

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		
GEF Project ID:	1794		<u>At endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>At completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P070338	<b>GEF financing:</b>	\$0.68	\$0.68
Project Name:	Removing Obstacles to Direct Private-Sector Participation in <i>In Situ</i> Biodiversity Conservation	IA/EA own:		
Countries:	Boliva	Government:	0.41	0.57
		Other*:		
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.41	0.57
Operational Program:	OP 3&4: Forest & Mountain Ecosystems; Focal Area: Biodiversity	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	\$1.09	\$1.25
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	PROMETA	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Nov. 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: Dec. 2005	Actual: Dec. 2005
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 36	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 0
Author of TE: N/A		TE completion date:  June 2006	TE submission date to GEF EO:  July 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 25 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	<b>S</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>S</b>
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	<b>S</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>ML</b>
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	<b>S</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>S</b>
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	<b>S</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>S</b>
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MS</b>

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

No, the project does not adequately assess IA and Executing Agency performance, and the assessment of financial sustainability does not address the question of how project activities can be continued and expanded.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds,

mismanagement, etc.?  
 No such findings were mentioned in the terminal evaluation report.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

**3.1 Project Objectives**

**a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

The global environmental objective of this project was to support conservation of privately-owned lands with globally significant biodiversity in Bolivia. This will be done through strengthening the regulatory and incentives framework, testing innovative conservation initiatives on four pilot sites, strengthening the technical capacity of private landowners, and disseminating the lessons learned throughout Bolivia and Latin America.

There were no changes in global environmental objectives during implementation.

**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)?)**

The objective of this project was to consolidate methodology, policy and innovative procedures in order to facilitate and develop private conservation initiatives that will contribute to globally significant biodiversity conservation in high-priority eco-regions in Bolivia. The project had four components:

- a. Strengthen the framework for regulations and incentives
- b. Demonstrate the benefits of private conservation instruments and incentives in three pilot areas
- c. Increase the participation of landowners outside of pilot sites in private conservation
- d. Disseminate project and results in Bolivia and elsewhere in Latin America.

There were no changes in project development objectives during implementation.

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?**

Existing regulations, incentives and capacities for *in situ* biodiversity conservation in Bolivia do not facilitate direct participation of important stakeholders such as private landowners and NGOs in biodiversity conservation. The current project complements and is consistent with the program on the Sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas in that it will promote and disseminate instruments for private conservation, thereby helping to strengthen regulatory frameworks for biodiversity conservation.

**(ii) The national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?**

This project contributes to the Bolivian government’s objective to “achieve the conservation of Bolivia’s natural resource base” as stated in its five-year action plan 1997-2002. Under the national program for Sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas, this project will improve representation of Bolivian ecosystems in protected areas,

and it will strengthen the management and sustainability of existing protected areas by identifying buffer-zone and corridor areas.	
<b>(iii) The achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?</b>	
The project supports GEF strategies in OP 3 and OP 4, and it is relevant to the GEF focus on biodiversity.	
<b>(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)</b>	
The project contributes to Bolivia's overall compliance with CBD obligations through the creation of new protected areas and the development of incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biodiversity. The project also contributes to the achievement of Agenda 21 objectives by encouraging local participation in environmental management.	
<b>A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup></b>	
Yes, pilot area I "El Corbalan" represents the first bi-national private conservation area under management in Latin America, having combined management efforts with the "Cañada El Carmen" private conservation area in Paraguay.	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>The project has successfully implemented all the activities proposed in the project document. The project has facilitated the identification, creation and management of areas in eco-regions of Bolivia considered critical for biodiversity conservation. It has supported the identification, creation and management of private areas in buffer zones of national protected areas, and in areas adjacent to ecological corridors.</p> <p>The project carried out an analysis of existing incentives (financial and non-financial) for private landowners, applicable to <i>in situ</i> biodiversity conservation and suitable for the development of an integrated strategy of models for their application in public and private territories in Bolivia. Procedures for the legal establishment of private protected areas, conservation easements and national patrimony private reserves have been developed and codified in national law, and also elaborated in a Practical Private Conservation Manual, for distribution to landowners. In order to broaden the range of available information for private landowners interested in creating and managing private conservation units, the project designed a Monitoring Manual that will allow landowners to monitor biological and socioeconomic aspects of conservation activities.</p> <p>Four private pilot conservation areas were established. These areas have improved the representation of rare ecosystems such as the semiarid Chaco and have provided the opportunity to create bi-national private conservation units, combine conservation activities with sustainable forest management, and allow biodiversity conservation through the purchasing of land and establishment of biological corridors. The establishment of the pilot areas has also resulted in very demonstrative initiatives, bringing together "non-traditional" stakeholders such as the municipal government and students from Agricultural Schools came together.</p> <p>One hundred areas and key private owners have been identified as potential models and promoters of conservation activities. Due to the broad dissemination of the different activities of the project, PROMETA has been contacted by additional private landowners requesting technical and legal support to establish protected areas.</p> <p>Information and training workshops were held, resulting in the creation of the Bolivian Private Conservation Forum, which provided an important and previously non-existent space for networking, discussion and exchange of ideas about private conservation. Landowners, governmental and non-governmental organizations and other related stakeholders were able to establish contacts with international cooperation organisms for the development of future operations in private conservation.</p>	
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>The project has successfully completed all programmed activities well within the three-year timeline. The area under protection has increased by 90,000 ha due to project activities. The project has demonstrated an effective and real contribution to complement the conservation efforts of the National Protected Areas System (SNAP), not only in quantitative terms (by protecting more than 90,000 hectares), but also in qualitative terms.</p>	
<b>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.</b>	
Overall, this project was successful in balancing environmental and development priorities. The project design	

