

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1611		Review date:		
IA/EA Project ID: 1109		GEF financing:	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$) 0.98	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$) .99
Project Name:	Developing a Model Conservation Programme- Conservation of the Gobi Desert Using Wild Bactrian Camels as an "Umbrella Species"	IA/EA own:	.08	.11
Country:	Mongolia	Government:	.13	.19
		Other*:	.37	.28
		Total Cofinancing	.58	.58
Operational Program:	OP1: Arid and semi-arid ecosystems	Total Project Cost:	1.56	1.57
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Government of Mongolia	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		2003 June
		Closing Date	Proposed: 2007 June	Actual: 2007 July
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 48 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 49 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 1 month
Author of TE: Batbold Dorjgurkhem Suvd Purevjav		TE completion date: 2007 August	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months):

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	HS	S	NA	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	NA	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation		S	NA	UA
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	HU	S

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

No. The TE did not provide a sufficient assessment of the project's M&E system and also failed to provide a list of the key lessons that could be applied to similar projects. Although the TE may not be considered a good practice, it was not deserving of the "highly unsatisfactory" rating given by the UNDP. The report provides a clear and extensive assessment of the project's outcomes and achievements and also provides a separate section breaking down the technical capacities built under specific project objectives. The report also, for the most part, provides a sufficient assessment of the project's sustainability and exit strategy.

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 project is:

"To ensure the long-term conservation of the Great Gobi ecosystem and the keystone species it supports through improving participation of local communities in the management of the Special Protected Area (SPA)."

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:

1. "Strengthen the management of the Great Gobi SPA."
2. "Improve the stewardship of the buffer zone areas."
3. "Develop and implement targeted responses for the cross-cutting issues of, overgrazing and range deterioration; over-collection of Saxual bushes and downy poplars; declining water resources."

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, causing a change in objectives	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 (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?	
<p>Although the government of Mongolia established the Great Gobi as a strictly protected area (SPA) in 1975, the project document informs that many of the key desert species have continued to decline. Habitat degradation along the Great Gobi and its buffer zone has increased over the years due to pressure for water, overgrazing, and the use of animal dung, Saxual bushes and downy poplar trees as sources of fuel by nomadic people in the area. The project document indicates that the lack of stewardship by local communities and their exclusion from the resource-use and decision-making process has prevented the proper control and access to resources along the SPA and buffer zones by these communities. The project proposal to establish buffer zone committees around the Great Gobi SPA will enable increased involvement on the part of local communities in the management decision-making processes which will allow for the proper dissemination of information regarding the biological requirements for sustainable management and harvesting, and the identification and implementation of sustainable livelihood options.</p>	
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?	
<p>According to the project document, the continued protection of Great Gobi Special Protected Area (GG SPA) was recognized as a priority by the Mongolia in its Biodiversity Action Plan. In addition the conservation of the Gobi ecosystem and safeguarding its “globally significant” biodiversity was identified as a priority in Mongolia’s National Action Plan Against Desertification. The agendas and priorities identified in both of these national action plans are in line with the project’s two main development objectives of strengthening the management of the Great Gobi SPA and improving the stewardship of the buffer zone areas.</p>	
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?	
<p>The project’s two main development objectives of strengthening the management of the Great Gobi SPA and improving the stewardship of the buffer zone area are in line with the GEF’s OP1 Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems which focuses on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in dryland ecosystems.</p>	
(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)	
<p>In 1993 Mongolia ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Additionally, Mongolia ratified the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance in 1998 and other conventions such as the Convention on International Trade on Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals. The project objectives, which focus on strengthening the management of the Great Gobi SPA and improving the stewardship of the buffer zone areas, will help facilitate Mongolia in meeting their obligations under these conventions.</p>	
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership ¹	
NA	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: S
<p>According to the TE the “major outputs and deliverables were achieved”. Additionally the TE claims there was an “exceptional level of involvement” across research institutions, technical experts, as well as stakeholders (i.e. herders) at the local level.</p> <p>The following were the major project achievements broken down by objective:</p> <p>Objective 1: Strengthening management of the Great Gobi ecosystem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular monitoring scheme setup for the Great Gobi SPA • Conservation monitoring data collected over the 3 year period • Establishment of on-site trainings for rangers and management staff • Technical improvements such as radio communication system that fully covers the entire ranger’s network, as well improvements in transport and other equipment • Great Gobi Strictly Protected Area (GGSPA) Section “A” Management Plan 2005-2012 developed <p>Objective 2: Improving stewardship of the Great Gobi buffer zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established the Buffer Zone Councils (BZC) in the Great Gobi SPA Buffer Zone 	

