1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		142	
GEF Agency project ID		N/A	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		People, Land Management, and Environmental Change (PLEC)	
Country/Countries		Brazil, China, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, Tanzania, Uganda	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		STRM- Short Term Response Measures	
Executing agencies involved		United Nations University (UNU)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		through consultation	
Private sector involvement		No involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		2/20/1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		3/13/1998	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		3/31/2001	
Actual date of project completion		2/28/2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.100	
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		6.176	N/A
Co-financing	IA own	0.701	
	Government	2.050	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	2.066	
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		6.276	N/A
Total Co-financing		4.817	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.093	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2/4/2003	
TE submission date		10/27/2003	
Author of TE		Janis Bristol Alcorn, Benjavan Rerkasem, and Eduardo Fuentes	
TER completion date		09/30/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The goal of the project People, Land Management and Environmental Change (PLEC), as stated in the Project Document (PD), is "*to develop sustainable and participatory approaches to biodiversity management and conservation based on farmers' technologies and knowledge within agricultural systems at the community and landscape levels*" (PD, pg.17).

Cultivated and semi-cultivated lands in the tropics and sub-tropics are the areas that contain most of plant biodiversity worldwide. These areas can be effectively protected through government controls. In the last century, commercialization, mechanization and land degradation have been the reasons for the disappearance of a significant numbers of cultivated plant varieties and landraces. The PLEC project has been developed in response to demand from governments and local groups for models of biodiversity conservation within agricultural systems (PIR, pg.1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is to provide "*strategic and timely recommendations to governments and local communities for achieving world food security while protecting global biodiversity and conserving resources"(PD, Annex 2)*.

As given in the PD, the four specific objectives of the PLEC project are to:

1. Establish historical and baseline comparative information on agrodiversity and biodiversity at the landscape level in representative diverse regions;
2. Develop participatory and sustainable models of biodiversity management based on farmers' technologies and knowledge within agricultural systems at the community and landscape levels;
3. Recommend approaches and policies for sustainable agrodiversity management to key government decision makers, farmers, and field practitioners; and
4. Establish national and regional networks for capacity strengthening within participating institutions.

The method is to do this through over 20 demonstration sites where sustainable and conservationist resource-use strategies are worked out and implemented jointly with different stakeholders: researchers, government officials, NGO representatives and farmers and other resource users (PIR, pg.1).

The PLEC project is a global project and is organized into Clusters of countries that represent diverse regions in East and West Africa, Southeast Asia, Papua New Guinea, Amazonia, and the Caribbean. The selection of Cluster was influenced by: (a) critical regional biodiversity importance in areas undergoing rapid change and land-use pressures; (b) critical ecosystems with important life support functions as well as national development potential, based upon national priorities and national plans; and (c) known examples of local agrodiversity management practices, or the strong likelihood of discovery of adaptive resource management (PD, Annex 2).

These five ecosystem clusters are spread over eight countries: Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, China, Papua New Guinea, and Brazil. The PLEC project is a farmer-driven demonstration project.

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

There is **no** change reported in GEO, DO, or in other activities during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The project meet the eligibility and programme priorities of the Convention on Biological Diversity. It specifically meets the guidance provided by COP3 on agro-biodiversity and responds to Article 12 of the CBD (PD, pg. 11). The PLEC project also gives priority to arid and semi-arid lands, mountain ecosystems, and forests ecosystems, which are identified by the COP of CBD as needing priority action. Those three ecosystems also correspond to the three GEF Operational Programmes for biodiversity. The project addresses the two main operational principles for biodiversity in the GEF Operational Strategy. It also meets the local participation guidelines of the GEF (PD, pg.11).

According to the TE, if the PLEC project had been presented to Council during year 2001 it would have been eligible under the Operational Program 13, on biodiversity of importance to agriculture. When it was presented to Council in 1998, there was no such OP, and it was eligible under the general biodiversity focal area (TE, pg.33). The PLEC project is a pioneer for activities in the agricultural production landscape and meets the GEF interests in developing ways "to conserve biodiversity in agricultural landscapes outside protected areas, particularly in corridors and transitional buffer zones, while meeting local needs for social and economic development" (TE, pg.33).

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

The effectiveness of the project is rated satisfactory, as most of the envisaged outputs and objectives have been achieved.

