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	1628
Project Title	Capacity Building for Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Agency	World Bank
World Bank ID	79865
Country	India
Project Status	Project Closure
Duration	3 years
CEO Endorsement	06/19/2003
Agency Approval	7/23/2003
Project Effectiveness	08/23/2003
GEF Agency Execution Partners	(Select Execution Partners) Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	Government Agency

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	Eija Pehu - World Bank TTL
TE Reviewer	Josh Brann
TE Peer Reviewer	Baljit Wadhwa

Completion, Submission & Delays

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	6/30/2006	
Project Actual Completion	6/30/2007	
Project Completion Difference	12	Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	11/21/2007	
TE Submission to EO	11/30/2012	
TE Submission to EO Difference	60	Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	03/11/2012	
TER Submission to EO		
TER Submission to EO Difference		Months

Comments on Delays

Project completion was delayed 12 months. Based on information in the PIRs and TE, this was due to initial slow start-up by the government execution partner. This apparently also contributed to delays in financial and implementation progress reporting during the life of the project.

The TE was submitted to the EO with a 5 year delay.

Funding and Co-Financing

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US$)	1,000,000	885,508	88.55 %
Cofinance Amount (US$)	2,070,000		
Total Amount (US$)	3,070,000		

Comments on Cofinancing

No information on final co-financing amounts is included in the TE.

According to the TE annex on financing, the balance of the GEF grant was cancelled as of the end of implementation.

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework: 2 - Unsatisfactory

Project Objectives -

The project logframe in the project document appears to be incomplete, and provides indicators only at the output level.

Prodoc: "The development objective of the project is to assist India to fully implement the obligations under the CP related to the transboundary movement of LMOs. This includes the assessment, management and long term monitoring and documentation of the risks to the sustainable use of biodiversity and to human health potentially posed by the introduction of LMOs. The major objectives for GEF support would be to improve capacity across ministries and among key stakeholders to analyze, inform, and make decisions to reduce potential risks related to LMOs, increase benefits to society, and protect biodiversity."

Prodoc (cont.): "The immediate objective is that at the end of the three year capacity building project there will be sufficient capacity in the country and effective coordination between the responsible agencies to assess and manage risks associated with the transboundary movement of LMOs."

Comment on Changes

There were no changes at the objective level. According to the TE, outcome indicators were added in 2005, and "The funding allocation to category 'training' was doubled from 200 000 to 400 000 USD following a re-assessment of the human power needs among different stakeholders as determined by the Training Needs Assessment. The funds were re-allocated from goods, consultancy and human-power categories."

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
Training activities and programs conducted for decision-makers.	Decision-makers trained on various aspects of biosafety.	Strengthened institutional and legal framework to improve capacity and coordination in decision-making at federal and state levels and in relevant specialized agencies			LMOs/GMOs are appropriately managed within India, including adequate risk assessment and appropriate and informed decision-making, to limit negative impacts on human and ecosystem health.	Negative impacts from LMOs/GMOs on human and ecosystem health avoided.	Edit Delete
Training needs assessment, training program designed, training activities conducted.	Technicians from relevant specialized agencies trained in risk assessment and management.	Improved capacity for risk evaluation and management.			LMOs/GMOs are appropriately managed within India, including adequate risk assessment and appropriate and informed decision-making, to limit negative impacts	Negative impacts from LMOs/GMOs on human and ecosystem health avoided.	Edit Delete

					on human and ecosystem health.		
Procurement of relevant equipment, training courses provided, LMO protection protocol development, GMO database enhanced.	Four national technical institutions with strengthened capacity; seven GMO detection protocols; actively used GMO database.	Technical facilities strengthened for analytical evaluation of GM ingredients and certification services.			LMOs/GMOs are appropriately managed within India, including adequate risk assessment and appropriate and informed decision-making, to limit negative impacts on human and ecosystem health.	Negative impacts from LMOs/GMOs on human and ecosystem health avoided.	Edit Delete
		Biosafety Clearing House operational and supporting informed decision-making, information sharing on GMOs, and public awareness.				Negative impacts from LMOs/GMOs on human and ecosystem health avoided.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...							

