

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1614	
GEF Agency project ID		1899	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Demonstrating the Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism in a Small Island Developing State	
Country/Countries		Antigua And Barbuda	
Region		Latin America and the Caribbean	
Focal area		Integrated Ecosystem Management Land Degradation, Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP12; EM-1 (SLM-1; SLM-2; BD-1)	
Executing agencies involved		Division of Environment, Ministry of Tourism and Environment, Ministry of Works, Transport and Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		August 2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		December 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2011	
Actual date of project completion		June 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.20	0.2
	Co-financing	0.06	0.06
GEF Project Grant		3.00	2.89
Co-financing	IA own	0.02	0
	Government	3.43	5.63
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.25	1.23
	Private sector	0	0
NGOs/CSOs		0	0
Total GEF funding		3.2	3.09
Total Co-financing		4.76	6.92
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		7.96	10.01
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2014	
Author of TE		NA	
TER completion date		March 19, 2015	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	--	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	ML	--	L
M&E Design	NR	NR	--	S
M&E Implementation	NR	S	--	MS
Quality of Implementation	NR	HS	--	MS
Quality of Execution	NR	HS	--	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Despite its small size, Antigua and Barbuda supports an important and diverse biodiversity including coral reefs, mangroves, beaches and forests. However, so far, conservation activities and the management of protected areas have been inadequate.

As a result, this project aims to “ensure the sustainability and maintenance of Antigua and Barbuda’s island ecosystem integrity, health, and function through integrated planning and management of island resources” (TE p.5).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

More specifically, the project’s objective was to develop and implement a Sustainable Island Resource Management (SIRM) to “to stabilize and maintain ecosystem functions, thereby providing a basis for continued sustainable economic development” (TE p.5). The project focused on four main outcomes to achieve this objective:

- Outcome 1: Easy and reliable access to information for environmental management by all stakeholders (through the development of an Environmental Information Management Advisory System for use in Planning, Decision-making and Improved Targeted Awareness).
- Outcome 2: A Sustainable Island Resource Management (SIRM) Mechanism developed and in place (through the development of a Sustainable Island Resource Management Zoning Plan).
- Outcome 3: Policy and institutional reforms to provide a framework for implementation of the SIRM Plan (through realignment of Policy, Legislation, and Institutional Capacity to support the SIRM Plan).
- Outcome 4: Requirements for implementation of the SIRM Plan in place, as well as mechanisms for the capture of lessons learned and best practices (including four on-the-ground Demonstration Projects to display SIRM in operation).

(TE pp.5-6)

In doing so, the project put emphasis on capacity development, public awareness and project replicability.

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

No changes in objectives or planned project activities were made.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as satisfactory due to its good alignment with both GEF and national priorities.

In Antigua and Barbuda, there were already 46 pieces of legislation governing the management of water resources, watersheds and coastal zones or other aspects of the environment prior to project start. The country had recently adopted two laws - the Physical Planning Act and the Draft Environmental Protection and Management Bill – to better manage its environmental assets and address environmental concerns. In addition, “the government has set up a Development Control Authority (DCA) with responsibility for regulating the use and development of land for urban, economic and infrastructure development. This DCA has finalized a National Physical Development Plan, which aims to develop a more integrated approach to land management” (PD p.19). It is clear that the Government of Antigua and Barbuda had already undertaken significant efforts to improve its resource management, and that this was becoming a higher priority for the Government. For example, “activities within the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) are managed out of the Prime Minister's office” (PD p.20), demonstrating the importance that the government gave to this topic.

The project was also very well aligned with the GEF-3 Operational Program 12 on Integrated Ecosystem Management. More specifically, the project fell under the OP 12 focus on ‘inter-sectoral and participatory approaches to natural resource management planning and implementation on an ecosystem scale’ and was planned to deliver benefits to the GEF focal areas of Land Degradation, Biological Diversity, and International Waters. The project was also consistent with the GEF Land Degradation Strategic Objective SO 1 *Promoting the country partnership framework approach for*

removing barriers to SLM and foster system-wide change, Strategic Objective SO 2 Upscale successful SLM practices for the control and prevention of desertification and deforestation through new operations. It was also consistent with the Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1, Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas. (PD pp.41-42)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates effectiveness as highly satisfactory due to more than 75% of planned outcomes having been realized. This TER also rates effectiveness as satisfactory due to the good outcome realization rate, but also due to the care with which the team ensured that all outcomes would get realized over time.

