Project Management Information System aagarwal5@thegef.org

To Do | Projects | Reports | Administration | Help | Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: GEF Project ID [ ] Select

<< Back to Project Edit Save Data

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	1600
Project Title	Biodiversity Conservation in the Lower Dniester Delta Ecosystem
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Agency	World Bank
World Bank ID	70044
Country	Moldova
Project Status	Project Closure
Duration	4 years
CEO Endorsement	03/07/2002
Agency Approval	3/28/2002
Project Effectiveness	04/03/2002
GEF Agency Execution Partners	(Select Execution Partners) Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	BIOTICA Ecological Society

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	Unconfirmed - Samir Suleymanov
TE Reviewer	Josh Brann
TE Peer Reviewer	Baljit Wadhwa

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	4/30/2005	
Project Actual Completion	4/30/2005	
Project Completion Difference	0	Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	05/30/2005	
TE Submission to EO	11/30/2011	
TE Submission to EO Difference	78	Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	03/16/2012	
TER Submission to EO	03/16/2012	
TER Submission to EO Difference	0	Months

Comments on Delays

There was 6.5 year delay between when the ICR was completed and submission to the GEF EO. Reason for delay is unknown.

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US$)	975,000	488,117	50.06 %
Cofinance Amount (US$)	1,040,550	289,000	27.77 %
Total Amount (US$)	2,015,550	777,117	38.56 %

Comments on Cofinancing

According to the TE: "The low ration of actual vs. proposed disbursements is explained by the fact that larger share of the co-financing was expected to be provided under the activities that were not implemented under the project, and mainly related to works category under the Component A [establishment of the national park]."

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework: 3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory

Project Objectives -

Prodoc: "The project objective is to improve in-situ conservation of biodiversity in the Lower Dniester river."

Regarding the logical framework - the project includes the typical World Bank results framework, with components and activities, with indicators in the corresponding column. Overall the results framework does not meet minimum standards, although there are some well-developed outcome level indicators included, which is a positive aspect.

Comment on Changes

A significant amount of undisbursed funding was cancelled at the scheduled end of the project, due to lack of progress on one of the key project outcomes, the establishment of the proposed national park. According to the TE: "The Project team did consider revisions to the approach of the Project – for example to support only community based management measures, but made a conscious decision not to change the Project design. The proposed change would have of course allowed full disbursement of the Grant; however the value and impact of the revised Project would be much less."

No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new project objective component.

Project Performance

Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments

Overall Project Rating: 2 - Unsatisfactory

Comment

According to information in the TE, the main factor in the shortcoming in project achievements was that the government changed between the time of project preparation and project implementation, and the new government had a lower commitment to establishing the national park, the main outcome expected under the project. At the time of project startup, a reassessment of the validity of this outcome was undertaken, and it was determined that it remained a relevant and important outcome, and so the project proceeded. However, during the course of the project the project stakeholders were not able to convince the government to support this primary outcome of the project, and the national park was not approved.

Rating from the TE: "Despite of enormous social and community mobilization and pressure (more than 30 appeals regarding expediting of the National Park creation were made by local communities), as well as support of international organisations (Man and Biosphere UNESCO Program, IUCN, PEBLDS Council) the Government failed to advance the creation of a National Park, envisaged under the project as the first multiple-use protected area in the country. The Draft Decision of the Government to create the Park was approved in December 2003, but submitted to Parliament only in June 2004. The Parliament has failed to endorse the Draft Decision giving the Park a legal status, after which it was supposed to be sent back to the Government for implementation. The project was closed with unsatisfactory rating in regards to both Implementation Progress and Achievement of Project Development Objectives."

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes	Last PIR:	5 - Satisfactory	The last PIR (2004) gives a rating of satisfactory for "achievement of grant objectives" but rates two of the components unsatisfactory and two components satisfactory.
	Terminal Evaluation:	2 - Unsatisfactory	Only about half the project's GEF grant funds were disbursed due to lack of progress from the government on one of the main outcomes. This was despite the best efforts of the EA.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The project failed to achieve two of the four main anticipated outcomes. This was due to circumstances apparently outside the control of the IA and EA.
Relevance	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating given on this aspect. The TE indicates in qualitative terms that the project was relevant.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project concept and strategy were relevant to the needs and priorities of local stakeholders, Moldavian national biodiversity conservation priorities, and GEF strategies. Unfortunately it turned out not to be relevant to overall government priorities, as the national parliament did not move ahead with establishment of the protected area.
	Terminal Evaluation:	2 - Unsatisfactory	