Project Performance

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

Overall Project Rating: 5 - Satisfactory

Comment

The project was relevant to the national needs, priorities and strategies of the time with respect to biosafety in India. The project was also relevant to GEF priorities. The expected outputs were produced, contributing to the planned outcomes. There were no quality outcome level indicators on which to objectively assess achievement however. Implementation was slower than expected however, with initial delays in project start-up from the government executing partner, and some activities moving along more slowly than expected. Based on the information available in the TE, there do not seem to have been any significant issues other than the slow implementation.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Last PIR:	5 - Satisfactory	The PIR rating on progress toward achievement of Project Development Objective is "satisfactory." The PIR does not give a single outcome rating, but rates all of the project component as satisfactory, except the fourth component, which is rated highly satisfactory.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	

Outcomes			The TE provides a rating of highly satisfactory for the four programmatic components, but a satisfactory rating overall. TE overall Outcome comments: "The biosafety capacity building project was highly relevant. It came at the time when India's biotechnoloy research was gearing up and when international interest to bring LMO products to the market was high, while having rather limited capacity to deal with this new technology, especially assessment of its potential risks. The PDO of strengthening capacity to comply to Cartagena protocol obligations and the different component objectives were met satisfactorily
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Progress was made toward project outcomes at the level anticipated. It appears that there is significant additional work required to increase biosafety capacity in India, but the project was of limited size and scope.
Relevance	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided on this parameter. The qualitative assessment provided indicates that the project was relevant.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory	Biosafety capacity is a critical and urgent issue for India. The only significant shortcoming in this regard was the project size and scope, which was not adequate to fully meet the needs of biosafety capacity building in India at the time.
Effectiveness	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	The TE provides a rating of highly satisfactory for the four programmatic components, but a satisfactory rating overall.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	Based on the information available, it appears that the main components of the project were successful, in terms of developing a training curriculum based on a comprehensive training needs assessment. The BCH was set up (though its current level of operation is uncertain - unable to be accessed externally at present), and the national laboratories and centers of excellence were strengthened. There are however no strong (or SMART) outcome indicators to provide an objective assessment of results against the baseline and planned target values. The logframe in the project document appears to be incomplete and includes only a number of output level indicators.
	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	

Efficiency			TE: "There were initial delays in getting the PCMU established and personnel recruited, which delayed the implementation of the project activities somewhat. Once the PCMU was fully functional it adequately managed and coordinated the activities and the use of the funds to achieve the project development objective."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	As is discussed in the TE, there were some initial delays and slow progress in implementation throughout the project, but ultimately the desired results were achieved in terms of the immediate objectives.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability	Last PIR:	NA - Not Applicable	No sustainability rating provided in PIR.
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	The TE does not provide a sustainability rating, but rates overall risks to development objectives as "low" with qualitative discussion. In the follow-up section of the TE, it states "The core courses developed and piloted are being scaled out by national resources; the BCH is kept running by national resources; and the services of the strengthened laboratories will be commissioned by various clients. The international expertise brought to play by the project is having continuous impact in contributing to the development of GM related biosafety/foodsafety sectors in India. This project has laid the foundation to the next biosafety project funded from the national GEF framework on biodiversity."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	There is limited concrete information in the TE with respect to sustainability, and it is not possible to say that the sustainability of the project results is assured. However, based on the information that is available, sustainability can be considered moderately likely. In a capacity development project such as this, the capacity built is generally inherently sustained, unless there is significant turnover in personnel, or other factors that would impair the continuation of individual, systemic, or institutional capacity.
Financial	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating given on this issue. The TE indicates that the national government is supporting continuation of various activities.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	

			Financial aspects do not seem to be a significant risk for sustainability, although there is little concrete information provided in the TE in this respect. Regarding the training component, the TE states:"The key idea in the development of the training program was to develop core curriculum for biosafety and to pilot test that for a subsequent scale up by national or other resources. The state and district level training courses are an example of those that will be scaled out with national funding."
Socio-political	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating given on this issue. The TE indicates that the national government is supporting continuation of various activities.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	There is little specific and concrete information provided in the TE in relation to this issue, but based on the contextual information of the TE, it appears that socio-political risks are low. The relevant government stakeholders, particularly the MoEF, continue to demonstrate support for biosafety and capacity development in this regard, but follow-up assessment would be required to truly determine the level of actual follow-up and continuation of the efforts under this project
Institutional and Legal	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating given on this issue. The TE indicates that the national government is supporting continuation of various activities.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	A number of government institutions were involved and benefited from this project. There are also significant legal considerations involved in biosafety. The indications from the TE are that the results achieved in this regard under the project will be sustained.
Environmental	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No specific rating given on this issue. The TE indicates that the national government is supporting continuation of various activities.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	This is not relevant to this project since it is a capacity development project.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide an assessment of this issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	

