

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:	1486		Review date:	
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Global Biodiversity Forum (Phase III): Multi-Stakeholder Support for the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity	IA/EA own:	0.997	.998
Country:	Global	Government:	0	0
		Other*:	2.306	3.445
		Total Cofinancing	3.006	3.445
Operational Program:	1, 2, 3, and 4	Total Project Cost:	4.003	4.443
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	IUCN - The World Conservation Union, World Resources Institute (WRI), the Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity Network (IPBN), Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Bureau to the Ramsar Convention, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)	March 2002	
		Closing Date	Proposed: September 2005	Actual: March 2006
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 43 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 48 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 5 months
Author of TE: Catrina Perch		TE completion date: June 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: August 2009	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 2 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	MS	MS	MS	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	U	U	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	MS	MU	MU	MU
2.1d Quality of	NA	NA	NA	MS

implementation and Execution				
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why? The terminal evaluation faced significant challenges:

Overall, the terminal evaluation report is not a good practice. The evaluation was conducted two years after the project ended and many of the staff had moved on. Many of the products produced in preparation of the GBF meetings as well as the reports developed after each meeting were inaccessible. As a result the terminal evaluation was based solely based on progress reports and previous evaluation and interviews with the few stakeholders whose contact details were provided. Despite these shortcomings, which could have been avoided by the implementing agency, the report provides sufficient information on project activities and outcomes and their sustainability and presents it in a coherent manner.

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

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives			
a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?			
According to the project document the global environmental objective of the GBF project is to:			
“...support ability of Parties and civil society to effectively implement the CBD by providing a multi-stakeholder forum to support and enhance the conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of biological resources, and equitable sharing of benefits from the use of these resources.”			
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)?)			
According to the project document the following are the development objectives of the project:			
Objective 1 “Through the GBF to provide an informal mechanism where CBD Parties and major stakeholder groups can explore and strengthen analysis and debate the central issues around CBD implementation.”			
Objective 2 “To expand the CBD constituency to foster broader involvement and commitment of independent, public and business sector partners in actively supporting and assessing CBD implementation.”			
Objective 3 “To catalyze new cooperative partnerships and initiatives among CBD Parties, among different sectors, and stakeholder groups at global, regional and national levels.”			
According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.			
Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

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
<p>This project falls under all four Operational Programs under the biodiversity focal area. The concept of the Global Biodiversity Forum (GBF) was borne out of international processes (i.e. AGENDA 21, Global Biodiversity Strategy and Convention on Biological Diversity) which revealed the need for a platform to “inform policy related processes” and engage a wide-range of constituents in “strategic dialogues” on key biodiversity issues. The aim of the third phase of the GBF is to “more effectively” target GBF meetings and outcomes on the regional and national implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Additionally GBF meetings are tailored to focus on areas that support national priorities, action plans and programs, including areas the COP recommends GEF support (i.e. Jakarta Mandate on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity, alien invasive species; biodiversity indicators, etc.). The project document specified some GBF sessions to be designed for the purposes of building “synergies” between biodiversity-relevant treaties, supporting national biodiversity planning processes and increase understanding of nationally-supported global processes.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<p>According to the TE the third phase of the GBF project had a “number of achievements”. One of these achievements was the establishment of an informal mechanism where the CBD Parties and major stakeholder groups could explore and debate issues surrounding CBD implementation. While the quality and success level of the meetings varied, the majority of stakeholders interviewed felt that this objective had been “successfully achieved”. The second achievement of the GBF sessions was the “fairly successful” broadening of stakeholder involvement in the CBD process through consultation, stakeholder participation and information dissemination. In terms of the third objective, aside from providing a conducive environment for partnership creation and anecdotal evidence of partnerships being forged, there was no “deliberate effort made to ensure that a certain number of partnerships were formed”.</p> <p>Additionally the TE emphasizes that while the dialogue provided an “enabling framework” to bring together an array of perspectives, interests and experiences the impact of this approach was difficult to measure and absence of concrete measures may have constrained its ineffectiveness. The TE indicates the increased understanding and capacity that was achieved was not ultimately converted to concrete, “shared action” such as formal decisions and recommendations at the CBD intergovernmental level.</p> <p>Below is the breakdown of achievements by project objective:</p> <p>Objective 1 Through the GBF to provide an informal mechanism where CBD Parties and major stakeholder groups can explore and strengthen analysis and debate the central issues around CBD implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among the GBF participants who completed M&E questionnaires, 93% found the recommendations and conclusions from the workshop sessions useful to their work in biodiversity. Approximately 90% of GBF participants agreed with the recommendations for action proposed as a result of the sessions, with 96% finding workshop discussions and conclusions relevant, fairly represented and constructive. <p>Objective 2 To expand the CBD constituency to foster broader involvement and commitment of independent, public and business sector partners in actively supporting and assessing CBD implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TE indicates almost 80% of the 1700 GBF participants were participating for the first time and a majority were participating at the associated CBD event. 	

