

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 1830 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | P075932 (associated with P065437) | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF - 1 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | World Bank | |
| Project name | | Protected Areas Management and Sustainable Use (PAMSU) | |
| Country/Countries | | Uganda | |
| Region | | Africa | |
| Focal area | | Biodiversity | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | OP1: Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems; OP4: Mountain Ecosystems; and OP3: Forest Ecosystems | |
| Executing agencies involved | | Uganda Wildlife Authority, Uganda Wildlife Education Centre, The Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry, The Department of Antiquities and Museums | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | Although the project meant to involve NGOs (TE pg. 5), the TE does not provide evidence of this occurring. | |
| Private sector involvement | | Private/public partnerships in Kaboyo Game Reserve, Ziwa Rhino Sanctuary and the Kabwoya Wildlife Reserve. (TE pg. 23- 25) | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | May 2, 2002 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | Dec 4, 2002 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | Dec 31, 2007 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | Jun 30, 2010 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | | |
| | Co-financing | | |
| GEF Project Grant | | 8 | 8 |
| Co-financing | IA own | 27 | 31.92 |
| | Government | 3 | 0 |
| | Other multi- /bi-laterals | | |
| | Private sector | | |
| | NGOs/CSOs | | |
| Total GEF funding | | 8 | 8 |
| Total Co-financing | | 30 | 31.92 |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 38 | 39.92 |
| Terminal evaluation/review information | | | |
| TE completion date | | Dec 29, 2011 | |
| TE submission date | | Dec 29, 2011 | |
| Author of TE | | Richard J. Carroll (TE pg. 8) | |
| TER completion date | | October 31, 2014 | |
| TER prepared by | | Dania M Trespalacios | |
| TER peer review by (if GEF EO review) | | Joshua Schneck | |

2. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF EO Review |
|---|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Project Outcomes | S | MS | MS | MS |
| Sustainability of Outcomes | N/R | Moderate | Moderate | MU |
| M&E Design | N/R | N/R | Modest | MU |
| M&E Implementation | S | N/R | Modest | MS |
| Quality of Implementation | S | MU | MS | MU |
| Quality of Execution | S | MS | MS | S |
| Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report | - | - | - | HS |

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective is to ensure the effective, long-term conservation of Uganda's biodiversity in the face of competing economic pressures. (PD pg. 5)

Uganda ranks in the top ten nations in Africa in terms of species numbers for all major groups, and among the top ten in the world for mammals, including over half of the known world population of mountain gorilla. Its concentration of biological wealth offers exceptional opportunities to achieve global biodiversity conservation objectives. (PD pg. 5) Uganda's biodiversity is threatened by: continuing insecurity in a number of parts of the country in which prime tourism destinations are located; low capacity in the private sector to develop tourism products and provide related services; problems with the concession process for lodges and activities in National Parks; and low tourist volumes leading to diseconomies of scale. (PD pg. 3) This project seeks to address these economic pressures and ensure the conservation of Uganda's biodiversity.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is the sustainable and cost-effective management of Uganda's wildlife and cultural resources. The project will provide funds to improve Uganda's ability to attract tourists to its wildlife and cultural heritage, and encourage cost-effective management strategies to reduce overall operating costs of the institutions managing these resources.

The project has 5 components, each the responsibility of one of the four implementing agencies:

1. Sustainable Wildlife Management, executed by the Uganda Wildlife Authority
2. Environmental Conservation Education, executed by the Uganda Wildlife Education Centre
3. Tourism Framework Development, executed by the Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry
4. Preserve the Cultural Heritage of Uganda, executed by the Department of Antiquities and Museums.
5. Project Coordination, provided by the project's Project Coordination Unit (PD pg. 4, 39)

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

There was **no change** in the Global Environmental and Development Objectives. However, the original 8 key performance indicators were revised, and 12 additional performance indicators were added, at the time of the Mid Term Review, in October 2005. The changes in performance indicators hoped to improve monitoring by implementing agencies and the supervision team, and to improve the financial sustainability of managing wildlife resources. (TE pg. 3-4)

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 project outcomes are consistent with the GEF Biodiversity focal area. The project is Uganda's major initiative to effectively integrate the conservation of biodiversity into national development. It focuses on a range of ecosystems representative of Uganda's biodiversity, including savannahs, mountains and forests. It will therefore contribute to the GEF operational programs for Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems, Mountain Ecosystems and Forest Ecosystems (OP1, OP4, OP3, respectively). The project is also consistent with guidance from the COP of the Convention of Biological Diversity as it addresses in situ conservation and sustainable use and includes (i) capacity building; (ii) strengthening the conservation, management, and sustainable use of ecosystems and habitats and endemic species; (iii) strengthening the involvement of local and indigenous people; and (iv) integrating social dimensions including those related to poverty. (PD pg. 7)