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

incorporated both environmental and developmental issues, through activities focused on sustainable use, and research into national economic incentives for private conservation. Based on information in the TE report, there did not seem to be a preference for one set of priorities over others during implementation. Two of the four pilot projects included sub-projects related to sustainable fishing, forest management, and ecotourism. The executing agency has also stressed the economic benefits of conservation and involved both big and small landowners in project activities.

**4.1.2 Results / Impacts<sup>2</sup> (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)**

The extent of private protected area has been increased, and the management of existing areas has been strengthened through infrastructure investments. The project has been successful in promoting the direct participation of the private sector in biodiversity conservation. As a result of the development and dissemination of technical and legal tools, the creation of the Bolivian Private Conservation Forum, and the creation and management of pilot project areas, the benefits of conservation have been demonstrated and a basis has been established whereby project experiences can be replicated. The project has also been successful in terms of expanding the stakeholder base for conservation projects. Previously, collective landowners or social groups (indigenous TCOs and *campesino* communities) had not been taken into account for private conservation activities in the country. Despite these positive impacts, the project has not strengthened the regulatory and incentive framework for private conservation initiatives in Bolivia, through new laws or policies. Much still depends on voluntary commitments from private landowners.

**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.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
Sustainable production activities have been integrated into management plans for private conservation units. A long term financial sustainability plan has been elaborated for each pilot conservation area, which lays out necessary investments and possible revenue sources. Eco-tourism has been prioritized as a potential revenue sources in other areas. The long-term sustainability of project outcomes depends on the insertion of biodiversity concerns into Bolivia’s economic development policies and the development of a national framework of incentives for conservation.	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
The project has garnered significant public and governmental support. Project activities have implicated both large and small private landowners, NGOs, and government agencies, and the implementation of pilot conservation areas have demonstrated the potential for private conservation efforts. The Bolivian Private Conservation Forum has established contacts with private conservation networks in the region and is likely to carry on some project activities.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
The legal and technical tools available to landowners for the creation and management of Private Conservation Units, all of which are presented in the Practical Private Conservation Guide and in other materials published over the course of the project such as videos, pamphlets and posters, create a basis for replicating project outcomes in other areas. The Bolivian Private Conservation Forum has been created in order to consolidate the main stakeholders in the conservation sector and to build links with international agencies, government and regional networks.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
Long-term environmental sustainability depends on the effective management of protected areas by landowners who become involved in private conservation as a result of project activities. Without monitoring of every landowner, there is a small, but real, risk that inappropriate land use practices in fragile ecosystems will limit the project’s outcomes.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
No technological risks were identified in this project.	

**4.3 Catalytic role<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>2</sup> 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>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders?</b>
Project activities have not directly provided incentives for change, but they have demonstrated that incentives exist. The experiences in the pilot areas have demonstrated the potential for combining conservation with eco-tourism activities to establish financially sustainable protected areas. Additionally, the project has conducted a study of the current incentive system and developed recommendations for proposed new incentives to promote increased private conservation. An analysis of all existing PCUs in Bolivia (41) was carried out in order to measure the real contribution of private conservation to biodiversity conservation in the country. The results of this activity have been published and disseminated among key stakeholders.
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors?</b>
The project has fostered the inclusion of collective landowners (indigenous TCOs and campesino communities) in the private conservation domain. Previously these groups were not invited to participate in private conservation activities in the country, which were dominated by large, individual landowners.
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>
Project activities have not led to policy changes, but the studies commissioned by the project team provide important recommendations for guiding future policy.
<b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contribute to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (This is different than co-financing.)</b>
The project has not secured any follow on funding from the Government or other donors, but a database has been created with information on possible sources of funding for the creation of private conservation areas in Bolivia.
<b>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)?</b>
No project champions were mentioned.

