

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	1438		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1881	GEF financing:	1.00	(Expected by end of project in PIR)1.00
Project Name:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dibeen Nature Reserve Project	IA/EA own:	.50	.15
Country:	Jordan	Government:	.20	.004
		Other*:	.32	.70
		Total Cofinancing	1.02	.704
Operational Program:	OP3-Forest Ecosystem	Total Project Cost:	2.02	1.85
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		08 March 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: 2007 August	Actual: 2007 December
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 53 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 57 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 4 months
Author of TE: Francis Hurst Dr. Nedal M. Al Ouran Via Nova Group		TE completion date: July 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 9 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	S	MS	NA	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MS	NA	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	-	MS	NA	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MU
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	U	MS

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

No. The terminal evaluation is not comprehensive and provides insufficient information on project activities to be considered a "good practice". As reported in the terminal evaluation, the evaluation faced time constraints and the late

implementation of project's activities made it difficult to make conclusive statements regarding the success of certain interventions. The UNDP Evaluation Office has rated the quality of TE to be unsatisfactory because "the analysis of outcomes and outputs is not based on clear criteria and is not well articulated." However, quality of the evaluation in the GEF EO opinion is in the satisfactory range. In addition to the extensive information it provides, the report extensively breaks down the deficiencies in the project's strategies and design, as well as the underlying factors which made it difficult to achieve project's objectives.

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

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project document:

"The development objective of the project is to establish a nature reserve in Dibeen Forest to conserve unique and globally significant biodiversity, develop sustainable alternative economic uses of the forest resources in the context of a regional forest park, and build in-country capacity in forest management and conservation-oriented land use planning."

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

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

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

- Output 1: Designated and established nature reserve within the Regional Forest Park
- Output 2: Biodiversity inventory and socio-economic profile
- Output 3: Prepared and implemented conservation management and eco-tourism development plan
- Output 4: Competent and effective reserve an forest park management team
- Output 5: Land use plan for Regional Forest Park
- Output 6: Socio-economic programme for local communities
- Output 7: Implemented awareness and outreach program

However, these objectives were changed during the project's inception phase as projects in GEF-3 were required to fit within the new Strategic Priorities that were introduced and a project log frame matrix was retrofitted to the project document which led to the development of the following objectives:

- Immediate Objective 1: Aleppo Pine Forest conserved through the establishment of the Dibeen Nature Reserve within the context of a regional park approach
- Immediate Objective 2: Sustainable economic uses developed for the forest
- Immediate Objective 3: A national pool of qualified personnel in conservation orientated forest management

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

articulated	objectives	over ambitious	progress	
				X - All projects in GEF-3 were required to fit within the strategic priorities introduced during the GEF-3 replenishment. As a result a log frame matrix was retrofitted to the project document during the inception phase.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S
A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:
(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?
According to the project document there is national concern the absence of biodiversity-friendly land use strategies within the Dibeen Forest may significantly threaten its ecological system and the sustenance of its resources. The Dibeen Forest resources are essential to the livelihoods of its surrounding community, thus its protection is critical. One of the main project objectives is the establishment of the Dibeen Nature Reserve (DNR). This objective is relevant to the national development agenda as establishment of a protected area will help to reduce overgrazing and unmanaged visitors. Another key component of the project is the development of sustainable use interventions, such as tourism, which is directly in line with Jordan's sustainable development agenda.
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?
The project meets government priority objectives that were outlined in the Country Study on biological diversity and established under the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan which was developed by GEF-UNDP. The project is also in line with the UNDP Country Cooperative Framework, adopted in 1976 by the UNDP and the Jordanian government, which recognizes the protection and conservation of the environment.
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?
According to the terminal evaluation the project has effectively established the Dibeen Nature Reserve. In doing so approximately 849 (ha) of forest land has been designated as protected area and the TE indicates this has contributed to a "considerable" improvement in key species in the areas within the reserve. The successful establishment of the DNR has also led to the successful pursuit of interventions, such as tourism, which is a sustainable use of the forest's resources. These project's outcomes are in line with the GEF OP3 forest ecosystem conservation goals.
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)
Jordan ratified the CBD – Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993. The project will facilitate Jordan in meeting its obligation under this convention.
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership ¹
The project does not explicitly intend to promote International Cooperation and Partnership.
b. Effectiveness Rating: MS
<i>Immediate Objective 1: Aleppo Pine Forest conserved through the establishment of the Dibeen Nature Reserve within the context of a regional park approach</i>
The terminal evaluation concludes the project has effectively established the Dibeen nature reserve within the Regional Forest Park. Approximately 849 (ha) of forest land has been designated as protected area as part of the DNR. The TE indicates the first flora monitoring program, conducted in the fourth year of project, has shown "considerable" improvement in key species within the viable population. However the regional forest park (RFP) component of the

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

project was dropped early on in the project. There is concern that with the collapse of the RFP concept the lack of a buffer zone may make the DNR susceptible to external threats. Additionally the formulation of the DNR management plan remains delayed and lacks significant mechanisms for the collaborative management of the reserve's resources.