The project outcomes are consistent with country priorities. The Government of Uganda has ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity, CITES, and the Ramsar Convention on wetlands. The Government's commitment to environmental protection and sustainable natural resource conservation and management is laid out in the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP) approved by Parliament in June 1994, in which the Government makes a commitment to conserving biodiversity both inside and outside protected areas. (PD pg. 7)

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 4.2 Effectiveness | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|--------------------------|--|

The project has five components, each implemented by one of four different executing agencies. The Project Document lists output indicators for each of the five components. (PD pg. 29-33) However, the Project Document is at times vague in the description of the specific subcomponents and activities of the project, and does not relate the output indicators to the subcomponents. (PD pg. 9-12, 29-33) Information on components, subcomponents and output indicators is spread out in different parts of the Project Document.

The TE describes the project's main components and subcomponents, but does not explicitly list or respond to the output indicators prescribed by the project document. (TE pg. 5-8, 33-35) Instead, the TE reports project achievements based on the achievement of key performance indicators. Using the Project Document and the Terminal Evaluation, Table 1 summarizes the project's main components and subcomponents, the prescribed output indicators for these, and the TE's report of achievements of indicators, when possible.

Table 1. Summary of Project Components, subcomponents, and outcome indicators
(TE pg. 5-8, 33- 35, 13-22, 49-61, PD pg. 29-33, and as reported.)

| Component 1- Sustainable Wildlife Management, executed by the Uganda Wildlife Authority | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Subcomponent 1 Capacity building for UWA to implement the Strategic Plan and the Protected Area System Plan, including logistical support, equipment and civil works, staff housing and training, renovation of UWA's Headquarters office. | |
| Subcomponent 2 Development and implementation of UWA community management program to address wildlife management issues outside the Protected Areas, including animal control, establishment of community wildlife management areas, and improved use of wildlife resources. | |
| Subcomponent 3 Enhancement of Protected Areas management, including support for increased park patrols, monitoring of PAs, development and implementation of park management plans and annual operations plans, staff training on data collection, conservation education, and acquisition of equipment and vehicles. | |
| Subcomponent 4 Rehabilitation and maintenance of Protected Areas rangers' outpost, existing roads; and headquarters office. | |
| Subcomponent 5 Preparation of a plan to address issues of residents in or users of the Protected Areas, including Mt. Elgon National Park, Katonga Wildlife Reserve, and Pian Upe Wildlife Reserve. <i>This resettlement component was cancelled. During the course of the development of the Protected Areas System Plan (PASP), substantial community consultation and redrawing of boundaries enabled the proposed PASP to avoid significant issues of resettlement in 19 of the total 22 Protected Areas. (TE pg. 7)</i> | |
| Output Indicators | Achieved |
| • All National Parks and Wildlife Reserves have boundaries marked and all genuine land titles identified are compensated by project end. | Partly achieved. (TE pg. 20) |
| • Community Management piloted in at least 2 CWAs; 10 resource programs; and 3 wildlife utilization schemes running by EOP | Not reported by TE. |
| • Management plans developed and under implementation for National Parks and Wildlife Reserves | Partially achieved. (TE pg. 46) |
| • AOP developed and implemented every year within each Protected Area | Not reported by TE. |
| • Cost-structure criteria of PA completed and accepted by YR1; evidence of PA management according to criteria by EO YR2 | Not reported by TE. |
| • At least 1 conservation supported project each for another 5 PA initiated by end of 5 years | Not reported by TE. |
| • Tourism concession revenue improves 50% over baseline 2000/2001 then to grow 10% yearly | Not achieved. (TE pg. 12, 44) |
| • Tourism number and revenue of Ugandan nationals increases over 2000/2001 baseline | Partly achieved. (TE pg. 2-3) |
| • Gate revenue increases 50% over 2000/2001 stats by EO 1yr and increases 5% per year after that | Partly achieved. (TE pg. 21) |
| • Revenue sharing scheme implemented in each revenue generating Protected Area | Achieved. (TE pg. 20) |