			There were multiple significant shortcomings in the project's M&E, including an incomplete and inadequate logframe in the project document, and delays in M&E activities during implementation. In addition, the TE is of low quality.
M&E Design	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide an assessment of this issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The project document briefly summarizes some of the expected M&E activities, but the project logframe (pg. 32) appears incomplete, and contains only a number of output level indicators.
M&E Plan Implementation	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide an assessment of this issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	According to the TE, some outcome level indicators were developed and included in the 2005 timeframe. Based on information in the PIR and TE, the executing agency was frequently delayed in submitting implementation and financial reports. There were also shortcomings in the functioning of the steering committee.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide an assessment of this issue.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	There is no information provided on this aspect. It does not appear to have been an issue, but there is no information available on which to make an assessment.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not present one single rating on this aspect.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	With some delays and challenges the World Bank and the national executing agency provided adequate support and oversight for the project to produce the majority of expected outputs, and to make progress under the overall objective of enhancing biosafety capacity.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	

			TE: "The project required one year extension and in hindsight it would have been better to delay effectiveness to allow the internal finance management procedures to be in place in MOEF. During implementation the Bank conducted regular implementation support missions twice a year. The Bank team included high level, international experts, whose inputs were invaluable and had national impact. The resident FM and procurement specialists in the Bank office provided frequent and timely support to the project team."
Quality of Implementation - IA	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The World Bank provided adequate oversight and support to ensure that the project outputs were produced, albeit with some delay. As stated in the TE, "The project required one year extension and in hindsight it would have been better to delay effectiveness to allow the internal finance management procedures to be in place in MOEF." There were also significant shortcomings with respect to M&E and other aspects, as highlighted in the above relevant sections of this review.
Quality of Execution - EA	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	TE: "There were initial delays in getting the PCMU fully functional, but once the staffing was completed it performed the project tasks efficiently. There were some limitations to the work of the Steering Committee. It could have met more regularly and taken a stronger guidance and oversight role of the programmatic aspects of the project."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The project coordination and management unit appears to have carried out an effective job from a technical perspective, in producing the necessary and expected project outputs. There were apparently delays in project startup and reporting

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	The TE does not provide a specific rating on this aspect. In the discussion on relevance, the project document and TE indicate that the project was fully in alignment with country priorities, and was developed in collaboration with country stakeholders.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.

	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The project was fully in alignment with country priorities, and appears to have had strong stakeholder drivenness.
Financial Planning	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	No specific rating is provided on financial planning. Under "efficiency" the TE indicates "There were initial delays in getting the PCMU established and personnel recruited, which delayed the implementation of the project activities somewhat. Once the PCMU was fully functional it adequately managed and coordinated the activities and the use of the funds to achieve the project development objective."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The project was extended for one year, yet only 88.5% of the funding was used, when there is certainly a need for additional resources and investment in biosafety capacity development in India.
Preparation and Readiness	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide a specific rating on this aspect, but generally indicates that there were issues with the project startup due to lack of preparation. According to the TE, "The project required one year extension and in hindsight it would have been better to delay effectiveness to allow the internal finance management procedures to be in place in MOEF."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	Apparently the executing agency did not have the necessary measures and procedures in place to appropriately execute the project at the time of project approval. This caused significant delays in project implementation.
Stakeholders Involvement	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not provide a specific rating on this aspect. Based on the information included in the TE, it appears that a range of stakeholders were involved, particularly with respect to the training needs assessment.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	While the TE does mention "stakeholders" at various points in the TE, there is not enough concrete information provided to be able to assess this aspect.
Need for Follow Up	Terminal Evaluation:	No	The TE does not identify any follow-up issues.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes	It would be useful to confirm that the cancelled portion of the grant (11.5% of GEF funding) was returned to the GEF trust fund.

Gender Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
Effects on Local Population	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Terminal Evaluation:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable	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:	Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Not Applicable	Not applicable for this project.

Progress to Impact

Progress to Impact	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to Assess	Progress toward impact is not analyzed in this context in the TE. Results and positive achievements of the project generally are discussed under the outcomes and effectiveness section. The strategy of this project, as a capacity development project, is also far up the results chain from the ultimate impact level results.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderate Progress	Short-term outcomes were reached in terms of improvements in capacity levels, mechanisms in place for further capacity development, and establishment of the biosafety clearing house. Sustainability aspects must be considered, but it can be said that there was at least moderate progress toward impact.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	The establishment of the biosafety clearing house was a significant achievement in this respect. The project also included some awareness programs and activities, such as newsletters and network establishment for relevant stakeholders.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	No further comments beyond those under the TE section of this parameter.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	This was not a significant component of the project - under component 1, which relates to institutional and legal frameworks, it appears the project mostly focused on training support for the relevant stakeholder institutions.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	No further comments beyond those under the TE section for this parameter.
Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The TE does not specifically discuss issues in this regard.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	Not relevant beyond aspects previously discussed in other sections of this TER.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No	Not relevant for this project, unless the establishment of the Biosafety Clearing House would be considered to fall under this parameter.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No	Not relevant for this project, unless the establishment of the Biosafety Clearing House would be considered to fall under this parameter.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	Not relevant for this project.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO		