Immediate Objective 2: Sustainable economic uses developed for the forest

With the successful establishment of the DNR tourism capacity has increased significantly. According to the TE total number of visitors to DNR can reach up to 8,000 people a week, with approximately 50,000 tourists visiting the reserve in 2006 alone. The project also produced a "Visitor Management Plan" to address the wave of tourism to the DNR. In addition, two training workshops were held with local communities that have resulted in the submission of 5 proposals (regarding sustainable economic uses) to the UNDP SGP. A socio-economic complex was also constructed which became active in November 2006 and currently holds three sustainable use-related workshops.

However beyond tourism within the DNR, the TE claims the project has not sufficiently developed systems for the sustainable use of forest products. The TE questioned the connection between certain sustainable development interventions and their impact on globally significant biodiversity. Despite the original strategy of sustainable use of forest products the project became focused instead on "alternative livelihoods trade off strategy". By doing this the TE claims the project was not considering other options that may have been more cost effective and socially equitable than the "protectionist approach" the project ended up pursuing.

Immediate Objective 3: A national pool of qualified personnel in conservation orientated forest management

In terms building a national pool of qualified personnel in conservation orientated forest management the project has held numerous training events on the patrolling system and procedures, the use of GPS conducted orientations for new staff, carried out study tours to two national protected areas and implemented the "Forestry Inventory" program. While some training efforts have been made, the TE claims the project has not sufficiently collaborated with other agencies that are engaged in forest management, especially the Forestry Department to build forest management capacity at the national level.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

One of the main components of the, the regional forest park (RFP) concept was dropped early on in the project and along with it the \$317,000 commitment in funds by EU's LIFE Programme in support of its development. With the abandonment of the RFP component there was a shift away from eco-system wide approach with the RSCN narrowly focused on certain aspects of the project such as the establishment of the DNR, which is considered as one of the project's main successes. The TE claims little effort has been made by the project to develop systems for the sustainable use of forest products other than through tourism within the DNR which has been achieved with some success. Additionally, the high turnover of project managers contributed to the lack of continuity and the desired progress in the development of the project's objectives. The TE attributes the high turnover of managers (4 in total) for the slow start of the socio-economic support program/study and which led to the bottlenecking of other project objectives and activities.

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

From the TE, the project did not result in trade-offs between the environment and development priorities.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

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

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

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

a. Financial resources	Rating: ML
The DNR is likely to incur considerable management costs and income generated from the DNR will be needed to offset these costs. The continued development of the DNR is contingent upon the utilization of the areas outside of the DNR to generate benefits. Regardless, the TE assures the RSCN has indicated it will maintain the management of the DNR and ensures the project's financial sustainability. The TE indicates RSCN's significant management and fundraising capacities, sound financial management, and its proven track record provides confidence that the management and the reserve's financing will continue long after the project's funding ends.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: ML
The RSCN's role as the project's executor is well articulated and supported by the government. The RSCN is an NGO which has been designated by the Jordanian government with the statutory role to "establish and manage protected areas and enforce wildlife protection laws". This combined with the fact Biodiversity Country Study conducted by the Jordanian government gives special recognition for the appropriate management of the Dibeen Forest has significant ramifications for the political sustainability of the project's outcomes. It is important to note that local support of the project outcomes is contingent upon the potential flow of benefits from the management and conservation of the forest's resources and how the issue of the sustainable utilization of forest land, which is still not under a discrete authority, will be addressed.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: MU
According to the TE, as it stands now the DNR is not institutionally sustainable as the RSCN has failed to integrate the DNR within the local institutional framework. Additionally the project has not reached out to other agencies that are engaged in forest management, especially the Forestry Department. A common vision and purpose across these organizations is necessary in sustaining the project's outcomes. In order for the DNR to take advantage or pursue regional initiatives like tourism development, the DNR would need to be incorporated at the governorate and municipal levels.	
d. Environmental	Rating: MU
The TE indicates that due to the fact the regional forest park component of the project was dropped, the DNR may become a stand-alone protected area disconnected from the larger eco-system. Without an external buffer zone the DNR may become more susceptible to external threats to biodiversity resources which may only increase over time. Additionally, the TE indicates the shape and fragmentation of the protected area, combined with its size, may expose the DNR to a number of environmental risks which can make the DNR biologically unsustainable.	
e. Technological	Rating: L
No technological risks were identified.	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders
As previously mentioned, the TE asserts the project has failed to sufficiently engage stakeholders, at the national or local level, in the process of implementing the project's objectives. The project has not reached out to other agencies that are engaged in forest management, especially the Forestry Department. Additionally the RSCN has failed to integrate the DNR within the local institutional framework. Thus without the proper level of involvement across relevant institutions and stakeholders, it is difficult to say to what extent the project's activities have produced incentives to contribute to any 'catalyzing' changes amongst them.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
See 4.3a
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
UA

³ Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
The TE indicates the RSCN has assured that it will provide for the project's financing after GEF funding ends. The TE claims RSCN's significant management and fundraising capacities, sound financial management, and its proven track record provides confidence for the project's financial sustainability. However it is difficult to determine if RSCN's commitment to the project's financing in direct result of the project itself.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
The TE does not specify any particular project champions.

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
As previously mentioned the regional forest park (RFP) component of the project was dropped early on in the project and along with it the \$317,000 commitment in funds by EU's LIFE Programme in support of its development. This led to a less than expected (\$1.02 m) materialization of co-financing and lower amount of disbursements through co-financing. According to the last PIR, the total disbursement expected by the end of project is \$704,000. Based upon the limited information provided in the TE it is difficult to assess how essential co-financing was to achievement of GEF objectives.
b. Delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
As previously mentioned, the high turnover of project managers (4 in total) contributed to the lack of continuity and the desired level of progress in the development of the project's objectives. The TE attributes the high turnover of managers for the slow start to the socio-economic support program which led to the bottlenecking of other project objectives and activities. Additionally the abandonment of the regional forest park (RFP) concept earlier in the project and the lack of a management framework to adapt to the revisions to the project's original objectives continued to plague the project's implementation.
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.
It is difficult to assess the extent country ownership has affected project outcomes given the information that was available in the terminal evaluation. What is recognized is that from the outset the project has been in line with the UNDP Country Cooperative Framework, which was adopted in 1976 by the UNDP and the Jordanian government, which recognizes the protection and conservation of the environment. Also, the RSCN, while an NGO, was created under the patronage of the His Majesty the Late King Hussein. It has been designated the responsibility for the establishment and the management of protected areas which is one of the main objectives of the project. Regardless of the fact the project objectives have not been fully realized, the TE assures the RSCN has indicated it will carry forward the implementation of the project activities and ensure the project's financial sustainability.

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

a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): S
The M&E system was sufficient to monitor the project's results and track its progress towards achieving the project's objectives. The project document provided an extensive outline of the project's M&E plan designating, what, when and by whom particular M&E activities needed to be completed. The project design also included a comprehensive list of baseline indicators and targets to monitor the project's progress and achievements. Baseline ecological and socio-economic surveys were also already integrated into the project outputs and activities.
b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MU
Throughout the project various activities were undertaken in the internal monitoring and review of the project by UNDP Jordan including field visits, follow-up with quarterly and annual work plans, preparation of financial reports and the APR and participation in annual meetings of the Tri-Partite Review. While these M&E activities attempted to gather quality information regarding the project's achievements, the TE reports there were "critical weaknesses" in the monitoring of the project cycle. For instance the quarterly and annual reports that were used were based upon the original 7 development objectives rather than the 3 objectives that replaced them. Also many opportunities to refit the project logical framework matrix (LFM) to the project's changing nature were left unexplored. Additionally, although the regional forest park component of the project had been dropped earlier in the project's cycle no revisions to the

