's Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MESD) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) in their application of the Nitrates Directive and in the development of the national Code of Agricultural Practices and the Code of Best Farming Practices.

#### 4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

<b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): S</b>
It appears from the outset of the project, the M&E system was sufficient to monitor the project's results and track its progress towards achieving the project's objectives. The project document included in an annex an extensive list of performance indicators that were measurable and specific. The project management unit was assigned the responsibility to monitor and evaluate the project performance through quarterly reports and through "beneficiary surveys". The results from the surveys and reports would be then compared against the baseline survey which was supposed to be undertaken prior to the project implementation. Additionally the project document designated the PMU to design a simple MIS for the purpose of M&E which would track and monitor the project's progress utilizing the performance indicators.	
<b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MS</b>
According to the TE, M&E implementation was "adequate" as much of the relevant data was collected "most of the time" for the majority of the indicators. Performance indicators which depended on social surveys were not measured for the first two years of project implementation due to the fact that these surveys were not conducted in those years. While the TE provides information on social surveys, it does not provide sufficient information regarding how the overall baseline data was collected. The TE indicates that project management unit (PMU) designated a full-time member as an "M&E and Technical Specialist" that was in charge of all M&E activities during the project's implementation.	
The PMU assessed the data and reported it biannually in progress reports which were shared with the MESD and the World Bank supervision mission to address implementation problems. Additionally, the project management unit developed a comprehensive database which included indicators and periodical progress reports. These reports and results were shared with the MEWM and the World Bank to address problems that arose during implementation.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? The budget included in the project document did not have a line item for M&E activities.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? The terminal evaluation does not provide sufficient information to gauge if adequate funding was provided for M&E activities during the project's implementation.	
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? See section 4.5b.	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. UA	

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

##### a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale):S

##### b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S

*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.*

The World Bank was the implementing agency for the project. The TE asserts project implementation was effective overall and did not experience any restructuring or delays due to the level of preparedness and capacity prior to the project implementation. According to the TE most implementation issues were resolved in a “timely manner” with the exception of the issue of afforestation on the Boianu-Sticleanu polder which took approximately two years to resolve in a “satisfactory manner”.

According to the TE the World Bank team “adequately recognized” local and national agencies' points of interests. During project preparation the Bank team worked closely with county and *comuna* level stakeholders, which the TE claims were the “main agents of implementation” as well as national and county level branches of MARD, MESD, and EPI to identify their priorities. Household surveys were conducted before the project began, during implementation and towards the end of the project to gauge the local population's “awareness of and satisfaction with the project”.

The TE indicates financial management was “highly satisfactory” and fiduciary supervision was conducted with “efficiency” and “professionalism”. The TE credits the fact the Under-Secretary of the State was responsible for the project's oversight rather than the minister for “minimizing disruptions in association with governmental transitions”. Additionally the TE claims the flexibility on the part of both the Government and of the WB supervision team was the “key to project's successful implementation as it allowed the revisions to project components in a relatively smooth manner.”

##### c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>4</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): S

The Romanian government was the executing agency for the project. An assessment of the project's outputs reveals the project's global environment objectives were largely achieved which is due to the project's “smooth implementation”. The TE credits the effectiveness of the project implementation to implementation arrangements that “were well conceived” and the fact that project implementation was assigned to a single agency, the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MESD), which was committed to implementing the EU Nitrate Directive. The TE emphasizes the PMU, which was established by the MWEP, played a critical role in the achievement of the project objectives and resolved most implementation issues within a “timely manner”. According to the TE this was due to the fact that the PMU was fully staffed before project effectiveness and there was no personnel turnover during the course of the project. Additionally the PMU staff had an “excellent mix of technical and managerial skills” and the PMU Manager “excelled in relations” with relevant stakeholders which kept relevant agencies “involved and informed” in the project's activities. Additionally the TE indicates project implementation benefited with the PMU's location in Calarasi as it brought “project management to the local level”. According to the TE this helped to ensure the “local institutional ownership” of the project as the PMU manager could report to the County Council and the Prefect, in addition to MESD.

## 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

- i) Ownership of local communities and their leaders through delivery of visible and tangible benefits.
- ii) A strong, full-time PMU with a good mix of diplomatic, managerial and technical skill based in the project area. Cultivation of good relations with ALL project stakeholders.

<sup>4</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.

- iii) Central Government responsiveness to local communities' expressed needs and preferences.
- iv) Flexibility and respect for client insights of Bank task team.
- v) Dissemination of information through a broad public awareness campaign.

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

The TE does not provide recommendations.

**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.**

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 report contains an adequate assessment of the relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and achievement of the project objectives.</p>	S (5)
<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> For the most part, the report is internally consistent and the IA ratings have been substantiated.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> While the report provides an extensive amount of information regarding the project sustainability, it could have been presented in a clearer manner.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The lessons learned were comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented in the report.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The report provides an unclear break-down of project costs (not per activity) and does not provide information on co-financing.</p>	MU (3)
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> While the report does not provide sufficient information to gauge if adequate funding was provided for M&amp;E activities during the project's implementation it does provides a sufficient assessment of the project M&amp;E system.</p>	MS (4)

**7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.**

**8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)**

--

**9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)**

--