

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		02/09/2010
GEF Project ID:	1412		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	4.4	4.4
Project Name:	Building the Capacity of the People's Republic of China to implement the Stockholm Convention on POPs and develop a National Implementation Plan	IA/EA own:	0.2	0.2
Country:	China	Government:	0.9	0.9
		Other*:	5.6	5.6
		Total Cofinancing	6.1	6.1
Operational Program:	14: Persistent Organic Pollutants	Total Project Cost:	11.1	11.1
IA	UNIDO	Dates		
Partners involved:	Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO), State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		October 2004
		Closing Date	Proposed: February 2007	Actual: April 2007
Prepared by: Tommaso Balbo di Vinadio	Reviewed by: Ines Angulo	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 27	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 30	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 3
Author of TE: Mr. Nee Sun Choong Kwet Yive		TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF EO: 8 December 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in 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	N/A	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	N/A	L
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	S	N/A	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
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?

No. Although, the TE is well written, its structure is not always clear (the section on M&E could have been more elaborated and is under the section on efficiency). Some of the high ratings presented in the TE are not substantiated by convincing evidence.

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

There are no such instances mentioned in the TE.

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 appraisal document, "the goal of this project is to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants – the principal objective of the Convention".

There were no changes during 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)?)

According to the project appraisal document "the purpose of the project is to enable the People's Republic of China to take the first steps towards implementation of the Convention"

The main expected outputs are:

"1) a comprehensive National Implementation Plan incorporating:

- an assessment of the national baseline with regard to POPs chemicals incorporating preliminary inventories of POPs chemicals currently in production and use, of PCBs and equipment containing PCBs, of unintentional production of POPs, of human burdens of POPs and health impacts, of research and development capabilities, and of regulatory and institutional frameworks relating to POPs and chemicals management and control;
 - management strategies, action plans and investment needs required by the People's Republic of China to meet the obligations of the convention; and
 - a methodology for the identification of sites contaminated by POPs or products containing POPs;
- 2) a Capacity Building Programme proposal to meet China's long-term institutional strengthening and capacity building needs;
- 3) management and information systems functioning at national level and instigated at provincial levels
- 4) a national information centre established and information dissemination and public awareness and education campaigns developed;
- 5) a pilot study to investigate the exposure to POPs and their adverse effects with special emphasis on the health of women and children;
- 6) a case study on non-POPs alternatives and Integrated Pest Management strategies for termite control;
- 7) a pilot project to develop a detailed inventory methodology for PCBs;
- 8) a pilot capacity building programme on PCB management;
- 9) a demonstration of methodologies to promote the implementation of BAT and BEP to reduce unintentional production of POPs in key sectors of industry"

There were no changes during implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)					
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	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

Rating: S

This project complies with the GEF operational program on POPs (OP number 14). The project is also relevant to the country's needs given the documented high incidence of POPs in China and is in line with the environmental policies of the country, set to protect its population and the environment against the hazardous effects of toxic chemicals. Last, project objectives addressed the real needs of China to meet its obligations towards the Stockholm Convention

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

In general, the stated objectives of the project have been satisfactorily achieved (except for the demonstration projects that had mixed results) and a high quality NIP has been developed, endorsed by the country, and submitted to the Conference of Parties.

The main achievements related to the expected outputs of the project listed above are:

