Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	1287
GEF Agency project ID	70552
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-2
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	World Bank
Project name	Parana Biodiversity Project
Country/Countries	Brazil
Region	LAC
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	3- Forest Ecosystems 4- Mountain Ecosystems
Executing agencies involved	Planning and General Coordination Secretary, State Government of Parana
NGOs/CBOs involvement	one of the beneficiaries
Private sector involvement	one of the beneficiaries
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	4/25/2002
Effectiveness date / project start	8/27/2002
Expected date of project completion (at start)	1/31/2007
Actual date of project completion	1/31/2009

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		8.00	7.8
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	14.86	11.36
	Other*	10.00	9.43
Total GEF funding		8.00	7.8
Total Co-financing		24.86	20.79
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		32.86	28.59

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	28/09/2009
TE submission date	
Author of TE	Lauren Kelly
TER completion date	02/12/2014
TER prepared by	Nelly Bourlion
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Joshua Schneck

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	MS	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	ML	UA	UA
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	MU	MU
M&E Implementation	S	N/A	MU	MU
Quality of Implementation	MS	MS	MS	MS
Quality of Execution	MS	MS	MS	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			S	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the Paraná Biodiversity Project (PBP) is the consolidation of existing biodiversity corridors in globally important forest eco-regions that occur in the state of Parana, in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest and Araucaria Forest.

Together, the Corridors involved in this project cover an area of about two million hectares and include seven state protected areas, 280 micro-catchments and 63 municipalities. These eco-regions are internationally recognized as unique and important repositories of biodiversity, but are severely threatened by deforestation and forest fragmentation. According to the PD, Parana harbors significant, pristine tracts of important ecoregions, including Araucaria Forest and Brazilian Atlantic Rainforest, or "Mata Atlantica." The global importance of these ecoregions' is based upon their extraordinary biodiversity and the fact that they are threatened by agricultural expansion, deforestation, forest fragmentation, and habitat degradation for many species. Both the Federal and State governments face the challenge of balancing development priorities and conservation.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objectives of this project as stated in the PD are to: (1) Support biodiversity conservation and natural resource management in two highly threatened ecosystems in the state of Parana, the Brazilian Inland Atlantic Rainforest and Araucaria Forest and (2) Design and implement a model for improving biodiversity conservation in Parana.

The project will achieve these objectives in three selected areas of the State through: (a) mainstreaming biodiversity conservation among targeted Government agencies, rural communities and civil society organizations; (b) mitigating threats to biodiversity through establishment of three ecological corridors and consolidation of sustainable practices in target areas; (c) strengthening monitoring and enforcement functions ; and (d) reviewing and developing relevant norms, legislation, regulation, enforcement and incentive systems.

This project comprises four components:

(1) Education and Capacity Building. The objective of this component is to (i) sensitize the population of Parana State to the importance of biodiversity conservation, mobilizing it to

support the process of recuperating and maintaining the quality of the State's principal ecosystems, and (ii) prepare project implementing agencies, beneficiaries and stakeholders to take part in the Project.

(2) Biodiversity Management. The objective of the largest component of the project is to work with targeted rural producers in interstitial areas and UC officials to assure the production and conservation activities promoted by the project will improve the environmental integrity of the three corridors and thereby safeguard biodiversity.

(3) Control and Protection. This component addresses reform of the state environmental monitoring and evaluation, licensing and enforcement functions, and the protection of threatened species.

(4) Project Administration. The basic project structure and organization is based upon the establishment of a PMU headed by the Planning Secretariat, and staffed with representatives of the main implementing agencies and supporting a successful and often used State model that ensures project coordination by forming central, regional and municipal management committees comprising relevant state officials. This component also carries out the following major studies: (i) identification and consolidation of legislative aspects and norms regarding environment legislation at different levels of government, (ii) environmental certification,(iii) identification and characterization of priority areas for conservation, (iv) cost-benefit of environmental interventions, (v) improvement of *ICMS ecologico* ("Green" Value Added Tax).

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

Although there were changes to the project components, the original Global Environmental Objectives and Development Objectives of the project did not change.