- The GBF was able to broaden the constituency and attract the private sector, indigenous people and other types of NGOs: GBF participants represented NGOs (45%), governments (29%), the private sector (10%), academia (10%) and local and indigenous communities (6%).
- The number of organisations and institutions involved in organising and managing the GBF increased by 63% from 2001 to 2006.

Objective 3

To catalyze new cooperative partnerships and initiatives among CBD parties, among different sectors, and stakeholder groups at global, regional and national levels

- An average of 53% of GBF participants (of those who completed the M&E questionnaire from 7 GBF meetings) mentioned they would score “maintain contact with new people met” the highest, followed by “integrating GBF information into my project work” (51%) and “cooperate with NGOs” (50%).
- During the project, GBF Website became a central repository for all GBF related documents with an (unconfirmed) 500,000 hits.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

The TE cautions that the qualitative nature of the project’s objectives makes it difficult to assess their level of achievement vis-à-vis costs involved. The project was able to leverage a large amount of co-financing over the course of the project: 3 USD of co financing for each 1 USD of GEF financing. GEF provided approximately 1 million in funding for the project activities and 3.45 million in co-financing was obtained over the course of the project. Given the significant amount of funding the project received the project was able to successfully convene two meetings of the GBF Steering Committee and organized 14 GBF sessions (5 global, 7 regional and 2 national sessions), with approximately 1700 GBF participants participating for the first time.

The TE asserts the project was “efficient” as IUCN absorbed a “large proportion” of the costs by running a “small and dedicated” secretariat. However the premature disbandment of IUCN’s secretariat led to a no-cost extension of the project and delays in project closure. The project duration was intended to be 43 months ending in September 2005 but project was extended to March 2006 to accommodate incomplete activities. However, given the project’s achievement the project funds appear to be efficiently spent with a reported a balance of \$1,643 USD at project’s closure.

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

According to the project document the overall mission of the GBF was to support ability of “Parties and civil society” to effectively implement the CBD by providing a multi-stakeholder forum to “support and enhance the conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of biological resources, and equitable sharing of benefits from the use of these resources.” At this point it is difficult to determine if GBF sessions have led to significant global environmental benefits and it is unclear if continued development and replication of GBF-style activities, will lead to significant measurable impacts.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources

Rating: ML

While the TE indicates the unlikelihood of the GEF providing follow-on financial support, it points to the significant level of co-financing that was leveraged for the project as evidence of “broad buy-in and relevance of the project beyond the GEF”. This buy-in is evidenced through related initiatives that have been recently replicated in at the international level. In 2008 UNEP convened a “Biodiversity Forum” which took forward the CBD agenda. In May 2008 the Japanese government committed to hold a global forum entitled the “Kobe Biodiversity Dialogue” in conjunction with the COP10, building upon GBF’s work. These examples point to continued relevance and willingness to fund and replicate GBF-style multi-stakeholder dialogues. Additionally, in GBF’s case the executing agency, IUCN, provided significant level of co-financing from both conveners and participants, who paid a registration fees. Funds can be similarly raised for future GBF-style forum discussions.

b. Socio political

Rating: ML

According to the M&E questionnaires that were completed following the GBF sessions approximately a little

over half (54%) of the participants felt that all important stakeholders were represented at the different sessions. Even though the GBF sessions were able to attract 1700 participants for the meeting, of which 80% were participating for the first time, many stakeholders were absent from the sessions. The stakeholders most commonly cited as insufficiently represented were governments, local officials and decision makers. This was followed by indigenous people, farmers, local population, various specialists, and at times the business sector. The TE indicates the low participation of the business sector was due to the fact that some session themes were not particularly relevant to business and “where their contributions were deemed relevant.”

According to the TE although certain donors and stakeholders started to show “signs of fatigue” many stakeholders still see a “niche” for GBF at the regional and national level to discuss key biodiversity issues. For instance UNEP’s convening of the “Biodiversity Forum” in 2008 which was organized in partnership with the CBD secretariat and other key stakeholders is one of the examples of continued willingness to replicate GBF type activities. However the TE indicates the continuation of the GBF would require the increased participation of various stakeholders mentioned above and “significant changes” to GBF’s format to “sustain its relevance”. The TE indicates the GBF would need to “evolve and diversify” and adopt a “more adaptive approach” which would involve problem solving, consensus building, promotion of action and setting agenda’s depending on key issues.

c. Institutional framework and governance

Rating: MU

While the project has been successful in broadening CBD’s constituency and there have been “concrete examples” of willingness to replicate GBF-style activities, the TE specifies there is “no formal evidence” of formal decisions and recommendations taken at the CBD intergovernmental level as result of this phase of the GBF project. The TE indicates in order for the project results to be sustained in the long-term, GBF changes how it “conveys its results” and institutional frameworks are “further developed” to ensure that they are properly and more explicitly embedded into the CBD or other policy processes.

d. Environmental

Rating: NA

Not applicable.