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided trainings for the Council members on planning and implementation of activities through “participatory approaches” • Illegal actions (i.e. poaching) recorded within the SPA have been reduced by 80% • Project provided initial funds for the Buffer Zones in each soum with startup/seed money; organized trainings and workshops necessary for managing of the funds • Great Gobi SPA website created and functional; information centers established in five BZ Soums; radio programs aired twice a month • More than 200 jobs created for locals. Total of 64 families out of the 150 engaged in additional income generation. <p>Objective 3: Responding to crosscutting issues of overgrazing and pasture deterioration, over-collection of Saxual bushes and downy poplars and declining water resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar water heaters installed at bath houses and hospitals in Soum centers • Water purifying equipment installed, repaired and restored • Low pressure boilers that use briquettes for heating installed; 38 household members trained on how to make briquettes - resulted in reduction of use of Saxual bushes (by 10 tons) • Location of winter settlements and wells of over 140 households identified and mapped • Carrying capacity of pastureland identified and data entered in a GIS based map • Four monitoring plots enclosed to ensure potential pastureland restoration
--

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: S
<p>The project went slightly over budget – the total amount originally allocated to the project was \$1.532 million by August 2007 actual expenditure of the project was \$1.569 million. Both the Government of Mongolia and the UNDP Mongolia Country Office contributed more the initial planned amount (\$187,797 versus the \$127,000 initially pledged by Government of Mongolia and \$110,000 by UNDP versus the \$80,000 it initially pledged). According to the TE, the GEF SGP funds allocated to the project were not used efficiently. For example, although the GEF SGP committed \$80,000, only \$34,816 was used for local community development. According to the TE, these issues were trivial given the significant achievement of the project’s objectives and the “exceptional” amount of engagement local and national stakeholders in pursuing the project’s objectives.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>It does not appear from the TE that there were in trade-offs between the environment and development priorities.</p>	

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= 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
<p>According to the TE the revolving funds and trainings provided by the project will help ensure that existing activities in the buffer zone of the protected area will be continued by BZ councils in each <i>Soum</i>. While the revolving funds are not extensive, the TE reports it will help to stimulate local stakeholder such as herders and community groups that are well trained on sustainable development principles to continue to pursue the project objectives beyond the project’s closure.</p>	

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)

b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: ML
As previously mentioned, due to the revolving funds and trainings provided by the project on-going project activities in the GG SPA's buffer zone will be continued by BZ Councils in each <i>soum</i> . The TE reports these revolving funds will also help to stimulate local stakeholders such as herders and community groups to continue to pursue the project objectives beyond the project's closure. The project implementation unit, with the help of multiple stakeholders, developed an exit strategy which provides a timetable for the transfer of responsibilities for the management of the project's activities to certain institutions. A part of the strategy designates the responsibility for the implementation of the management plan to Mongolia's Ministry of Nature and Environment (MNE), the GGSPA Administration and the BZ Councils.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
The project has led to collaboration across such institutions as the Institute of Biology at the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, the Denver Zoological Society and other scientific institutions on the research and monitoring of wild Bactrian. According to the TE cooperation across these professional institutions and organizations has led to the successful implementation of the project activities and establishment of good practices which will reduce risks to the sustainability of project outcomes. In addition an exit strategy was developed with the participation of multiple stakeholders which TE indicates provides "management arrangements to institutionalize capacities" and a timetable for the transfer of responsibilities.	
However the TE cautions that in order to ensure the sustainability of the project achievements Mongolia's Ministry for Nature and the Environment needs to amend the Mongolian Law on Buffer Zones and other necessary regulations based on the "recommendations, experiences and achievements of the projects and programs implemented". The TE asserts amendments or revisions to the Law need to address making buffer zone councils a legal body with clear status, appoint full time secretaries for Buffer Zone Councils and establish a legalized accountability system.	
d. Environmental	Rating: NA
No environmental risks were identified in the TE.	
e. Technological	Rating: ML
The key technology that was introduced by the project was the GIS based GGSPA database. According to the TE the maintenance and the updating of the database will be ensured by the Institute of Biology of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences.	