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**

According to the TE, at project appraisal, the objectives of the project were in line with the March 2000 CAS that listed environmental management, and in particular, ecosystem protection, as one of Brazil's development challenges. The project objectives were also very much in line with the progressive environmental programs that began in the state of Parana during the 1990s, such as the integration of environmental incentives into the VAT, the Tax on the Circulation of Merchandise and Services (ICMS-Ecologico), the introduction of tradable development rights as part of the State System for Conservation and Recuperation of Legal Reserves and Permanent Preservation Areas (SISLEG), and the Rede de Bioversidade program, or the Biodiversity Network Program. However after 2002, the change of State authorities in Parana affected the effective implementation of some of the project activities, particularly related to the Control and Enforcement activities.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The project effectiveness is rated as satisfactory, because the project objectives were largely achieved. The TE mentions that "outcomes of the project provided useful lessons, particularly in the area of institutional development and inter-agency collaboration".

The project increased native forest cover by 70,000 ha, including 35,000 hectares of recovered areas in legal reserves. It provided the means to develop planning and regulations for the thirty-two Privately Owned Protected Areas protected by the Government (RPPNs) that were created during the implementation of the project, totaling 14,520 hectares. The project helped to prepare management plans, eight of which were approved by IAP. It also provided support to an NGO to help create 51 additional Privately Owned Protected Areas covering an additional area of 8,293 hectares, however at the time of project close, only one had been fully created. The TE provides data on the number of hectares affected by the project, both in terms of restoration and conservation efforts; however it does not provide data on species health or the resulting total forest cover. Satellite images included in the MTR provide some evidence of recovery of fragment

connectivity due mostly to the restoration of riparian vegetation, and also to the addition of the new private reserves. Recovery is particularly visible along the Iguaçu- Paraná e Caiuá-Ilha Grande corridors, and to a lesser extent in the Araucaria corridor.

The project also supported biodiversity conservation and natural resource management by instituting a landscape level planning approach with a focus on the micro-catchments. Landscape level planning was conducted across 1.2m hectares targeting 296 micro-catchments in which to work. These 296 micro-catchments then received biodiversity related assistance. The assistance was delivered to rural producers in the form of 67 agro-ecological modules, or demonstration projects, that were implemented by EMATER and Codapar in the two designated corridors. According to the TE, a total of 1,434 persons were affected by this project intervention. However, according to the TE, there was a disconnect between the proposed activities and the primary objective of restoring and integrating degraded forest fragments into functional corridors. This approach changed in the second phase of the project, as a result of the Mid Term Review following the request for inspection. Specifically, the project added another sub-project component, that supported 41 conservation and research sub-projects.

Finally, the project strengthened the environmental capacity of the two main implementing agencies (IAP and EMATER). With project support, IAP's Biodiversity department developed a significant capacity for conservation planning and Emater was equipped with a central planning unit and six satellite centers. About 100 Emater professional and technical staff was trained in remote sensing and geographic information system techniques. As a result, the State of Parana has in place a regional planning system devoted to land-use planning, biodiversity conservation, and catchment conservation. Emater extensionists, specialized in agriculture, were trained to add environmental matters in their work. The project also promoted and supported institutional capacity building at the state level, by helping Instituto Ambiental do Paraná (IAP) to strengthen and expand its operational capacity, particularly in terms of remote sensing and land-use planning area. The project also benefited IAP by supporting activities at the state level, beyond the corridor areas. The project supported the development of a state biodiversity monitoring system, including the selection of 71 species for baseline observations and training to 150 field monitors.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

Project efficiency is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory. Due to a disagreement about procurement procedures between the new state administration of Parana and the bank, project activities experienced an 18 month delay that had an important impact on project implementation. The concerns raised by the Inspection Panel process panel resulted in a 2 year project extension. The main impact of those delays was a lower co-financing loan from the IBRD; the P*arana Rural Poverty Alleviation and Natural Resources Management Project* was less than half of the appraisal target.

The project supported the implementation of two types of small grant programs: agro-ecological

modules and conservation subprojects. The project supported 67 agro-ecological modules benefiting 1,434 producers with total investments of $2,322,511 m. According to the TE "this level of direct support though small grants is considered both acceptable and efficient." However, no formal economic analysis was conducted during implementation. The project did conduct a survey that found that there was on average an increase in productivity across all subprojects by about 15 percent, but this figure is unsubstantiated.