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good

The project was able to successfully produce several public goods:

- Two meetings of the GBF Steering Committee held
- 14 sessions (5 global, 7 regional and 2 national sessions) of the GBF organized and convened in conjunction with three major environmental conventions
- 1700 GBF participants participating for the first time GBF sessions of which 71% are from developing countries
- Global Biodiversity Forum website established becoming a central repository for all GBF related documents

b. Demonstration

Not applicable to this project.

c. Replication

According to the TE “there are clear signs” that the principles of GBF are being replicated. In May 2008 the Japanese government committed to hold a global forum entitled the “Kobe Biodiversity Dialogue” in conjunction with the COP10, building upon GBF’s work and UNEP convened a “Biodiversity Forum” in the same year. The TE indicates most stakeholders feel that there is still niche for the GBF although it would have to be redesigned to match current needs.

d. Scaling up

According to the TE the regional GBF meeting on Cook Island provided “additional impetus” for the creation of the Pacific Regional strategy on Invasive Species. Additionally the TE credits the GBF as being instrumental to the establishment of the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) due to its attention to the article 8 of the Convention which relates to invasive species.

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? 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

<p>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 project received \$3,445,281 in co-financing which is \$339,781 more than originally indicated in the project document. According to the TE the GBF generated co-financing for each GBF meeting as they were "decided and developed". The TE indicates the extra Global Biodiversity Session in Curitiba, Brazil in 2006 led to changes in the planned budget. According to the data provided in the TE UNEP did not secure any co-financing for the project. However, it does not provide an explanation as to why UNEP was not able to do so. The TE indicates co-financing from various sources is indicative of a high degree of "buy-in" for the project. However, based upon the limited information provided in the TE it is difficult to assess the extent to which co-financing was essential to the achievement of GEF objectives.</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>According to the TE, the project was delayed due to premature break up of the IUCN GBF management team. As a result there was a "lack of focus" in completing the project's final activities. An 18 month no-cost extension was necessary to complete project activities.</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>As previously mentioned the aim of this project from the outset was to "more effectively" target GBF meetings and outcomes on the regional and national implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). According to the TE, GBF meetings were tailored to focus on areas that support national priorities, action plans and programs with GBF sessions designed for the purposes supporting national biodiversity planning processes and increasing the understanding of nationally-supported global processes. According to the TE the willingness to host and prepare various GBF sessions at the national and regional level provides evidence of the project's relevance to national and regional agendas. Additionally the TE points to the significant co-financing mobilized from organizations such as African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) and the Regional Environment Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC) as evidence of ownership at the regional level. However, the TE indicates the stakeholders most commonly cited as missing at GBF sessions were governments, local officials and decision makers. Of the 1700 GBF participants in the GBF sessions, less than 30% were members of national governments.</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): MS</p>
<p>The M&E plan outlined in the project document specifies the key goals, indicators, and data collection methods. The M&E plan provisions for survey – orally and/or through questionnaires – of participants, organizers and conveners, after each GBF session. However one of the key shortcomings at the project development level was that no baseline information was provided regarding the proposed outcomes in the project document. Additionally, the nature of the project activities makes it difficult to identify indicators that are consistent with the SMART framework.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MU</p>
<p>According to the TE, inability to implement the M&E plan "significantly affected" the ability to document the project's impact and potentially improve its performance. The qualitative nature of the project and its objectives, made it difficult to assess the results of sessions, especially in the absence of established baselines and unspecific and measurable indicators. The PIR (2005-2006) indicates that a number of indicators were not able to be reported such as the extent to which GBF meeting discussions, publications and initiatives contributed to decision-making and recommendations at the CBD intergovernmental level. As reported in the PIR (2005-2006) these factors were "almost impossible" to measure with out "significant pre-design and costing". The TE also attributes the inability of the project to document its impact to the high demands on a two person run GBF secretariat and staff turnover which eventually led to non-compliance with the existing M&E plan and which, while not explicitly stated in the TE, would explain why adjustments in the M&E plan were not made. However, despite these deficiencies in the M&E plan in the project design and implementation, the TE claims the project team, with the limited information they were able to gather, complied with annual reporting, (PIRs) and other UNEP M&E requirements (i.e. terminal report, self-assessments).</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?</p>