| • By end of 2nd year no staff retained with three consecutive | Not reported by TE. |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| warnings of non-performance. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual review of the contribution of operational initiatives to UWA strategic objectives. | Not reported by TE. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New cost-effective management criteria/ strategies devised and adopted over 5 years | Not reported by TE. |
| Component 2- Environmental Conservation Education , executed by the Uganda Wildlife Education Centre | |
| Subcomponent 1 Carrying out an IEC campaign through teacher education programs, development of conservation education materials, and visits to schools and children in remote areas. | |
| Subcomponent 2 Construction within UWEC facilities of natural open air exhibits of the three major ecosystems of rainforest, savannah, and wetland, b access roads, staff accommodation, and a child discovery center. | |
| Subcomponent 3 Implementation of an animal welfare and rehabilitation program to comply with CITES, through improvement of veterinary facilities and care of wildlife. | |
| Subcomponent 4 Development a plan to strengthen the institutional structure, management, and capitalization of UWEC. | |
| Output Indicators | Achieved |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife Conservation Education (WCE) curriculum and materials developed with Ministry of Education by year 2 and integrated into Primary education | Achieved. (TE pg. 2-3) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School child residential education program completed and operational by year 3 | Achieved. (TE pg. 55-56) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three major exhibits (Rhino, Kidepo and Lake Mburu eco zone) and 5 minor exhibits completed by year 4 | Partly achieved. (TE pg. 23) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second Chimpanzee rehabilitation site established and populated | Uncertain. (TE pg. 55) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding from new sources increases over 5 years | Not reported in TE. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnerships with agencies (NEMA) and donor program established | Achieved. (TE pg. 24) |
| Component 3- Tourism Framework Development , executed by the Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry | |
| Subcomponent 1 Development of the tourism sector through: (a) establishment of a sustainable tourism policy and enabling legislation; (b) establishment of a licensing and registration system for operators within the sector; (c) compiling of accurate statistics on the sector; and (d) training of MTTI's staff in human resources. | |
| Subcomponent 2 Capacity building for the Wildlife Department in the MTTI through acquisition of equipment and staff training. | |
| Output Indicators | Achieved |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tourism Policy adopted and enabling legislation enacted | Achieved. (TE pg. 52) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliable and valid statistics on tourism | Activity dropped. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Licensing and registration of all major service providers | Partly achieved. (TE pg. 52-54) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher quality graduates from tourism training institutes | Partly achieved. (TE pg. 52-54) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compilation of statistics and obligatory presentation of those to treaty conference | Achieved. (TE pg. 52-54) |
| Component 4 Preserve the Cultural Heritage of Uganda , executed by the Department of Antiquities and Museums. | |
| Subcomponent 1 Strengthening of the Department of Antiquities and Museums through: (a) renovation and maintenance of its current buildings; (b) refurbishment of museums; (c) establishment of a heritage trail in Fort Portal; (d) construction of a facility to house a cultural center in Kabale; (e) development of a country wide cultural historic sites register and database; (f) development of pilot cultural sites; and (g) training of DAM's staff in visitor management and museum operations. | |
| Output Indicators | Achieved |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| • At least two important antiquarian sites outside of Kampala developed for visitation | Not achieved. (TE pg. 58-59) |
| • A steady increase in visitation numbers to the National Museum in Kampala from its early post renovation baseline. | Not achieved. (TE pg. 58-59) |
| Component 5 - Project Coordination , provided by the project's Project Coordination Unit | |
| Output Indicators | Achieved |
| • Decrease in # of action items returned from TM due to inadequacy | Achieved. (TE pg. 60- 61) |
| • All monitoring missions adequately prepared; quarterly reports to TM within 2 weeks of quarter close | Achieved. (TE pg. 60 – 61) |
| • Number of complaints from project IA's decreases over 5 years | Not reported in TE. |