Effectiveness			As noted in the comments at top on the overall rating, the main project outcome was not achieved, and another smaller outcome was also not achieved. Although the project was operational for the planned implementation period, only about half of the funds were disbursed due to the inability to move ahead on the establishment of the protected area.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The lack of project's achievement of expected outcomes appears to be due to factors beyond the control of the project, mainly the commitment of government partners at the national level. The main outcome expected was
Efficiency	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not give a specific "efficiency" rating, but rates "implementation progress" as unsatisfactory, due to the lack of progress on the key outcome. With regard to financial management, the TE indicates that there was no problem in this aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Assessing efficiency for a project in which half of the planned funds were canceled is a challenge, but for the implementation of the activities that were carried, out there was good cost-effectiveness. Of course some of these activities were directed toward one of the main overall outcomes of establishing the national park, which did not happen - the outputs produced however are not wasted, and are potential useful future references.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability	Last PIR:	UA - Unable to assess	The PIR does not provide a rating on
	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide a rating on sustainability, but notes that the main question around sustainability would have been in relation to the sustainability of the national park that was to be created. Since this did not happen, other questions related to sustainability are not as significant
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely	Based on the below ratings combined. There are not significant questions on sustainability as the project did not achieve its main expected outcome. For the activities and aspects of the project that were completed, the experience and lessons will remain, and the technical outputs can be used again in other contexts, but there does not appear to have been any strong effort to continue supporting or sustaining the limited activities and results that were produced.

Financial	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating given on this specific aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely	See comments under overall rating.
Socio-political	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating given on this specific aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely	See comments under overall rating.
Institutional and Legal	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating given on this specific aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely	See comments under overall rating.
Environmental	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No rating given on this specific aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely	See comments under overall rating.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating is given on M&E. The TE briefly discusses M&E, indicating that M&E activities were carried out as planned.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The main shortcoming is that the results framework could have been significantly
M&E Design	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating given on this aspect, and little discussion on M&E design.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The project document does not include an appropriately structured results framework, but does provide indicators for expected project activities and outcomes. The indicators do not fully meet SMART criteria, and baseline data is lacking. The prodoc also includes a short section on the M&E plan, but indicates that a detailed M&E plan was to be developed during the first three months of the project.
M&E Plan Implementation	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating given on this aspect, but the TE briefly indicates that M&E activities were completed as planned.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.

	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Limited information is available in the TE on this aspect, but based on the information available, there do not appear to have been any issues with M&E implementation.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating on this aspect, and no
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	No information given in the TE, but the prodoc indicates that there was adequate budgeting for M&E planned. There does not appear to have been any significant issues with M&E budget

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide a specific discussion of this aspect, but indicates that the World Bank and executing partner did everything possible to try to get the government to move ahead with the approval of the national park, to no avail.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The shortcomings in project achievement were not due to implementation or execution factors, but rather due to contextual aspects beyond the control of the IA and EA.
Quality of Implementation - IA	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating is given on this aspect, and little information is provided in the TE.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	There do not appear to have been any significant issues in this regard. The World Bank performed its duties adequately.
Quality of Execution - EA	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	TE: "The PIU within BIOTICA NGO has performed satisfactorily. The entity is adequately staffed, with qualified and experienced professionals, who know very well the sector, as well as the intricacies of Bank policies and processes. Its staff proved extremely effective in dealing with complex, multiple tasks of project management, including financial management, accounts and audits, procurement, M&E and safeguards. It has demonstrated capacity to serve as an efficient interlocutor between stakeholders, beneficiaries and donors on all aspects of project preparation and implementation. During the Project implementation it became as a focus group for thought and innovative approaches for many aspects biodiversity conservation measures."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.

	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the information available in the TE, this appears to have been a strength of the project, with a very capable project implementation unit.