- 1) A high quality National Implementation Plan (NIP) on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) has been developed; it has also been endorsed and adopted at the highest level, and submitted to the Conference of Parties. After some delays, a very comprehensive document (i.e an assessment of the national baseline in chapter 2, the management strategies, action plans and investment needs required by the People's Republic of China to meet the obligations of the convention as planned in the project document are described in details in chapter 3) in line with the UNEP/GEF guidelines was submitted to the Conference of Parties on 18 April 2007.
- 2) Capacity has been built at all levels in China through workshops, training, inventories, reporting. An international consultant was hired to assist China in the development of a Long-Term Capacity Building project proposal to implement the Convention in the country and there is at present an on-going project on capacity building executed by UNIDO and implemented by FECO/SEPA/CIO at national level.
- 3) A draft of the overall framework for Management Information System (MIS) for POPs Convention Implementation in China was prepared by MIS sub- group (within FECO/SEPA) and was ready in July 2004. According to an international consultant hired to assess that framework, there are indications that the system was working adequately and information was exchanged appropriately between the different partners of the project
- 4) A national information centre has been established for information dissemination, public awareness and education campaigns and a website was created
- 5) The pilot study that was undertaken near contaminated sites under the Sino-Canadian Cooperation was successfully completed in July 2005 and has produced the expected results. The TE notes that the results should be used for awareness raising or for the promotion of alternatives
- 6) The study on non-POPs alternatives and Integrated Pest Management strategies for termite control was successfully completed by August 2005 and the recommendations and conclusions are reflected in the National Implementation Plan document.
- 7) The Pilot project to develop a detailed inventory methodology for PCBs was implemented successfully (i.e. inventory investigation, training etc.). The TE notes that during NIP implementation there is a need to take into consideration the specific mechanisms and dynamics of how replication will be achieved in other provinces and to interview appropriate retired employees of relevant companies in order to get information on sites where PCB-contaminated equipment were land filled / disposed of in the 1970's and 1980's.
- 8) Pilot capacity building programme on PCB management was successfully implemented and produced several outputs (i.e. a very comprehensive PCB management training manuals, inventory guidelines, assessment report for PCB disposal technologies)
- 9) All the demonstration projects have been implemented. However, the purpose of them was not clearly explained in the project document and the results are mixed. For instance, the TE notes that for the pulp and paper sector, the project failed in reducing the production of dioxins. However, awareness has been raised regarding dioxin formation during paper production at the sector level. For the waste incineration sector, the project undertaken at the Huzhou Industrial and Medical Waste Treatment Centre in the Zhejiang province produced interesting results but the Stockholm Convention requirements were still not met. The demonstration project in the iron and steel sector also had limited success. Due to limited funds, no technological improvement was possible only some Best Environmental Practices (BEP) were promoted.

Other outputs (some of them are actually outcomes) that the TE mentions in the report were:

- FECO/SEPA is presently a more respected institution.
- The establishment of CIO within FECO/SEPA, a permanent office with the appropriate human resources, is viewed as important outcome in view of sustainable implementation of NIP in the country.
- Awareness regarding POPs is high at key stakeholder levels including key ministries, leading research institutions, key industrial sectors, electric power companies, and also at provincial level. Cleaner production and best environmental practices are being promoted in the enterprises that participated in the BAT/BEP demonstration projects.
- The hazardous waste/medical waste plan funded by the central government including considerable investment and executed by SEPA was driven by Convention activities in China.
- Through the BAT/BEP demonstration project, the capacity exists presently in China to reduce dioxin release from hazardous / medical waste incineration sector by 99%.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NIP activities also promoted the environmental management of other hazardous chemical and wastes beyond POPs • Much more funds coming from the central government are available for research on POPs.
<p>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: S</p> <p>The project did not occur in major delays (only some problems related to translation and disbursing funds) and it lasted only 3 more months than expected.</p> <p>The participatory approach adopted during the preparatory phase was successful in mobilizing a high level of co-funding (Italy, Canada, and others). The TE argues that the timely implementation of activities and good quality of inputs as discussed in the previous sections contributed to high efficiency. Moreover, the project applied a successful mixed form of agency execution and national execution.</p>

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

<p>As mentioned above, some tangible results were achieved as a result of the project especially regarding the demonstration projects. For the waste incineration sector, the technological modifications that the Zhejiang University made to the incineration process at the Waste Centre improved the dioxin emission values considerably (a 99% reduction of dioxin release was possible as compared to performance of the incinerator when it was first in operation in 2006).</p> <p>The demonstration project in the iron and steel sector also had some impact. For example, methodologies such as separation of plastics from scrap, pretreatment of oil and paint-contaminated scrap, among others, were applied with some success, resulting in a 10% reduction in dioxin emission.</p>
--

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.