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
The TE provides very limited information on whether the project activities provided socio-economic/market based incentives to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders. What the TE does indicate is that revolving funds and trainings provided by the project will help ensure that existing activities in the buffer zone of the protected area will be continued by BZ councils in each <i>soum</i> and will stimulate local stakeholders such as herders and community groups that are trained on sustainable development principles to continue to pursue the project objectives beyond the project's closure.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
The TE indicates the project activities have enabled the GGSPA to become the leading institution and a research base through the various on site trainings it offers for rangers and management staff and technical improvements it provides. As previously mentioned the project has led to collaboration among institutions such as the Institute of Biology at the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, the Denver Zoological Society and other scientific institutions on the research and monitoring of wild Bactrian. According to the TE cooperation across these professional institutions and organizations has led to the successful implementation of the project activities and establishment of good practices which will ensure the projects' sustainability.

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

c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
The TE does not provide sufficient information to assess to what extent project activities have contributed to policy changes. However the TE does caution the sustainability of the project achievements depends on the amendment of the Mongolian Law on Buffer Zones and other necessary regulations to make buffer zone councils a legal body with clear status, appoint full time secretaries for Buffer Zone Councils and establish a legalized accountability system.
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 did not indicate if the project led to catalytic financing from the Government or other donors.
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 did not specify any 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?
The total amount of co-financing that was proposed in the project document was \$0.58 mill. According to the TE, the total actual co-financing that had been received by August 2007 was \$0.62 mill. 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?
While the TE does not indicate the project experienced any delays the last PIR indicates the closure of the project was delayed by two months. The project was originally supposed to be completed by June 5, 2007 but was instead closed on July 31, 2007. The PIR indicates the two main reasons why the project was delayed 1) to "ensure proper operational and financial closure" of the project and 2) several important activities such as wild camel capturing and collaring and the Project Lessons Learned and Experience Sharing Workshop needed sufficient time to be carried out.
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.
As previously mentioned the development objectives outlined in Mongolia's National Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, Mongolia's National Program on Special Protected Areas and the policy on environment outlined in the Mongolian government's Action Plan for 2000-2004 are consistent with the project's key development objectives. Additionally, the TE indicates that project structure and design was established through a "high priority to the participatory approach." In 2000, three years prior to the official project start date a multi-stakeholder meeting was held which was attended by the Mongolia's Great Gobi SPA Administration, various national representatives from various institutions such as the Mongolian National University, National Commission on Endangered Species of Mongolia, Mongolian Association of Conservation of Nature and Environment. Additionally in December 2002 a project advisory board meeting was organized which was attended by officials from the Mongolian Academy of Sciences (MAS) and Mongolia's Ministry of Nature and Environment. According to the TE, feedback and recommendations from these national representatives were incorporated early on in the project document and as the project progressed.

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
At the outset of the project the M&E plan was reasonably sufficient to monitor the results and track the progress of the achievement of the project's objectives. The M&E plan specified which M&E activities (i.e.	