#### 4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> 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 original co-financing committed under the project was \$0.41M, however during the implementation period, an additional \$0.15 M was raised, for a total co-financing of \$0.57 M. The additional co-financing is the result of increased interest by private landowners in the establishment of private conservation units, allowing three additional pilot areas to be included in the project.
<b>b. Delays.</b> 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?
Neither the terminal evaluation report nor the PIRs noted any delays in project implementation.
<b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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.
Country ownership has had a positive impact on project outcomes and improved the likelihood of sustainability. PROMETA, as the executing agency, had significant local experience and credibility with all groups of landowners. Several of the landowners identified as having potential conservation areas in the present project took the initiative to contact PROMETA due to their interest in the topic. Furthermore, PROMETA is a partner of, or has signed agreements with, the main conservation organizations in the country, such as The Nature Conservancy, FAN, CIPA, LIDEMA, FCBC, IYA, SAVIA, etc. These alliances have facilitated many aspects of project implementation, such as the launch of Pilot Areas II and III, the creation and strengthening of the Bolivian Private Conservation Forum, and the identification of potential areas for critical biodiversity conservation.

#### 4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

<b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): S</b>
The project's M&E plan at entry was based on a clearly elaborated logical framework, with outcomes, activities, and assumptions for each component. The principal mechanism for project monitoring and evaluation was an annual	

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

<p>planning and review process and preparation of Annual Operating Plans. Internal reviews by the Technical Advisory Committee were scheduled for months 12 and 24. Mid-term and final external evaluations were planned. A baseline assessment of biodiversity was conducted for the selection of the pilot areas.</p>
<p><b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): S</b></p>
<p>M&amp;E implementation was based both on indicators established in the project document and on other indicators proposed by the project team. The project team reviewed progress towards indicators monthly, and bi-annually, and adjusted activities accordingly. The GEF-World Bank carried out four evaluations and three external audits, which were used as effective monitoring and evaluation tools, especially with respect to administrative procedures. The terminal evaluation report also notes that the project team made efforts to monitor qualitative as well as quantitative indicators.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document? No, the budget proposed in the ProDoc does not contain a separate M&amp;E line item.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation? Unable to assess.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provide 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?</p> <p>The project's M&amp;E system was designed so that project results fed back into management. Based on information in the terminal evaluation report, the GEF-World Bank evaluations allowed for the adjustment of some project activities in accordance with the country's socio-political situation, and for follow-up on project achievements.</p>
<p>b.3 Can the project M&amp;E system (or an aspect of the project M&amp;E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.</p> <p>The project's logical framework was well designed and provided a useful tool monitoring progress towards desired outcomes.</p>

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</b>  <i>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.</i></p> <p>The implementing agency for this project was the World Bank. The terminal evaluation report does not contain an assessment of IA performance. However, based on information in the report, the IA provided adequate supervision and input to the project management team. The project was well designed, and all the activities and objectives were clearly achievable within the 3-year project timeframe. The World Bank carried out six supervision missions that allowed for the adjustment of some project activities in accordance with the country's socio-political situation, and for the periodic follow-up on project achievements. PROMETA indicated in the terminal evaluation report: "In relation to the support provided by the World Bank in administrative and technical matters of the project, it is important to emphasize the invaluable cooperation and willingness of the Project Manager who on many occasions facilitated these processes."</p>
<p><b>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>4</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): S</b>  <i>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.</i></p> <p>The executing agency for this project was PROMETA, a conservation NGO, which has been operating in Bolivia since 1990. The terminal evaluation report does not contain a detailed assessment of PROMETA's performance in executing this project. The terminal evaluation report notes: "Overall project management during the implementation period was satisfactory. A project coordinator and technical team were responsible for project implementation according to the agreed implementation plan. PROMETA's accounting and administrative systems were adequate and contained the standard controls over goods and assets, and provided adequate information about financial management and project results in accordance with World Bank requirements."</p> <p>Based on information in the terminal evaluation report PROMETA maintained a strong focus on results and was able to deliver the project outputs within the 3-year timeline. In addition, PROMETA was able to capitalize on its strong standing and credibility with the local community to promote project outcomes.</p>

## 5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<sup>4</sup> 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.