Overall, according to the TE, there was a lack of economic analysis in this project related to the modeling and application of environmentally benign production methods on the rural producers' estates. The need for economic analysis of the models supported by the project was also raised by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel comments.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The sustainability of this project cannot be assessed, because the TE does not provide enough information about the risks of this project.

The only information available that would lead to think that this project could be sustainable is that a formal collaboration agreement of different state agencies and institutions has assured the continued support for project objectives. IAP and Emater signed an agreement of cooperation to continue working together through a new state program, Integrated Environmental Management Program in Microcatchments (PGAIM). They will also work together in Prodesus, the loan currently in preparation with the Bank. PGAIM adopts the methodology of the Paraná Biodiversity Project, both planning of microcatchments as well as environmental education in a cooperative model. It operates throughout the State and with the participation of a greater number of institutions. This new program will be operationalized through an executive secretariat, in which the Project Director of PBP continues as the executive secretary.

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?

The Government used its own funds to support project preparation and established a strong and well-funded project preparation unit in the Planning Secretariat. It was also committed to applying US$10 million of the Bank-funded "Parana Rural Poverty Alleviation and Natural Resources Management Project" (Parana 12 Meses) as co-financing for the PBP to finance the implementation of alternative production systems in PBP targeted interstitial areas.

However, the project faced a lack of co-financing from the Parana 12 Meses loan, and the Government of Parana failed to obtain an alternative source of funding to fill the gap. The low

disbursement of the loan from NRM Project (Parana 12 Meses) was due to three factors: (1) the requirement of the State Court of Accounts (Tribunal de Contas do Estado) that all procurements be made in a centralized manner via electronic bidding, a new system for both the project staff and service providers who were unprepared and needed time to learn the system; (2) procurement procedures was affected by the interpretation of the Tribunal de Contas do Estado that procedures should follow Law 8.666 instead of World Bank procedures; and (3) the timing of the loan which closed in 2005. By the time the procurement issues finally resolved in 2005, the loan was closed. According to the TE, the Government did not supplement it with other source of funding when it was clear that lack of support from Parana 12 Meses was affecting the implementation of the agro-ecological modules. However, the consequences of this lack of funding are not described in details in the TE.

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?

Several delays were reported by the TE:

GEF-financed activities of the project were implemented at a slower pace than the NRM activities. According to the TE, the relatively slower implementation of the biodiversity conservation component was mainly caused by disagreements over procurement procedures between the new state administration in Parana and the Bank. Differences in accounting criteria between the Bank and the Brazilian "Tribunal de Contas do Estado" regarding financial procedures led to significant delays in the Project implementation leading to undisbursement of some funds at the end of project. Moreover, consultancies of the State Fauna System and biological monitoring were also cancelled. The result was an 18 month delay in the GEF-financed activities, and different rates of progress under the two parts of the project.

A second delay happened due to the Inspection Panel process. In 2006, a local NGO submitted a Request for Inspection to the Bank's Inspection Panel, criticizing the way the Project was being implemented. The panel claimed that project implementation methods could compromise the project's biodiversity goals by prioritizing the restoration of degraded areas to the detriment of protection of mature native Araucaria forests. Addressing the concerns raised by this panel caused a project extension of 2 years. The main impact of those delays was a lower co-financing loan from the IBRD; the P*arana Rural Poverty Alleviation and Natural Resources Management Project (Parana 12* Meses) was less than half of the appraisal target.

The planned building of the proposed Wildlife Management Center in Palotina was not contracted. According to the TE, this is probably the most critical negative result of the project in terms of infrastructure. Cancellation of this plan was caused by restrictions imposed by the recipient administrative authorities that delayed contracts to a point when construction was no longer feasible. In contrast, technical equipment for another Management Center was purchased as scheduled.

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:

During the planning stages of the Parana Biodiversity Project, the State Government of Parana showed a strong commitment and support for environmental protection. The project was designed under the assumption that the State authorities would support innovative approaches and their effective implementation. After elections in 2002 the new authorities did not embrace the government commitment with the same emphasis. As a result, project implementation suffered both administrative delays and changes in priorities that affected the normal development of planned activities.