<p>a. Financial resources Rating: L</p> <p>According to the TE, a high level of co-funding and a number of GEF follow up projects are already underway (in the field of chlordane and mirex, DDT, PCBs, medical waste, capacity building, iron and steel, and paper making), which are essential for the continuation of the Convention’s support to funding and technology transfer to China.</p>
<p>b. Socio political Rating: L</p> <p>One of the outcomes of the project was that awareness regarding POPs and the Convention was raised at stakeholder level. In fact, before the project, almost all central/provincial government officials involved in hazardous chemicals management knew little or nothing about POPs. Also thanks to the project, strong central government and strong commitment to meet Convention requirements are now secured and China central government has confirmed its determination to comprehensively take legal, economic, technical and necessary administrative measures to solve POPs issues.</p>
<p>c. Institutional framework and governance Rating: L</p> <p>According to the TE, there is already an appropriate infrastructure in place (Foreign Economic Cooperation Office/ State Environmental Protection Agency – Convention Implementation Office) with appropriate monitoring from NCG. In fact, the implementation capacity in terms of human resources (CIO), offices and related infrastructure (FECO/SEPA), administrative system (bidding, auditing, financial, etc.), management structure (FECO/SEPA, NCG, MIS) already exist and is fully operational. Moreover, the implementation of the national implementation plan is on-going and is being monitored by the National Coordination Group (NCG) with CIO as executing agency.</p> <p>The TE notes however that the enforcement of existing policies (like the Cleaner Production policy and Best Available Technology/ Best Environmental Practice) as well as lack of inclusion of specific UP BAT/BEP measures in such policies has been identified as a problem area. There is need to develop strategies to enhance enforcement of policies, regulations.</p>
<p>d. Environmental Rating: L</p> <p>The TE notes that the Stockholm Convention is about the sound management of toxic chemicals. It should be noted that the national implementation report does not consider the open burning of wastes and accidental fires were that could contribute significantly to dioxin emission</p>

4.3 Catalytic role

<p>a.. Production of a public good The project produced a NIP that includes several inventories (i.e. he inventory on the production of POPs pesticides, dioxin inventory) and the human burdens and health impacts of POPs, and the research, monitoring and development capabilities relating to POPs that exist in China.</p>
<p>b.. Demonstration The project also provides for a series of case studies and demonstrations of methods that may represent suitable, practical and feasible approaches to meet the obligations of the Convention. As mentioned above, a series of demonstration projects were part of the project, and were planned to be used extensively for dissemination and replication in the future.</p>
<p>c.. Replication There was no replication of project achievements during the time it was under implementation. According to the TE, provinces where project was not run already showed interest. In that sense, one of the recommendations was to set up a proper training system for demonstration projects, especially the one on medical waste that has produced substantial results (99% dioxin reduction), and that should be disseminated across the country.</p>
<p>d.. Scaling up No mention of scaling up of project achievements</p>

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

<p>a. Co-financing. 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?</p>
<p>The TE states that overall the co-financing materialized as planned. The total project budget was of USD 10,202,250 (excluding PDF-B Phase) with the GEF funding ascending to USD 4,056,500 or 40% and the co-funding to USD 6,148,750 or 60% of the total budget. The sources of co-funding were mainly (83% of co-funding) international donors (Governments of Italy and Canada). The rest was to be provided in-kind by the Government of China (14%) and by UNIDO (3%). The Government of Italy financed a large proportion of the work package dealing with POPs pesticides, on PCBs and activities related to the reduction of unintentional production of POPs. The Government of Canada provided assistance for capacity building, particularly in PCBs management and for case studies and demonstration projects related to termite control and health impacts. Those contributions were essential for the achievement of project outputs.</p>
<p>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?</p>
<p>There were no major delays; rather there were some minor delays in disbursement of funds from UNIDO to FECO and some translation problems. In fact, it took time for an English version to be ready before it could be reviewed by the non-Chinese speaking partners, in particular the international experts. The whole drafting process including consultation and review by all national and international stakeholders took one year.</p>
<p>c. 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.</p>
<p>The approval and endorsement of the NIP by China and submission to the Convention Secretariat indicates the very high ownership of the project at country level. A very high ownership has also been observed during the field mission of the TE at the level of CIO/FECO/SEPA, responsible for project management at country level.</p>