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**

1. *Establish adequate legal frameworks to remove obstacles for the creation of private protected areas.* The main obstacles identified for the strengthening of the private conservation sector in Bolivia are illegal human colonization, government vision of the justification of the Economic and Social Function of land, government disincentives, and the economic needs of landowners. The usufruct has been introduced as a new legal figure based on the analysis carried out by the project. It consists of a real right of limited duration on the property of another. The benefit of this alternative is that it offers an alternative for a landowner interested in conserving the property but unable to do so for lack of financial resources, insufficient technical knowledge, or other reasons. The landowner has the option to grant the property as usufruct to another person or environmental organization, which in turn will carry out conservation activities. The usufruct can be registered in the real estate registry and be opposed by third parties.

2. *Create incentives for private conservation.* The consultancy document “Analysis and development of incentives for private conservation in Bolivia,” carried out as part of the present project, demonstrated that government incentives for private conservation in the country are practically non-existent. For both individual and collective private landowners, the cost-benefit issue is fundamental. Among the identified landowners there is a small minority that practice conservation out of a “love of nature,” combined with the fact that their economic situation allows them to allocate resources to this end. For the majority, mainly collective landowners, the incorporation of conservation into national economic activities is indispensable. The different legal alternatives offered through the project to establish private conservation units are an initial step towards establishing a good incentives package for landowners.

3. *Develop an integration space for stakeholders such as the Bolivian Private Conservation Forum.* A national land titling process is currently underway in Bolivia, and for this reason, private landowners are looking for legal security for their properties so that they are not overtaken by squatters or expropriated. Some landowners have tried to obtain legal security by creating Private Conservation Units for this purpose only, and with the intention of later making the properties productive without much concern for environmental sustainability. Faced with this situation, the Bolivian Private Conservation Forum was constructed as an integration space for stakeholders interested in private conservation, and the organizers have been careful not to allow the Forum to provide support to landowners for the purpose of obtaining legal security. This risk has been minimized through the participation and involvement of all interested sectors, and the process itself of training and planning of the Forum has avoided the incursion of personal interests.

4. *Identify and clarify the advantages of private conservation.* It is estimated that once the land titling process has concluded, approximately 50% of Bolivian territory will legally be in private hands; it is clear that a large portion of critical and important areas for biodiversity conservation will belong to private landowners. Private conservation presents greater possibilities for attracting and working with different sectors such as the forestry sector, Amazon nut producers, cattle ranchers, farmers, campesino communities, TCOs, etc., and to commit them to sustainable management of their activities.

5. *Strengthen the role of the state in private conservation.* Following the vast experience and working relationship of PROMETA with SERNAP in the co-administration of national protected areas, several attempts have been made to involve the state in project activities, including its participation in training workshops, document validation, exchange of criteria, and the creation of the Bolivian Private Conservation Forum. This contact should be strengthened in the future to achieve the approval of policies, instructions and decrees that allow for greater recognition of civil society and local actors in biodiversity conservation.

**b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

1. *Link private protected areas to key economic and social issues.* A significant impediment to private conservation in Pando was the lack of definition of property rights, due to the slow and conflictive process of land titling underway by the INRA. Following an extensive effort on the part of the nut producers, the government finally legalized the implementation of Amazon nut management plans in 2005, paving the way for viable economic activities on this and other private protected areas. It was clearly evident from the beginning that there was a need for a legal framework to provide a justification of the economic and social function of the conservation of low impact productive activities such as Amazon nut gathering, which is considered by INRA as an extractive and unregulated activity. These characteristics generated legal insecurity and impeded land titling in accordance with the interests of this productive sector despite the fact that the department of Pando harbors rich biodiversity and that activities such as Amazon nut collection is compatible with biodiversity conservation.

2. *Actively monitor administrative aspects.* There were some problems concerning the reception of disbursements on the programmed dates, which in some cases delayed the implementation of activities. In addition, the focus of the first audit was not considered adequate, being that it was too theoretical and not sufficiently oriented toward the

achievement of the project’s objectives. In relation to the support provided by the World Bank in administrative and technical matters of the project, it is important to emphasize the invaluable cooperation and willingness of the Project Manager who on many occasions facilitated these processes.

**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.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The report contains a comprehensive assessment of outcomes and impacts.</p>	S
<p><b>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?</b> The report is internally consistent. However, it does not adequately cover project implementation by the IA and EAs. Ratings have not been provided for relevant performance dimensions.</p>	MU
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The report does not adequately cover issues pertaining to financial and environmental sustainability. There is no discussion of the costs of continuing project activities or potential environmental risks.</p>	MS
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by evidence presented in the report.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Yes, actual project costs and co-financing amounts are included.</p>	S
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The M&amp;E assessment is a general overview of the system.</p>	S

**7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION 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)**