Agency Specific Project Criteria

Criteria	Document	Rating / Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating on this aspect. The TE indicates that there was strong local stakeholder support for the project, but the commitment was lacking among critical partners at the national level.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE indicates there was strong local stakeholder support and drivenness, but inadequate ownership and support from key
Financial Planning	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating provided on this aspect. The TE indicates that all aspects related to financial planning were adequate, particularly in relation to the fact that approximately half of the grant resources were canceled.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	This does not appear to have been an issue. Also see comments under TE section for this parameter, above.
Preparation and Readiness	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating provided on this aspect. Little or no discussion in the TE on this aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	This does not appear to have been a significant issue for the project, or at least was not a key contributing factor to the project's lack of achievement, other than the fact that national level stakeholders commitment may have declined at the start of the project due to the change in government following elections.
Stakeholders Involvement	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating is provided on this aspect. The TE qualitatively indicates that stakeholder involvement was generally good for the project, particularly among local level stakeholders. The main shortcoming was the lack of commitment from some key national level partner institutions.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	No comments beyond those in the TE section for this parameter, above.
	Terminal		

Need for Follow Up	Evaluation:	No	The TE does not comment on this, but indicates generally that there are no outstanding issues.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	Confirmation should be made of the return of the canceled funds (approx. $487,000) to the GEF trust fund.
Gender Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess	Not discussed.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	No	No information provided in the TE on this aspect. Appears relevant based on the fact that there were alternative livelihood activities supported at the community level, so it would be helpful to understand any potential gender aspects related to this.
Effects on Local Population	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes	TE: "to support formation of new environmentally sustainable businesses meeting the objectives of the National Park, and creation of Savings and Credit Associations (SCAs) to serve as focal points for technical and financial assistance to rural businesses and individual farmers in designing and implementing projects. The following activities have been carried out: an intensive promotion campaign, seminars, training and information activities in all 13 villages in the project area (103 meetings with 1,672 participants in total); registration of 4 SCAs and financing by Rural Finance
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	The project did directly benefit a few member of local communities through a small grants program to support biodiversity friendly activities.

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	No	The TE does not identify any results in this regard, although poverty reduction activities were supported through the small grant and special credit line facility.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	No	See comments under TE section for this
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.

	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
Democratic Governance	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.

Progress to Impact

Progress to Impact	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to Assess	The TE does not provide a rating on this aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	The project was only an MSP to begin with, and with half the GEF funding canceled, there were a limited number of activities carried out over the life of the project. The main aspects that could be considered progress toward impact are the production of the technical documents related to the potential creation of the national park, and some of the small grant/micro credit activities. However the former cannot progress toward impact until the government approves the establishment of the protected area.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The project included a small community outreach campaign, and information dissemination program. A website was also established, that the TE indicates is "frequently visited and referenced." In terms of informing stakeholders, 8 national seminars were held, 17 workshops, and more than 70 meetings with local representatives. The TE indicates that the project activity was "widely covered by the media."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See comments under TE section for this
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The main component of the project included the production of legal documents for the establishment of the national park, and these were completed (legal justification, resolutions, draft decisions, bylaws, etc.).
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See comments under TE section for this
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	Not applicable.

Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	Not applicable.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	TE: "Pilots on community natural resource management (pastures and forests) were successfully established and tested within the Project. These pilots have demonstrated that local communities are highly motivated and have ability to manage it in efficient and environmentally friendly way. Developed concept is further utilized in other GEF-WB supported projects." "Established and tested Community Resource Management Pilots are already being continued under Soil Conservation Project."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See comments in TE section of this parameter.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	TE: "Rural Development Center's (RDC) mobile team has been contracted by BIOTICA on cost sharing basis with RISP to support formation of new environmentally sustainable businesses meeting the objectives of the National Park, and creation of Savings and Credit Associations (SCAs) to serve as focal points for technical and financial assistance to rural businesses and individual farmers in designing and implementing projects." Also - TE: "The project is providing co-financing grants for eligible rural credits extended under RISP, through a Special Credit Line Facility (SCL) of the RISP. The SCL provides 20% grant co-financing for first-time borrowers only, with Swedish SIDA funding the grant portion. This project utilizes the same mechanism, except the grant share is funded by the GEF funds is larger (40%), and eligibility is determined not based on borrowers, but sub- projects that to support the conservation and sustainable resource use objectives of the project. 18 projects had been approved with a total value of MDL 4,919,955 ($393,596) and matching grants contribution of
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See comments under TE section of this