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

<p>a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MU</p> <p>The project document does not include a logframe with indicators or targets. Activity 3.1.2 only includes some mention about the project evaluation mechanisms.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MU</p> <p>The lack of a logframe and indicators in the project document is considered to be a major constraint and because of that it is difficult to assess the M&E implementation plan.</p> <p>The TE mentions that project monitoring was conducted adequately by UNIDO, Technical Coordinating Group, and national coordination group. UNIDO supervised the project through the project manager (PM) in numerous meetings and discussions of different draft versions of NIP and through emails. However, at the end of the report the TE states</p>

<p>there was no involvement of UNIDO country office in execution or monitoring of project. In so doing the TE offers conflicting information regarding the level and quality of implementation of M&E.</p> <p>Another major problem found is that the agreed annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIR), supposedly prepared by FECO/SEPA and based on progress reports submitted to TCG, were not submitted to GEF.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? The TE states that the funding was sufficient.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? UA</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? There is no information in the TE.</p>
<p>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. No. There were major M&E constraints highlighted above.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The TE states that combination of the National Implementation Plan with demonstration projects, pilot studies and capacity building is considered a very good approach. The stated objectives in the project document were developed according to the Articles, Paragraphs and Annexes of the Convention. However, the purpose of some of the demonstration projects and studies were not clearly defined and the project did not explain clearly how the capacity built and experience gained at central level or in some provinces would be transferred to other provinces.</p> <p>For the project identification and planning, a strategic and participatory approach was used where the major national stakeholders including key ministries, relevant national institutions and universities, and international agencies and bilateral donors were invited to participate in preparatory workshops and meetings. However, the TE argues that the project document should have stressed the importance of the participation of NGOs in the process as relevant environmental and nature organizations, social organizations or women’s groups could have been invited as indicated in the GEF/UNEP guidelines.</p> <p>However, a major constraint was the lack of a logframe at project entry.</p> <p>The implementation approach was a “mixed execution”, i.e. while part of the project was implemented directly by UNIDO, many activities were executed through a subcontract by the project counterpart, the Foreign Economic Cooperation Office of the State Environmental Protection Agency (FECO/SEPA), This approach is considered to be appropriate in the sense that it combines UNIDO’s agency execution of international expertise components with FECO’s national execution of national expertise components. The TE argues that this approach provided for more flexibility in the management of funds (for example for the reallocation of funds) and allowed for more efficient substantive backstopping or project supervision than the typical UNIDO agency execution.</p> <p>Basically, UNIDO’s guidance was mainly on the drafting of NIP document and on technical aspects of the case studies and demonstration projects. According to the TE, this guidance was considered very useful and helpful by all national partners (although more guidance could have been provided at initial stages of NIP drafting). UNIDO PM seems to have adapted to situations as for instance he decided to stay two weeks longer in China to help in the drafting process. The TE notes that there was no involvement of UNIDO country office in project implementation or monitoring.</p>
<p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) S</p> <p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and</p>

¹ 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.

processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

As mentioned above the bulk of the activities were executed by FECO/SEPA/CIO in the field. The TE states that its staff was competent and very effective in helping national experts, who were mostly from academia, and international experts to open doors and to establish good work relations especially with industries and provincial authorities. CIO was particularly helpful in acting as translator for the international experts as many of the national partners did not communicate properly in English. CIO also acted as a link between academia and the industries where a communication gap between these two worlds existed according to one of the international experts interviewed during this assessment. It was noted that staffing of CIO during the initial stages of the project was not sufficient and this made the coordination of activities difficult. However, as the project progressed CIO recruited more staff and, coordination and management improved significantly. Another issue was the frequent changes of staff at the management level of FECO/SEPA.