The PLEC project as a whole has achieved all four original project objectives; even though goals and progress vary among clusters. At a global level, the PLEC project has made achievements in developing and promoting global appreciation of the value of landscape level diversity (social and biological) in agriculture. The PLEC project has also developed the foundations for analyzing how resource use systems and diversity levels are correlated and how they are influenced by the market and by policies (TE, pg.4). At the local level, PLEC has successfully conserved biodiversity in agricultural landscapes through the replication of good agricultural techniques based on expert farmer experimentation and demonstration. (TE pg. 16)

According to the TE, the PLEC project has shown that collaboration is possible between scientists, agriculture advisors and end-users of agricultural technical advice (TE, pg.6). The PLEC project has created and demonstrated a way to reform agricultural research in order to reverse global trends toward monoculture, land degradation, and biodiversity loss.

Another main achievement of the PLEC project is the successful development of pilot programs in 12 countries, that are a foundation for "*replicating the PLEC approach in other countries as part of their national agricultural education system, and as a component of other GEF biodiversity projects*" (TE, pg.7).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The efficiency of the project is rated as Satisfactory.

There is very little information in the TE and in the PIRs about the efficiency for the project. The Evaluator states that in some areas (for example in Ghana and in the Amazon), the financial resources

per site was too low to ensure the protection of those areas by permanently removing all human-induces threats to them. Some of the sites received about USD 10,000 per year for all their activities, and therefore, under these conditions, the TE believes that PLEC cannot be asked "to account for permanently eliminating all threats to the biodiversity of the working areas" (TE, pg.28).

The TE mentions, that at most sites the time given for the project to show its results is too short. The TE believes that in four years the project cannot be expected to generate, test and disseminate land use innovations (TE,pg. 32).

The PIRs on the other hand, does not mention any implementation delay or any issues due to bureaucratic, administrative, or political problems, that could have affected cost-effectiveness.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Likely**

The sustainability of the PLEC project is Likely for the following reasons.

According to the TE, there is a number of collaborators and interested other groups at local level willing to replicate the PLEC's agrodiversity approach. The adoption and adaptation of methods exhibited during the project's implementation also supports sustainability of project outcomes. Additionally, the TE believes that "adopting and adapting PLEC ideas in environmental (and developmental) curricula of educational systems, from primary to university level, will ensure sustainability of PLEC even beyond specific projects to be developed" (TE, pg. 10).

Moreover, in some cases PLEC technical and policy recommendations have been incorporated into national development and conservation planning processes (for example in Ghana Strategic Plan for Conservation and Use of Genetic Resources, Brazilian State of Amapa Sustainable Development Plan, KARI strategy in Kenya). In other cases, other projects have adopted PLEC methods (for example SRMP in Ghana, Pro-Varzea and Pro-Manejo programs in Brazil) (TE, pg.11).

On the other hand, it is difficult to evaluate long term sustainability, several PLEC's country programmes have been successful in leveraging support from other sources for continuation of the programme, but it is not clear how many clusters have identified adequate funds for continuing their work. One good sign for project sustainability is that the project can continue working with minimal investment; following the PLEC approach, farmers demonstrate to others that agrodiversity is a solution for farmers' problems. "*Agricultural scientists and extension workers learn that agrodiversity and the PLEC process offer them solutions to offer to farmers elsewhere, and a process to discover, evaluate, and disseminate new solutions in the future with little outside investment or inputs*" (TE, pg. 8). Finally, clusters have produced plans for continuation, according to the last annual project report.

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?

There is no information reported in the TE about expected or actual co-financing of the project.

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?

Only minor delays were reported in the TE in some of the pilot areas.

In Papua New Guinea, some key personnel passed away during the project implementation, and therefore the work in Ogotana demonstration site had been going for only two years when the TE was realized. Consequently, most results were already well known. According to the TE (pg.32), to have more successful results, the project would need to continue for at least 4 or 5 more years.

The project in Uganda was delayed by the need to co-ordinate within EAPLEC (East Africa PLEC), in which the three sub-clusters decided to work together on the common theme of "Developing sustainable agricultural systems in diverse and dynamic bio-physical and socio-economic environments" (TE,pg.84); However this delay did not have major impact on the results.

No other delay or extensions were reported in the TE or in the PIRs.

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

The PLEC project is about local communities' participation, and its goal is to convey beneficial resources management and conservation approaches to farmers and local communities. The project consists of a network of scientists, farmers and extension workers linking local clusters into a global framework that assists all clusters to advance through collaboration (TE pg.8). According to the TE, scientists, researchers and students had a very active role in recording validating and disseminating project findings and results; this has been crucial for the project's success (TE, pg.31). Moreover the project coordinators at all level (country, cluster and international) were very involved and "have provided both scientific and administrative back-up as well the appropriate delivery of project results and recommendations for impacting policy and project development locally, nationally and internationally" (PIR, pg.10)

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 **Satisfactory**

M&E Design is not described or analysed in the TE, the assessment below comes from a reading of the PD.