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	TE: "Despite the overall objective of the Project was not reached, the Project results are replicable. Management Plans and Technical Studies are already used as reference documents for other similar initiatives in the country. Established and tested Community Resource Management Pilots are already being continued under Soil Conservation Project. The public financial incentive system to encourage private investments in rural areas that are environmentally friendly is used already as a model for the Securing Long-Term Biodiversity Conservation in the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion Project being implemented by WWF-Russia."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	Aspects of the project are "replicable", but there was little replication that had as yet occurred, based on the information in the TE (cited above). There are some small replication aspects mentioned, but do not appear significant enough to give a positive rating on this aspect.
Upscaling	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	See comments above under replication.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	See comments above under replication.
Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The second component of the project was designed to link with a Rural Investment Support Program development initiative supported by the Bank. TE: "Rural Advisory and Financial Services Sub-Component. This Sub-Component is being carried out in close cooperation with Rural Investment and Services Project (RISP) to ensure full mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource use efforts in economic development initiatives in the region"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	Yes - the project design was innovative and interesting in this regard, to link with another, larger, rural development project to promote mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in rural development. However, much less was actually completed under the program than may have been anticipated because of the overall lack of progress toward the project outcome for establishing a national park. A significant portion of the planned co-financing related to the credit program, which was not realized.

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document	

Environmental Stress Reduction	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility** | **Boundary** | **Intent** | **Comments** N - No | Demonstration Site | Intended | No stress reduction achieved. Edit Delete Add New Row...
Environmental Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility** | **Boundary** | **Intent** | **Comments** N - No | Demonstration Site | Intended | No status change achieved. Edit Delete Add New Row...
Socioeconomic Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility** | **Boundary** | **Intent** | **Comments** N - No | Demonstration Site | Intended | No socio-economic status change noted. Edit Delete Add New Row...
Arrangements for Impact M&E	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.
	GEFEO Review	**Visibility** | **Comments** N - No | No arrangements in place, but little to monitor anyway. Edit Delete Add New Row...

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The summary of the below ratings equates to an overall TE rating of 4.4, which is considered moderately satisfactory. The TE has a number of strengths, but is relatively shallow in terms of the level of information provided. Physical length should not be an indicator for TE quality, but the fact that the TE overall is less than 10 pages provides some indication of the level of detail provided.
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project outcomes indicators could have been improved, but the TE does a good job of qualitatively summarizing the outcome level results, which, in any case, were quite limited. At the same time, the TE does not provide comprehensive information on the activities that were completed, and their relative significance - it primarily just states what outputs were produced.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information on this aspect.
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE includes an assessment of project sustainability, but does not break this down by the four components of sustainability, and does not provide a rating.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE provides only three brief lessons, all related to the issue of lack of success in securing the establishment of the national park. Among all of the other project activities and from various perspectives there surely must have been other valuable lessons from the experience - particularly related to the involvement of local level stakeholders, which seems to have been a strength of the project. No recommendations are provided, which may be acceptable for a terminal evaluation, but could still be useful in the context of the project being left with only half of the resources disbursed.
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE provides good financial information and assessment, which clearly outlines where and how funds were expended by expenditure category. It would be helpful to have a summary of expenditure by project component as well, instead of just by expenditure category.
	Agency	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.

M&E Asssessment	Review:		
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The TE does include a section on M&E, but it is three sentences long and does not adequately assess the M&E aspects of the project, particularly the quality of the results framework and outcome indicators.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE provides a summary table assessing project results by indicator, by activity. The problem is that a majority of the indicators are at the output level and do not facilitate assessment of achievement of outcomes. But in the larger picture, the relative level of achievement of outcomes is known, based on the completed and canceled project components.
Consultation with Stakeholders	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information on this aspect.
Compliance with Guidances	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information on this aspect.
Compliance with UNEG Norms	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information on this aspect.
Addressing of ToR requests	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	TORs not provided.
Independence of Report	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE appears to fairly and accurately assess the project achievements and shortcomings, considering that approximately 50% of the GEF funds were canceled. Ratings provided are supported by the evidence presented.

Lessons & Reccomendations

Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Other	Country drivenness	TE: "In order to introduce modern resource management concepts in the country, all other circumstances - political, economic, and social behavior of	Edit Delete

		the Government has to be ready to adsorb such modern ideas"	
Stakeholder Involvement		TE: "Despite of tremendous social and community mobilization, and support of international community, the decision evolving a major shift in the resourceownership and use can't be achieved unless the Government becomes convinced of doing so"	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new Recommendation.

<< Back to Project Edit

Save Data

A product of the Global Environment Facility