<p>annual project reports, project implementation reviews and quarterly operational reports) will be conducted, the time frame and responsibilities. It also provided an extensive list of performance indicators that were specific and measurable which were broken down by the project's objectives and further broken down by sub-objectives. Additionally, the budget included in the project document allocated an amount for the implementation of M&E activities.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): UA</p>
<p>While the TE intimates the project's M&E plan was relatively successful, it provides very limited assessment and information in support of it. The TE indicates that key performance indicators that were developed early on in the project design phase were used to report the project's progress in Annual Progress Reports. Additionally a mid-term review (MTR) of the project was conducted. A "Follow-up Action Plan" was developed and implemented in response to the recommendations that were presented in the mid-term review. According to the TE the recommendations from the MTR were "accurately followed up and appropriate measures have been taken."</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? The budget in the project document allocated \$50,000 to M&E activities. The TE does not provide any information if the amount that was allocated was insufficient or sufficient for carrying out the project's M&E activities.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? The TE provides a very limited and broad assessment of the project's M&E plan. While the TE praises the implementation of M&E plan, it is not clearly apparent if the \$50,000 that was initially allocated in the project document was sufficient or if further funding was provided during the course of the project implementation to carry out the project's M&E activities.</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? See section 4.5b.</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. Although the TE reports the M&E plan effectively monitored the progress of and responded to the project's outstanding issues, the TE does not provide sufficient information to support this or to properly gauge which aspects of M&E system can be considered a good practice.</p>

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</p> <p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</p> <p>The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. According to the TE the project was implemented in a "satisfactory" manner as all major outputs and deliverables were achieved and within budget. The TE asserts the project has significantly strengthened "human and technical" capacities of the Great Gobi SPA and "upgraded research, monitoring and inspection work to a professional level" by facilitating cooperation across key project stakeholders. The strengthened capacity of the GGSPA administration has enabled it to become a leading institution and research base, as compared to other protected areas in Mongolia, and is hailed as one of the project's main achievements. According to the TE the project's implementation was aided significantly by the logical framework, its main management tool that allowed the project implementation unit at the GGSPA administration to address the threats to the project's objectives.</p>
<p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale): S</p>

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.

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 main executing agency was Mongolia's Ministry of Nature and Environment (MNE). The Protected Areas Management Division (PAMD) within the MNE was responsible for the project's execution. The PAMD hired a full-time National Project Manager which was directly responsible for the implementation of the project activities. The project implementation unit was headed by the National Project Manager which responsible for various activities such as providing support in preparing technical studies, creating work plans and coordinating project activities, collecting and disseminating relevant information and reporting on progress of the project. In addition to the logical framework, the TE also attributes the successful implementation of project activities to the superior organization and management of the PIU. The national project manager was awarded the "Outstanding Conservationist" by the MNE and the project training officer was awarded a certificate of excellence in recognition for work on conservation of the Gobi ecosystem.

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

The TE does not provide key lessons, practices or approaches.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

- i) Amend the Mongolian law on the Buffer Zone to establish the secretary of BZ Council as a full time post or split duties of Secretary across the Soum Government officers.
- ii) *Soum* Citizen's Representative Khurals should retain portions of compensations and fines paid by violators of environmental legislations into a Buffer Zone Fund and monitor its expenditure to ensure the sustainability of Fund operations.
- iii) Specialists in charge of BZ issues and rangers of the SPA administration should act as consulting bodies for BZ Council activities and the revolving fund.
- iv) The Park administration should develop and offer special itineraries for the SPA and its Buffer Zone to tourists and visitors; itineraries should be published in fliers and distributed to local tour operators during tourism fairs and posted on the SPA website.
- v) BZ councils should handle the assessment of the BZ conditions and achievements and hold meetings and discussions with local residents on a regular basis.

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

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 clear and extensive assessment of the project's outcomes and achievements and also provides a separate section breaking down the technical capacities built under specific project objectives.

Ratings

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?</p> <p>The report is for the most part internally consistent and the IA ratings have been substantiated 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?</p> <p>The report, for the most part, provides a proper assessment of the project's sustainability and exit strategy.</p>	S (5)
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>While the TE provides an extensive list of recommendations which was supported by the evidence presented, it does not provide any lessons learned from the project.</p>	MU (3)
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>The TE provides an extensive breakdown of the co-financing used and actual total project cost, but it does not break down the costs by activity.</p>	MS (4)
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?</p> <p>The report provides a very limited assessment of the project's M&E system.</p>	MU (3)

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)