project's LFM were made. Due to these weaknesses and the limited information provided in the TE, it is difficult to assess the quality of information that was gleaned and if it was adequate to properly evaluate the project's outcomes.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? No funding was explicitly provided for M&E activities in the budget included in the project document.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? UA
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? A key critique provided by the monitoring activities was the fact RSCN had failed to integrate the DNR amongst the wider institutional and ecosystem framework. Issues surrounding the progress of the socio-economic programme and the regional forest park, although having been raised in the PIR, had been largely ignored and misunderstood. The TE claims the Tri-Partite Review (TPR) could have used its role to a "greater effect" in addressing these issues and implementing all of the components of the strategy. However, the TE indicates the project's lack of an adaptive management framework and the high turnover of project managers made it difficult to address these issues. By the time fourth project manager took over the project was behind in its implementation and was narrowly focused on the establishment of the DNR and particular socio-economic enterprises.
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. While the M&E system had a good design the system was not implemented well. The design provided for timely feedback and monitoring of the project's progress through the inclusion of necessary targets, baseline indicators, data collection system and a logical framework. However the project was restructured making the earlier M&E design ineffective during the project's implementation. Additionally, there was insufficient initiative on the part of the RSCN and an adaptive management framework to adjust the M&E system to significant changes that occurred in the project's lifetime.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MU
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU 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. As previously mentioned the high turnover in project managers – 4 project managers within the first two years of the project – made it difficult to begin project's components on time. Due to turnover of project managers the socio-economic survey was not conducted earlier on in the project cycle which then pushed off the implementation rest of the project's components. Additionally two key events early on in the project, the redesign of the project development objectives due to the changes in the GEF strategic priorities and the abandonment of the regional forest park (RFP) concept which led to the loss of the eco-system wide approach plagued the project's implementation. Considering these setbacks the UNDP was still active and took initiative in the implementation of the project's objectives. However, when the UNDP attempted to address the challenges that arose with the project, it was met by with considerable resistance by the RSCN. For example, when UNDP-GEF mission and the MTE identified the need to reform socio-economic programs to meet local community expectations and needs, the UNDP prepared a management response to address this and other similar challenges while the RSCN failed to provide an adequate response. This may have contributed to the strained relationship which TE mentions existed between the UNDP and RSCN throughout the project.
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale) MU Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency. The executing agency for the project was the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN). While the RSCN

⁴ 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.

was able to implement some components of the project well, such as the development of the Dibeem Nature Reserve, it was not able to implement all the necessary strategic components of the project. This was due to three factors mentioned earlier-the high turnover of project managers, the abandonment of the RFP, and the revisions to the project objectives-which also plagued the UNDP in its role as implementing agency.

The TE suggests certain issues may have prevented RSCN from fulfilling its role as the executing agency: it may have not fully understood the project's strategy and the role of the UNDP; it did not have a sufficiently developed adaptive management framework to adequately respond to the project's challenges; given the project's slow start the RSCN may have implemented some of the project's components with the intent that it would pursue their continuation after the project ended. In addition to its strained relationship with the UNDP, the RSCN did not build relations with other key forest management institutions such as the Forestry Department which may have hampered the development of an ecosystem approach and building capacity for forest management at the national level.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

- i) Projects concerning land use processes or involved with ecosystem management need to follow an adaptive management approach that tracks risks, assumptions, utilizes indicators, and applies a number of different strategies which are clearly articulated in the project document.
- ii) For populations who rely heavily on agriculture and forest products for their livelihoods, must take into consideration a) the opportunity costs surrounding the adoption of alternative livelihoods approach for this population and b) the likelihood that these populations can find an alternative livelihood.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

- i) Strengthen and build connections amongst agencies and institutions at the local level
- ii) Extend the usage log frame matrix beyond non-GEF/UNDP invested projects
- iii) Use resources available at the local level to revitalize the regional or ecosystem approach
- iv) Strengthen the adaptive management approach to the DNR and management practices especially those that pertain to sustainable utilization
- v) Establish similar capacity building amongst the RSCN and the Forestry Department and a common vision amongst all stakeholders regarding the management of the Dibeem Forest ecosystem

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?</p> <p>While the report contains an extensive assessment of the relevant outcomes the analysis of outcomes are not predicated on clear criteria or well articulated.</p>	MS (4)
<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?</p> <p>For the most part the report is internally consistent but insufficient information as a result of the lack of progress in implementing particular project objectives fail to substantiate some of the ratings provided in the report.</p>	MS (4)
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit</p>	MS (4)

strategy? While the evaluation provides an extensive assessment of project's sustainability, it is not presented in a cohesive manner.	
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? While some lessons are comprehensive and applicable to other GEF projects, others are specific to the project. Also few of lessons presented were not entirely supported by the evidence that was presented in the TE.	MU (3)
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report does not include the actual co-financing used and actual project costs are not clear in the terminal evaluation.	U (2)
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report provides an adequate assessment of the various M&E activities that were performed as well as the shortcomings of the projects monitoring and evaluation system.	S (5)

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

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

--

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)

--