Outcome 1: Easy and reliable access to information for environmental management by all stakeholders

The main output planned under this outcome was the development of an Environmental Information Management and Advisory System (EIMAS), which has been delivered and is now operational. This new system facilitates identification of the remaining data gaps, and it is planned that all related data collection going forward will be in a format compatible with the EIMAS. The establishment of this system is considered as one of the project’s key achievements (TE p.4).

Outcome 2: A Sustainable Island Resource Management (SIRM) Mechanism developed and in place

The SIRM mechanism has been developed and approved by Parliament. However, there are still legislative regulations pending that need to be approved before the SIRM can be fully operational. In addition, Local Area Plans were developed for two areas. The project had planned to conduct a cost benefit analysis in support of a Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism for Antigua and Barbuda. However, the funds available would not cover an adequate exercise, and a decision was made “to use the money available in these budget lines to support the development of the Sustainable Island Resource Management Zoning Plan (SIRMZP)” (TE p.28). While not all planned components under Outcome 2 were realised, the outcome as a whole was achieved.

Outcome 3: Policy and institutional reforms to provide a framework for implementation of the SIRM Plan

Given the short time frame of this project, achieving policy and institutional reforms turned out to be challenging as the authority to make those changes did not reside in the project team. Despite this challenge, “The SIRMM Project made considerable progress in advancing the policy and legislative frameworks that will be required for effective integrated island resource management, and in developing the institutional capacity that will ultimately be required. Many of the necessary policy and legislative tools now lie with various arms of Government for ultimate Parliamentary approval” (TE p.8). Among others, the project team attempted to update the National Physical Development Plan, which was presented to Parliament in May 2011. It also “worked extensively on the Draft Environmental Protection and Management Bill (EPMB). The revisions are designed to more fully incorporate the SIRM

approach as the basis of the Bill, and the Draft Bill now adequately captures the missing policy elements required for sustainable environmental management in Antigua and Barbuda” (TE p.29). At project end the draft EPMB was with the Attorney General’s Office for review.

Outcome 4: Requirements for implementation of the SIRM Plan in place, as well as mechanisms for the capture of lessons learned and best practices

The project planned to achieve this outcome by developing four Demonstration Projects. Four projects were designed for this purpose:

1. Body Ponds
2. Reefs to Ridges
3. Northwest Coast
4. Barbuda National Park

In each project, actions were undertaken to demonstrate the benefits of SIRM in action. According to the TE, “the projects were effective in convincing the general public, as well as the political directorate, of the benefits of a SIRM approach, whilst simultaneously achieving positive impacts on the ground. However, there was significant variation between Demonstration Projects in what was achieved, and in all cases funds are being sought to continue and expand the activities at the Demonstration Sites” (TE pp.7-8).

While not all project components had been fully implemented by project end, the project made very good progress against all four outcomes, and was successful in furthering the implementation of the SIRM in Antigua and Barbuda.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates efficiency as highly satisfactory due to the highly cost effective manner in which the project was implemented. This TER rates efficiency as satisfactory as there is not sufficient evidence to grant a rating of highly satisfactory, however the evidence suggests that the project was implemented in an efficient manner.

According to the TE, “the Project was implemented in a highly cost effective manner; much was achieved with the funds available. Project staff, and particularly the Project Coordinator, is to be complimented on the efficiency with which the project was executed” (TE p.24). The project operating context was difficult, with some activities were under-budgeted from the onset of implementation and the global financial crisis of 2008 having the impact of reducing the co-financing available for the project. This was challenging, but the project team managed to find costs savings, move funds around and nonetheless achieve good results.

No cost benefit analysis was done, nor was the cost effectiveness of the project activities evaluated. The project was implemented within the planned timeframe.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
--------------------	----------------

The TE rates sustainability as Moderately Likely due to the overall strong country ownership for the project and the efforts made to seek additional financial resources to ensure the sustainability of project outcomes. This TER rates sustainability Likely, finding the prospect for financial sustainability more positive than described in the TE.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE rates financial sustainability as Moderately Likely, and this TER upgrades this to Likely. The main way in which the project outcomes will be maintained is through the Draft Environment Planning and Management Bill, which establishes the Antigua and Barbuda Sustainable Island Resource Framework (SIRF) Fund. This Fund will be legislatively established and will continue financing activities designed to improve resource management in the country.

In addition, several planned projects have emerged as the result of this project; those will continue to support project outcomes. For example, “the Environment Division and UNEP have created the Sustainable Pathways, Protected Areas and Renewable Energy Project (SPPARE) which will replicate some of the successes of the Demonstration Project at Body Ponds, and further develop and implement the activities of the Ridge to Reef Demonstration Project” (TE p.40). Several community groups have also applied for GEF Small Grants funding to follow up on activities initiated as part of this project.