	Review:	NA - Not Applicable	Not relevant for this project.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	TE: "The diagnostic work on assessing training needs of different stakeholders and development of a comprehensive training program, from which various courses can be scaled out and replicated is likely to have a long lasting impact."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	There are definitely aspects of the project that could be replicated, specifically including the training components. The TE does not identify concrete evidence that this will or has happened, but states, "The key idea in the development of the training program was to develop core curriculum for biosafety and to pilot test that for a subsequent scale up by national or other resources. The state and district level training courses are an example of those that will be scaled out with national funding. There are also multiplier effects through the inclusion of the training modules into mainstream curriculum of different agencies (e.g. Customs Officer training will now include biosafety) and State Agricultural Universities."
Upscaling	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	See above comments under replication. In particular, the TE indicates that the training aspects will be scaled up.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	See previous comments under replication.
Mainstreaming	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	Not relevant for this project.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable	Not relevant for this project.

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	Systemic	Intended	See comments under environmental	Edit Delete

					status change, below.	
		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	Systemic	Intended	This project is far up the logic chain in the overall strategy to positively affect changes in status in biodiversity, and thus it is not possible to make a direct linkage at present.	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	
NA - Not Applicable	Demonstration Site		Not applicable in the context of this project.	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.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...		

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Agency	NA - Not Applicable	

TE Quality	Review:		No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE is cursory, and there are numerous issues that it does not adequately cover.
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE summarizes the project results, but does not provide much detailed information. The TE also includes very brief data in respect to the identified output and "outcome" indicators (some of which are still output indicators), but does not provide much analysis or concrete and specific information about the value of the results in the context of the overall situation with respect to biosafety capacity development in India.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information available on this aspect.
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The TE provides only brief information on risks to project results, and does not answer many of the critical questions about sustainability. There is a lack of concrete data and evidence, and sustainability is not considered in the four component breakdown.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE provides 2-3 each of lessons and recommendations. These are based on the experience of the project, but are not high quality. Much more useful lessons could have been drawn from the project experience. The recommendations simply focus on what the EA and World Bank should do next to continue working on biosafety
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	The TE provides a summary table of project expenditures broken down into four categories - consultant services, training, goods, and incremental operating costs. Other detailed information or financial breakdowns, including by project component, are not provided. Also the financial summary table indicates that 11.5% of the GEF funding was cancelled as of October 31, 2007, but this is not discussed anywhere in the TE
M&E Asssessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	

			The TE does not specifically discuss this issue. An effective results framework was particularly an issue for the project, and the TE itself is of inadequate quality. The TE does briefly mention the activities by the World Bank (supervision missions, etc.), but does not discuss reporting aspects from the executing agency, which were identified in the PIR as an issue.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE briefly summarizes the output level results by indicator, but provides little analysis on the value of many of these outputs.
Consultation with Stakeholders	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information available on this aspect.
Compliance with Guidances	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information available on this aspect.
Compliance with UNEG Norms	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information available on this aspect.
Addressing of ToR requests	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	TORs not included.
Independence of Report	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency TER.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE appears to present information in a relatively objective manner, but it is extremely cursory, and does not adequately analyze key issues such as sustainability. This approach to the TE could be interpreted as an inadvertent lack of independence, that is to say not intentional, but at the same time not at the level of independence that would be provided by an external source.

Lessons & Reccomendations

Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Capacity		TE: "Positive lessons: Bringing in high level international expertise at this critical	Edit Delete

Building		early stage of agricultural biotechnology commercialization in India was very important and productive. To carry out a training needs assessment among different stakeholders was very helpful in designing an inclusive, structured training program addressing the specific training needs of each stakeholder. For the Bank the India operation was very important to make an opening into this new regulatory area of modernizing agriculture sector. "	
Financial Planning		"The timing of effectiveness could have been delayed to allow time for MOEF to get all the FM procedures in place."	Edit Delete
Stakeholder Involvement		TE: "A multistakeholder steering committee is a good choice in such a cross-sectoral activity, but it is also important to empower the members to give their contributions and to follow-up agreed actions.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Other	Next steps	TE: "Recommendations to the recipient: This project was the first step in building GMO related biosafety. But the work has only begun. MOEF could take the activities that worked well and scale them out in the next phase. Of special value would be to build the capacity of state and district level committees. It is very important to continue the development of the risk assessment guidelines to arrive at standard protocols for different crops and events. Of special importance is to develop high quality environmental assessment protocols. Further focus on the decentralized State and District level committees and their capacity is recommended as well as support to research supporting biosafety regulation."	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

<< Back to Project Edit

Save Data