According to the PD, the project would be evaluated based on; execution performance and delivered outputs. Monitoring would concentrate on the management and supervision of project activities, seeking to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation. The process would be continuous and would collect information about the execution of activities programmed in the annual work plan, advice on improvements in method and performance, and compare accomplished with programmed tasks. The managing director would be directly responsible for that work. Ongoing evaluation would assess the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality. Internal assessment would continuously be provided by the Scientific Coordinators, and mid-term and final evaluation of outputs would have to be carried out by external consultants contracted by UNEP in consultation with UNU. A timeline for those reporting and evaluation is presented in the PD, however, no budget is planned for that activity.However, no indicators for measuring implementation progress are given in the PD. Therefore, the M&E design is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

Very little information is given in the TE, and in the last PIR about the M&E implementation.

The TE only mentions that management and supervision of activities during project implementation was monitored continuously by UNU and UNEP in addition to internal assessment continuously done by the Scientific Coordinators. Moreover, monitoring helped facilitate informed adjustments to the project design during implementation. Most importantly, the focus of the clusters was narrowed from landscape to conservation of biological diversity within the participating agricultural systems (TE, pg 2). Management and supervision of activities during project implementation was monitored continuously by UNU and UNEP in addition to internal assessment continuously done by the Scientific Coordinators.

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: **Unable to Assess**

There is not enough information in the TE and in the last PIR to rate the quality of project implementation.

UNEP is the implementing agency of the PLEC project. As the implementing agency UNEP was in charge of overall monitoring and evaluation of the project. Work plans, budget plans, and financial statements were provided by UNU to UNEP for approval. UNEP also carried out periodical supervision missions for the project. The responsibility for the oversight of the project was assigned to a senior staff member. The project Advisory Group (AG) oversaw implementation of the overall level (PD, pg.3).

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

The executing agency of the PLEC project was UNU.

According to the TE, the strong involvement and keen interest in PLEC by UNU Vice Rector as well as the outstanding performance of the PLEC project manager have effectively compensated the departure of the UNU senior PLEC Task Manager (TE, pg.10). The former Scientific Coordinator was responsible for winding up of the GEF-funded project while the new scientific coordinator concentrated on development of follow-up activities.

The international coordination activities allowed the PLEC project to be much more than a sum of its clusters. The PLEC management team pursued their objectives and sought the review and advice from other scientists. The international coordination work achieved many milestones, even though coordinating activities in a diverse set of countries could have been challenging. The PLEC project's Scientific Coordinators developed guidelines and assisted clusters to prepare their annual workplans. They also assisted the clusters to standardize their financial and personnel management. The PLEC Biodiversity Advisory Group created methods and frameworks to improve data collection and analysis. And PLEC's Demonstration Activities Advisory Team developed guidelines for working with master farmers and stimulated change by visiting clusters to work with farmers and researchers in each cluster (TE, pg.13).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

According to the TE, only in China where PLEC was working with villages on the edge of protected nature reserves, PLEC activities have had direct impact on biodiversity in the reserves, the work of the Nature Reserve Bureau responsible for protecting the reserves, as well as on farm productivity and agrodiversity (TE, pg.29).

Two state nature reserves (Xishuangbanna and Gaoligonshan) in Yunnan, China had improved management effectiveness:

(1) Relationship between the Nature Reserve Bureau and demonstration villages next to the state nature reserves has been improved;
(2) Alternative sources for preferred timber (e.g. Phoebe puwenensis), fuel wood (e.g. Cassia siamea), and NTFPs (butterfly and medicinal plants) through agroforestry models was developed and promoted to reduce extraction pressure in the two state nature reserves.

Moreover, sustainable use of biodiversity resources was improved: biodiversity in agricultural landscapes at 21 “demonstration sites” in 8 participating countries has been conserved through the replication of good agricultural systems and techniques based on expert farmer experimentation and demonstration (PIR, Annex I.B).

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

According to the TE, it is because PLEC was able to provide inputs and technical assistance contributing to improve the livelihoods of people that it has had such impact in the field (TE,pg 29).

The project has been successful in demonstrating scientist-to-farmer and farmer-to-farmer transfer of practices aiming to increase farm income while maintaining or increasing number of crop varieties and useful species in each individual field type (TE, pg. 4).