The overall execution approach seems to have been successful and the one of the lessons learned listed in the TE was that “the project applied a successful mixed form of agency execution and national execution”.

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

According to the TE, the following are the lessons learned:

- 1) A comprehensive management mechanism and sufficient involvement of a wide range of stakeholders (IA/EA, international community, government, technical entities and local authorities) in all important events, including inception, TCG, regional workshops and consultations, are the basis to achieve effective and relevant formulation of NIP.
- 2) The mixed form of agency execution and national execution (through sub- contracts to counterparts) is a very efficient implementation modality when the national capacities are sufficient (substantive competence, procurement, financial management, auditing).
- 3) Country ownership, including a dedicated counterpart organization and high level Government commitment and follow up (budgetary resources, legislation) is key to impact of a NIP.
- 4) Applying existing procedures or technologies in developed countries to other countries using different raw materials (wheat straw or bagasse instead of wood) does not necessarily meet success (reduction of dioxin formation).
- 5) Toolkit guidance was found useful for the preliminary assessment of dioxins and furans but needs adaptation to local context (China developed its own emission factors for some sources). Activities for such adaptation should be built into the design in similar projects.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The following are the recommendations included in the TE:

- 1) It is recommended that the GEF and partner agencies continue to support projects that are designed to create capacity in China for NIP implementation. Follow up by GEF, UNIDO, and other GEF agencies.
- 2) UNIDO should increase efficiency of its supervisory and management functions by installing relevant capacity (i.e. technically specialized staff) at the regional office in Beijing. Follow up by UNIDO PTC and PCF
- 3) UNIDO should explore possibilities to include specific Cleaner Production initiatives in the further implementation of NIP. Follow up by UNIDO EMB/CPU
- 4) The national monitoring system should be replicated at the provincial level to ensure sustainability across the country. Follow up by CIO
- 5) It is recommended that implementation and enforcement of policies be explicitly monitored (using adequate indicators) by CIO. Follow up by CIO
- 6) In the case of medical waste incineration more should be done to minimize waste before it is incinerated. It is recommended to explore possible CP initiatives for medical waste management and disposal, and also lifecycle initiatives should be developed to contribute to reduction of UP POPs. Follow up by CIO, UNIDO
- 7) As no proper records were kept, there is an urgent need to interview appropriate retired employees (due to failing memory or persons passing away) of relevant companies in order to get information on sites where PCB- contaminated equipment were land filled/disposed of in the 1970's and 1980's. Follow up by CIO
- 8) UNIDO should consider creating special provisions within the internal management framework to ensure minimization of risks for projects where the project manager has the nationality of the country where the project is implemented. Follow up by UNIDO
- 9) For ongoing and future projects the project manager should ensure that project implementation reviews (PIRs) are carried out as planned and submit them to the GEF. Follow up by UNIDO, PTC/EMB

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.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. 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 makes a good assessment of the achievement of outputs. The section on effectiveness could have been as detailed as the one on efficiency. There is some confusion between outputs and outcomes</p>	MS
<p>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? The TE is clear and consistent. The report on quality of TE states that evidence is not always complete (i.e. the section on M&E is not very detailed and the rating given by the TE might be too high)</p>	MS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE assesses sustainability appropriately.</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons learned are comprehensive</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes</p>	S
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report includes an M&E section, but does not elaborate in detail on the quality of the M&E at entry, the sufficiency of resources.</p>	MU

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

Checklist on evaluation report quality (UNIDO)