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: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The M&E design is moderately unsatisfactory. The project's initial design included key performance indicators for outcomes and intermediate outcomes for the main objectives of the project. The intent of the project's M&E system was to collect quantitative and qualitative data on a sample of 10 percent of all investment subprojects and to conduct impact evaluations based on data collected for two impact indicators. Beyond this intent, the PD put in place a list of indicators (27 input indicators, 33 output indicators, and 20 outcome indicators, 10 "continuous indicators" and five impact indicators). However those are not connected in a logical framework. The PD indicates that reference values should be established by the baselines assessment but according to the TE, this assessment had not been conducted by the time the project was approved and the PD gave no indication as to when this activity would occur.
Moreover, information available on the selected indicators is lacking. According to the TE, this is due to the nature of the project. A significant delay between implementation of conservation measures and biodiversity response is to be expected because of the natural forest successional process in managed areas. Moreover, the studies being funded that aimed at developing adequate monitoring methods were also delayed, from satellite image analysis to specific methodology to particular indicator species. It would be very desirable therefore that monitoring of the long-term results of the project (particularly restoration of forest patches along corridors) would continue to

be implemented after project finalization, for periods long enough to include successional vegetation changes and other long-term effects on biodiversity.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The M&E Implementation is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory**,** because the M&E implementation did not follow the M&E described in the PD. The M&E implementation had the following shortcomings:

- the two impact indicators were not systematically tracked,
- there is no evidence of monitoring of investment subprojects
- monitoring was limited to forest cover from aerial images,
- a methodology to monitor fauna was developed and published, but was not applied
- a biodiversity database was developed, but some information was not gathered and updated by the end of the project.

Changes to project implementation were more affected by the Inspection Panel request and the technical audit that was conducted in response to the request, as opposed to the M&E system. In fact, according to the TE, the NGO's initiative had a strong influence on project outcomes during the last two years of the project. The second phase of the project (2007-2009) incorporated comments and suggestions of the Technical Audit particularly by increasing support to the existing State protected areas, promotion of the private reserve system (RRPN), a more focused emphasis of the agro-ecological models on forest restoration and forest corridor continuity, and a small-grant program, aimed at financing NGO-proposed conservation and research projects aiming at improving biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in the State of Parana, particularly in the corridors.

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: **Moderately Satisfactory**

Overall the World Bank performance is rated as moderately satisfactory. According to the TE, the IA preparation team and management provided adequate attention to the design of the project and made efforts to ensure the balanced project design in terms of strategic approach, technical and financial aspects, components, implementation arrangements, fiduciary aspects, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements. Risk identification was comprehensive and objective. However, some identified risks became reality during the project implementation, including: possibility of corridor implementation delays because several factors such as mapping and identification of specific sites using satellite imagery; delays in the implementation of decentralized conservation enforcement and monitoring, and continued fiscal problems result in budgetary retrenchment that undercuts PBP development.

The Bank task team conducted a total of 17 supervision missions during the implementation of the project, where the mission provided adequate inputs and processes to the recipient and beneficiaries. Fifteen Implementation Status Reports were filed with reporting on the issues focusing on the implementation progress and its impact on the achievement of project objectives. The task team conducted a full performance review, developed and guided the project to implement a four-month plan (Sep-Dec '05) with a detailed budget and targets for 42 indicators.

During the Inspection Panel process, the task team and Bank management worked swiftly to respond to the Inspection Panel. The task team followed up the case by conducting a comprehensive technical audit, as part of the mid-term review. The recommendations from these reviews were critical for preventing a full investigation by the Panel and for the successful outcomes in the second half of the project implementation. However, the Bank did not make an effort to revise the target value for one of the outcome indicators despite having identified the issue of substantially reduced co-financing from the IBRD loan for farmers to adopt the alternative production systems to help protect or restore forested areas.

As a result, the overall achievement in terms of hectares on which alternative production systems were adopted reached only 75% of the target value, though the project provided the planned level of GEF resources for direct support to producers through small grants.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The quality of project execution is Moderately Satisfactory. According to the TE, the Parana State Government, one of the executing agency of this project, demonstrated their ability and commitment to achieve development objectives in general. Adequate support by the Government has been provided throughout the preparation and the execution.