<p>No. According to the TE no budget was provided for M&E activities in the project document, aside for the conduction of the terminal evaluation.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? No. As previously mentioned, the original project's budget did not include funding for M&E activities apart from the terminal evaluation. While information regarding M&E funding during implementation was limited, the TE states "both human and financial resources" should have been earmarked to implement the project's M&E plan.</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? According to the TE the lack of use of the M&E plan "significantly affected" the projects ability to document its impact and potentially improve its performance. One of the main shortcomings of the M&E implementation the TE identifies is the lack of reporting of M&E indicators which prevented the use of the information of the project monitoring system. Although an independent Canadian-based consultancy company assisted in the collection of the project's M&E data and IUCN wrote up the project's M&E reports, the project manager did not utilize many of these reports due to time limitations.</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. According to the TE, the M&E system was constrained because the project did not "lend itself to showing concrete results". However, an even greater problem was that the existing M&E system, while with its inadequacies, was utilized only to "some extent." Thus the TE asserts while the project team were "generally satisfied" with the project results, the inadequate implementation of the M&E system and incomplete follow-through with M&E activities made it difficult to accumulate the necessary facts and figures to document its success.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS 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. According to the TE the GBF project had a "number of achievements" such as the establishment of an informal mechanism where the CBD Parties and major stakeholder groups could debate issues surrounding CBD implementation and increased stakeholder involvement in the CBD process. UNEP provided support in the project development process but played a passive role once the project took off. According to the TE, the UNEP played a "sufficient albeit removed" role throughout the project with UNEP being described as "passive". The TE asserts that at the same time the project did not face significant "threats" in its implementation to require significant intervention by UNEP. One of the main shortcomings of the project was the inadequate implementation of the M&E system and incomplete follow-through with M&E activities. According to the TE this "significantly affected" the projects ability to document its impact and potentially improve its performance.</p>
<p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): MS 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 this project was the World Conservation Union (IUCN) headquartered in Switzerland. According to the TE, the IUCN was praised by GBF participants for its ability to bring wide-range of stakeholders together. The TE asserts that it was unlikely the project could have functioned without IUCN's experienced management team and its global network. The TE indicates the project partners (UNEP, UNDP, World Bank) played a limited role (i.e. participating in Steering Committee) in the project with IUCN conducting much of the work. However the premature disbanding of the IUCN team resulted in lack of</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.

focus to complete the final activities of the project led to a 12 month delay in organizing the last 2 regional activities. This combined with the decision to convene the last GBF session during CBD COP8 extended the project by 6 more months, a combined 18 month delay. The TE asserts this was due to the fact that while the IUCN had the capacity to execute the project, it may not have considered adequately the demands on the secretariat in managing and preparing the sessions.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

These were the key lessons learned that were specified in the TE document:

- i. While the dialogue-based approach provides an enabling framework that brings together a broad range of perspectives, interests and experience the impact of the dialogue-based approach is difficult to measure and may lead to ineffectiveness if the increased understanding and capacity is not concretely tied to shared action.
- ii. Getting the balance between laymen and “experts” is crucial for Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues if they are to be credible and influence decision making.
- iii. The best M&E system will fail if the required human and economic resources to implement it are not in place.
- iv. In order to conduct credible evaluations proper documentation and data is necessary.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

These were the key recommendations made in the TE document:

- i. A more adaptive approach should be adopted, such as problem solving, consensus-building, promotion of action and setting agendas depending on the nature of the issue in dialogue forum.
- ii. Future GBF-related projects that evolve around Multi-Stakeholder Dialogues should also consider adapting and extending how they convey their results to ensure that they are properly embedded in policy processes or action on the ground.
- iii. The topic of meeting and its structure should be given attention when designing meeting – i.e. an expert panel approach might be useful, especially where a high degree of technical information is involved, a more participatory approach may be appropriate in other circumstances.
- iv. Sufficient priority for M&E activities needs to be given in project management and M&E budget and activities need to be integrated into overall project budget and work plan.
- v. Ensure that evaluators have easy access to project related data and contacts and provide project staff with a checklist of necessary documentation to carry out rapid feedback on available information resources.

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 provides a sufficient assessment of the project outcomes.</p>	S (5)
<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 report provides sufficient evidence regarding the project implementation and outcomes with the IA ratings generally supported by the evidence that was provided.</p>	S (5)
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report provides an extensive assessment of the project's sustainability breaking down the analysis of sustainability along, social, financial, institutional dimensions.</p>	S (5)
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are comprehensive, and for the most part, supported by the evidence presented in the report.</p>	S (5)
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE provides a breakdown of the co-financing used and actual project costs and breaks them down by activity.</p>	S (5)
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report provides sufficient assessment of the project's M&E system.</p>	S (5)

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