Socio-Political Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE rates sustainability of project outcomes in the context of country ownership/sociopolitical risks is likely, and this TER agrees. The government staff involved in this project were very committed and deeply involved in project implementation. Buy-in at the highest political levels for the importance of the project and its activities was also very good, and the demonstration projects were successful as raising public awareness and appreciation for the project activities. According to the TE, “there is a strong sense that the public is now more interested in and knowledgeable about what is required for ecosystem management and sustainable development in Antigua and Barbuda” (TE p.39). Overall, there appear to be very low socio-political risks.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

The TE rates sustainability of project outcomes in the context of institutional risks as moderately likely, and this TER agrees. According to the TE, “national agencies are already mainstreaming best practices from the SIRMM Project into their work programmes” and “the SIRMZP has been approved by Parliament and the necessary supporting Regulations are being developed” (TE p.39). The SIRMZP will require a new institutional framework and governance structure, and it was at project end unclear what shape these would take. For this reason, institutional sustainability is rated as moderately likely.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE rates sustainability of project outcomes in the context of environmental risks as likely, and this TER agrees. There is no identified environmental risk to project outcomes.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

As a result of the 2008 global financial crisis, some of the planned co-financing from the private sector did not come through. However, the project was successful in increasing co-financing from other sources (especially from multilateral and bilateral agencies) to make up for the gap this created. Ultimately, project co-financing was higher than expected, and allowed the project to achieve its planned outcomes.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project document was finalized in August 2007, but project implementation did not start before 2008, and project start-up was slow. For this reason, and the fact that quite a few changes needed to be made to the project activities, the project needed a three-year extension until June 2014.

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

According to the TE, the "the technical government staff in Antigua and Barbuda were fully committed to the Project and heavily involved in Project implementation as members of the PCC. As Project implementation progressed, there was also government buy-in at the highest political levels to the importance of Project activities and goals" (TE p.39). This not only contributed to the accomplishment of project outcomes, but also increased the sustainability of the project in ensuring the continuation of project activities after completion.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not assess M&E design at entry. This TER rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory due to its having all the necessary components of a strong M&E framework.

The initial project document (PD pp.52-53) lays out a clear plan for M&E, including reporting and formal evaluation exercises. A detailed M&E plan and budget is specified (PD p.64), featuring specific responsibilities for monitoring activities, detailed information on required monitoring reports, and a timeline for evaluation activities. The M&E plan for this project appears well defined and endowed with an adequate budget. The logframe indicators (PD pp.82-93) are generally SMART and accompanied by baseline data.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory. This TER rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory due to the loss of baseline data that could have strengthened the M&E findings.

A hurricane destroyed the baseline data collected, and not enough M&E funds were available to re-collect the data. This was clearly outside the control of the project team, but nonetheless weakened project M&E. In addition, the TE notes that no specific M&E strategy was developed to track project progress; instead, the reports required by the UNDP and GEF became the basis for M&E. This TER notes that this ‘obligation-based approach to M&E’ is one very frequently taken by project teams. In this case, the team met all of its reporting requirements and conducted all the M&E activities it had set out to do. The TE also reports that “the Mid-Term Evaluation Report made recommendations to project staff, many of which were acted upon” (TE p.21). Despite M&E not being an important focus of the project, the project team met its M&E obligations.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

This project was implemented by the UNDP. The TE rates the quality of project implementation as highly satisfactory, but does not differentiate between implementation by UNDP and execution by the Environment Ministry. This TER rates implementation by the UNDP to have been moderately satisfactory due to some gaps in the support provided during implementation.

Indeed, according to the TE, initially, the UNDP Programme Manager paid frequent visits to the project sites every year. However, “the change in UNDP Programme Manager created some discontinuity in site visit monitoring and no site visits have taken place in the latter stages of the project” (TE p.21). Project staff also complained that it took the UNDP a long time to approve the annual budget to and disburse funds, creating challenges for implementation. Finally, “project staff also felt that there was inadequate flexibility in terms of approval to move funds between budget line items, and that this at times constrained the adaptive management they required to achieve maximum outputs in a challenging implementation environment” (TE p.24).

Finally, there were some issues with project design: funding envelopes for certain activities were inadequate. As a result, the project team had to shuffle money around and make the decision to drop some activities.

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

The TE rates project implementation and project execution jointly as highly satisfactory. This TER rates the project execution by the project management unit, based in the Environment Ministry, as satisfactory due to their ability to use adaptive management to help the project move forward.