However, when the project faced lack of co-financing from the Parana 12 Meses loan, the Government of Parana failed to obtain an alternative source of funding to fill the gap. The Government did not supplement it with other source of funding and, according to the TE, it was clear that this lack of support affected the implementation of the agro-ecological modules. Also most activities requiring the recruitment of consultants had been delayed due to the administration's requirement that all contracts have to be reviewed and authorized by the office of the Governor and, in some cases, sent to the Procuradoria for further review. Especially, contracts of NGOs and consultancies had to go through rigid review, which affected the conservation activities introduced after the restructuring.

In the last twelve months, the state government made positive steps toward meeting their commitments. The issue showed strong improvement as all consultancies and the granting scheme for NGO subprojects were authorized and the UGP was able to process the contracts before the project execution period ended.

There were three other main executing agencies: The Technical Assistance and Rural Extension Company of Parana (EMATER), The Environmental Institute of Parana (IAP) and the Secretariat of Planning (SEPLAN). The inter-institutional arrangement involved: The State Secretary of Planning (SEPL), the Secretariat of Agriculture (SEAB), the State Secretariat of Environment (SEMA), The Environmental Institute of Parana (IAP), and the Technical Assistance and Rural Extension Company of Parana (EMATER). These executing agencies demonstrated their commitment and ability to adhere to the "Four-month Plan" (Sep-Dec 2005) which was developed following the full performance review by the Bank team. According to the TE, in May 2006, compliance of 91% with the indicators was confirmed. Areas where further progress was required were monitored closely and subsequently improved. The State agencies together reacted swiftly and positively to the Inspection Panel case by holding consultations with NGOs and presenting the Action Plan which incorporated the recommendations from the consultations and the Technical Audit. As a result, the second half of the project implementation contributed positively to the achievement of the project objectives.

8. Lessons and recommendations

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

The following lessons are given in the TE:

(1) The importance of a transversal, multi-sectorial approach to GEF projects. The success of the Parana Biodiversity Project, even considering the difficulties that emerged along its development, strongly suggests that there is an added value in trying to promote this innovative approach. Moreover, it could be further expanded by including more government agencies, NGOs with different, complementary profiles, the Academic and Research, as well as other relevant sectors of the civil society. Even if challenging and difficult to implement, developing a better and wider coordination and integration between government sectors and other non-governmental institutions is becoming an urgent need in face of the growing environmental problems that affect the whole planet.

(2) Monitoring and indicators. Because of its long-term nature, adequate indicators for projects like the Parana Biodiversity Program are very difficult to design and measure. However, it would be extremely useful in case monitoring of the effects of the project is not continued. Otherwise, a great deal of useful information may be lost. It would be very desirable that monitoring of the long-term results of projects of this nature (particularly restoration of forest patches along corridors) would continue to be implemented after project finalization, for periods long enough to include successional vegetation changes and other long-term effects on biodiversity.

(3) Changes in government support. At the time when the Parana Biodiversity Project was planned, the State Government of Parana had showed a strong commitment and support for environmental protection. Accordingly, the project was designed under the assumption that the State authorities will support innovative approaches and their effective implementation. After elections in 2002 the new authorities did not embrace the government commitment with the same emphasis. As a result, project implementation suffered both administrative delays and changes in priorities that affected the normal development of planned activities in several components.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

There is no recommendation given in the TE. Only lessons are given.

9. 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 report contains a detailed assessment of the project achievements. However, some issues raised during implementation are mentioned and not described thoroughly (e.g. the NGO audit, the disbursement lag, the lack of achievement of some objectives).	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and contains evidence. All ratings are given, however some evidence lacks details and therefore the ratings are not fully justified.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability is not assessed. The risks as given in the PD are mentioned, but not assessed in comparison to the actual implementation.	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are supported by the evidence and are well documented. However, there is no distinction between lessons and recommendations.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes some of the actual costs, but it is not broken down by component. Moreover, information is missing on how funds switched after mid-term evaluation. Very little information is given on co-financing.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The quality of the M&E system is assessed, however the TE does not discuss why the logframe was not used.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

TE Quality = (.3*(4+4)) + (.1*(3+4+4+4)) = 3.9 = MS

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