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

a) Capacities

According to the TE, PLEC's achievements in capacity building and enhancement of knowledge base are plenty. Besides capacity building of individual farmers and agricultural scientists who received training, the PLEC process itself built capacity by creating the conditions for agricultural researchers to discover the rewarding working with expert farmers. The database developed by the project provides a framework for gathering comparable data for analysis to reveal the conditions in which farmers' knowledge continues to exist, and as a baseline for identifying and following farming system trends into future (TE, pg 4). At least 200 project members and several thousand farmers were impacted by the PLEC project. Over the years of collaboration in this project, hundreds of project participants, including scientists, technicians, local officials, students, and farmers have come to use agrodiversity for sustainable rural development. The project helped broaden the agricultural scientists' concepts of diversity and it contributed to the knowledge of how farmers and communities can help to maintain and enhance biological diversity even in intensively cultivated areas. The project created replicable process to empower people who support agrobiodiversity (TE, pg.14). At the local level, farmers and agricultural agents have gained new, useful knowledge. At the national and international level, systematic data collection has improved during the course of the project with the assistance of international advisors, and a database has been created, although it is so new that it has not yet used as the basis for analysis that can be confirmed by independent review. (TE.pg11)

In terms of Capacity Building indicators, the 'Consolidated Report on Capacity Building' provides a detailed description and analysis of the project's impacts on human and social capital (TE, pg. 10).

More details on the capacities building are given in the TE page 14.

b) Governance

Some changes in policies, laws and regulations and in their application, as well as changes in institutional arrangements, responsibilities and effectiveness, to improve biodiversity conservation and sustainable

use were reported (PIR, Annex I-B). A local process of farmers, researchers and officials was created to empower people who support agrobiodiversity. Farmers' organizations for sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity nurtured (for example the network of farmers' associations in Ghana). Project results were also incorporated into designing the relevant programs (for example GEF projects with FAO and IPGRI, and "Pro-Varzea" program in Brazil) and policies (e.g. National Land Use Policy and Biodiversity Conservation Strategies in Uganda) (PIR, Annex I-B).

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

No unintended impacts were reported in the TE and in the PIRs.

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

According to the TE, upscaling and mainstreaming the PLEC approach globally has not been achieved yet (TE, pg.16).

However some replication processes had already started at the time of TE. PLEC's role in helping to constitute or strengthen farmers associations is an important and sustainable outcomes of the project, as these associations provide an effective platform for future developments. The associations were successful in giving farmers negotiating power with banks and governments, and in enabling fruitful exchanges of information and genetic material. The TE also found that the environmental education programmes of PLEC (for example in Brazil) was very attractive and worth replicating elsewhere in the PLEC and non-PLEC world (TE, pg.4).

Several projects external to PLEC have provided collaboration and already adopted to build on PLEC's achievements both nationally (for example Ghana and Brazil) and internationally (for example the project called IPGRI 'Conservation and use of crop diversity to control pest and disease pressures in support of sustainable agriculture') (PIR pg. 10).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE gives several lessons to be learned from the PLEC project:

(1) In four years the project of this kind cannot be expected to generate, test and disseminate land use innovations. The optimum mixture of species, and their arrays and densities are the subject of involved academic studies, or the result of long trials and errors in the field (TE; pg.5).
(2) The strength of PLEC in helping to shape agrodiversity polices has been affected by the overall weakness in design between and within clusters. Clusters have little in common besides the goal of improving yields and increasing biodiversity.
(3) The project approach has been flexible enough to make the best out of the clusters according to their capacities. Sharing of the agrobiodiversity information collected and knowledge that farmers share with the project could be stored at local level through the compilation of information in a simple booklet in local language and serve many purposes. It would begin to store local knowledge that can be built upon and used by everyone from farmers to schoolchildren.
(4) While the main focus of PLEC should be to continue work at each cluster, a more visionary goal of how to develop a way to reach agricultural researchers and extension agents around the world would enhance the impact of PLEC.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are given in the TE:

(1) PLEC should develop curricula for training scientists, agricultural researchers and extension agents in the 'agrodiversity' approach and the techniques developed by PLEC.
(2) One way to start mainstreaming would be for PLEC to establish regional training centers that would build interest among more established universities, as well as provide specific types of training.
(3) Mainstreaming PLEC approaches into agricultural research and farmer-based promotion of sustainable alternatives will be the essential companion to economic reforms to support biodiverse landscapes.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a very detailed assessment of the project's achievements. The objectives, outcomes and outputs are well described. A global analysis of the project's achievements is given as well as an analysis for each country involved in the project.	**HS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and the evidences presented are complete. However, there is no rating for any of the categories.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses project's sustainability at a global level, as well as at a country level. However, there is no information on environmental sustainability and on institutional sustainability.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Only a few lessons are given in the report; however there is no specific part in the report that gives global lessons to the project, and no part on the lessons for each demonstration projects.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include any information about the costs.	**HU**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does not include information about the M&E systems at entry, and it contains only very little information on M&E system during implementation.	**U**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

0.3*10 + 0.1*11 = 4.1

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