As mentioned above, the project management team was challenged due to the financial crisis and the lower than expected co-financing. In order to mitigate this problem, the team used adaptive management and was able to secure successful project outcomes. For example, the team managed to gather additional funds “from the budgets of other complementary projects whenever appropriate and feasible”(TE P.24). In addition, the team made modifications to the project activities “in order to ensure that the Outcomes could be realised to the greatest degree possible within the time and financial constraints prevailing during Project implementation”(TE p.38).

The Project Management Unit appears to have displayed great flexibility and commitment. They also put a strong and successful emphasis on ensuring the projects remain consistent with national priorities and get a high level of country ownership. According to the TE, “the Project Coordinator, fully supported by the Project Manager, are to be commended for their dedication and commitment to the Project, which was a principal contributor to its successful and cost effective execution” (TE p.25).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The expected environmental benefits from this project were the protection of critically important biodiversity, the restoration of ecosystem resilience, the reduction in negative socio-economic impacts that may lead to conflicts over resource use, and the demonstration of the benefits of the SIRM approach to conservation management (PD pp.57-58).

While this last expected benefit did materialize, this TER cannot assess the other benefits listed above. While the project will most likely have contributed to biodiversity protection and ecosystem resilience, no data was collected to support this claim.

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

No socio-economic change was recorded as part of this project.

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

a) Capacities

This project featured several capacity building components. The Project organised and supported workshops on the topics of water resources and waste water management, GIS, climate adaptation, and biodiversity indicator development and monitoring. National capacity in GIS spatial analysis and data mining was also built.

b) Governance

The project worked extensively on the Draft Environmental Protection and Management Bill, which now incorporates the SIRM approach and adequately captures the missing policy elements required for sustainable environmental management in Antigua and Barbuda.

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

No unintended impacts were identified as part of this project.

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

While the project has not yet been replicated, its design would be appropriate for other small island states, and it could easily be replicated by other Caribbean island states.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The key Lessons Learned from this project as presented by the TE are:

- Project design and scheduling must allow a realistic project duration when deliverables include new policies and institutional changes that require Parliamentary approval.
- Adaptive Management that seeks consistency with national priorities and emphasises the achievement of tangible national impacts is required for successful project implementation. Project Managers need the flexibility for Adaptive Management to achieve project outcomes.
- Stakeholders, including the general public, the private sector and the political directorate, are more likely to appreciate tangible national impacts emerging from the project than to learn that the project is meeting its reporting requirements.
- Project Managers and Project Coordinators who understand the local environment and culture in which the project is being implemented are essential for project success, as is the personal dedication and commitment of staff.

- When international and regional consultants are hired to execute project activities, they should be paired with local/national consultants, since this ensures that consultant reports adequately capture national/cultural priorities and that there is capacity building of nationals as consultants.
- Appropriate framing of environmental and natural resource management as underpinning sustainable economic development is important, since the case for environmental management is often more difficult to make than the case for economic development.
- An informed, engaged and active public is important in garnering political support for project activities.

(TE p.9)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Key recommendations emerging from the TE are:

- Project budgets should be re-visited to ensure adequacy for financing project activities if there a significant time lag between project design and project implementation.
- Projects should seek to ensure, not only that indicators are monitored and reporting requirements are met, but that there is adequate focus on achieving tangible national impacts through the activities implemented.
- Continue to advocate for Parliamentary approval of the necessary policy frameworks for supporting and implementing SIRM, and for the necessary supporting Regulations to be developed, approved and operationalised.
- Continue to advocate for the necessary changes in institutional arrangements required to effectively operationalize SIRM to be identified and implemented.
- To facilitate the required integrated approach to island resource management, institutionalise the PCC/PMC, with additional membership as required, as an effective multi-sectoral committee and support its merger with the National Coordination Mechanism.
- Aggressively support the establishment and operationalization of the Antigua and Barbuda Sustainable Island Resource Framework (SIRF) Fund, and support the activities identified to be supported under the Fund.
- Support the further data collection required for the EIMAS, as well as its continuous updating and capacity expansion.

(TE p.8)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Project outcomes are described and assessed. However, a systematic presentation of achievements against the logframe would have been beneficial, for example by providing an updated logframe table.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. The evidence appears complete, but the M&E design rating and assessment is missing.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides a very thorough discussion of all relevant aspects of sustainability for this project.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are detailed and appear comprehensive. They are supported by evidence presented elsewhere in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes, actual total project costs, actual project costs per activity and actual co-financing used figures are provided.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report describes some of the M&E activities that took place as part of the project, but does not assess their quality. No assessment of the M&E design is provided.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.