From Table 1, it may be concluded that:

- the project's original output indicators, as listed in the Project Document, are not accurate indicators with which to judge the achievement of the project subcomponents
- the TE does not use the project's original output indicators to determine project effectiveness
- the TE does not list or acknowledge the Project Document's output indicators

The TE summarizes the main achievements and discusses the weaknesses of the project in general, and does not systematically measure achievements against a list of expected objectives or results, nor as a set of subcomponents for each main component. (TE pg. 14-20) Regarding the Sustainable Wildlife Management component, the TE reports that the Protected Area System Plan was implemented, management of protected areas improved, infrastructure and resources of staff and rangers improved, and there were beneficial community engagement activities. But many of the expected project outputs were not achieved.

The Environmental Conservation Education component was successful in implementing an official education curriculum and reaching many more students and teachers than originally targeted, and also in developing the infrastructural and financial sustainability of Uganda's Wildlife Education Centre. But the TE makes no mention of the project's animal welfare and rehabilitation program, or of the planned natural open air exhibits.

The Tourism Framework Development Component was successful in developing policies and enacting legislation for Uganda's tourism infrastructure, but it seems it was unsuccessful in training tourism operators, developing a statistics program, and licensing and registering all major service providers.

Regarding the fourth component, Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Uganda, there is evidence that the two output indicators specified by the Project Document were not achieved. However, the TE reports that several achievements under this component contributed to the long-term protection of Ugandan cultural heritage and helped achieve the development objective of sustaining and managing cultural assets. (TE pg. 18) These achievements include upgrading the National Museum in Kampala, the development of 10 sites for regional museums, the implementation of the Fort Portal and Kabarole trails (though these were not completed), and development of tourism promotion materials. (TE pg. 18)

The Project Document lists 8 key performance indicators that would measure the progress in achieving the environmental and development objectives. (PD pg. 5) These key performance indicators were revised and expanded into 20 key performance indicators after the Mid Term Review, in an effort to provide more effective indicators, to improve project results. (TE pg. 4)

The original and revised indicators, and the project's achievement of these, are listed in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Original and Revised Key Performance Indicators, including responsible Executing Agency, and Project Achievement. (TE pg. 2,3, viii-xi, 15) UWA- Uganda Wildlife Authority. UWEC- Ugandan Wildlife Education Centre, MTTI- Ministry of Trade Tourism and Industry, DAM – Department of Antiques and Museums.

| Original Indicator | Revised /New Indicator | Agency | Achieved? |
|---|---|--------|-----------|
| 1. Revenue generation at UWA increases to 6.0bn Ugandan Shillings by the 5th year | Target achieved by Mid Term Review. New target: 10bn Ug. Shillings | UWA | 157% |
| 2. Poaching of key species in patrol area reduced from initial baseline. | Indicator deleted. (Poaching reductions would be reflected in Indicator 3.) | | -- |
| 3. Population numbers of key mammal species in Queen Elizabeth, Murchison Falls, Kidepo conservation areas increase by 5% within 5 years. | Proportion of Protected Areas with evidence of increased population of key mammal species is 100% | UWA | 100% |
| 4. Communities are satisfied with UWA response to problem animals. | Number of Protected Areas with significant community use/access reduced to 0. | UWA | 89% |
| 5. Approx. 120,000 visitors/year, including 80,000 students visits to Uganda Wildlife Education Centre. | Approx. 200,000 visitors/yr to Protected Areas. | UWEC | 71% |
| 6. Ministry of Education adopts Wildlife Conservation Education into primary school education in Uganda by EOP. | Target achieved by Mid Term Review. | UWEC | 100% |
| 7. 40% of primary schools receive Wildlife Conservation Education material by project end. | Target achieved by Mid Term Review. | UWEC | 100% |
| 8. Accurate and reliable information about Uganda's tourist potential is established. | Indicator deleted. | | -- |
| | 9. UWA own revenue generation as proportion of recurrent costs. | UWA | 77% |
| | 10. US \$1 million UWA Reserve Fund Revenues available. | UWA | 570% |
| | 11. UWEC owns 110% of its revenues as proportion of recurrent costs | UWEC | 86% |
| | 12. Tourism policy adopted and enabling legislation enacted. | MTTI | 100% |
| | 13. National registry for all antiquities and monuments developed. | DAM | 100% |
| | 14. 10 cultural sites gazetted or developed | DAM | 200% |
| | 15. UWA Central recurrent costs as proportion of total recurrent costs. Target = 30% | UWA | 100+% |
| | 16. 100% UWA boundaries demarcated in PA system | UWA | 80.6% |
| | 17. 100% of UWA field staff housed adequately on site. | UWA | 50% |

| | | | |
|--|---|------|------|
| | 18. 250,000 UWEC visitors/yr | UWEC | 85% |
| | 19. US \$1 million capital in UWEC Endowment Fund | UWEC | 92% |
| | 20. Tourism Development Fund levies revenues | MTTI | 100% |

Out of the 20 final performance indicators listed in Table 2, 2 were cancelled, 8 were partially achieved, 6 were successfully achieved and met expectations, and 4 were achieved successfully and exceeded expectations. Thus, both the environmental and development objectives were successfully met.

According to information present and absent in the TE, it seems that the project did not achieve many of its expected outcomes, but did achieve most of its key performance indicators. The TE lists substantial project achievements, including improved environmental conditions, institutional strengthening, and increased financial sustainability. (TE pg. 20) There were shortcomings in achievement of expected outcomes, thus project effectiveness is rated as moderately satisfactory.

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| 4.3 Efficiency | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|-----------------------|--|

Project implementation was significantly delayed, due to security issues at some parks, lack of access to funds on a timely basis, political interests that interfered in the procurement process, and a long delay time between the project preparation (2002) and the commencement of activities (2008), by which time the costs of many project activities had substantially increased. (TE pg. 8) The project required a two and a half year extension, and still many components were not achieved.

The TE explains that, while project costs did increase due to procurement delays, the costs of construction were highly underestimated at project preparation, and that despite the high costs, project activities were at least partially achieved at very low costs. (TE pg. 19) In one example, the TE states that the estimated cost of completing 100% of the housing target was UgSh 87 billion, but that the project fulfilled 50% of this target with only UgSh 24 billion, or 28% of estimated resources. These numbers suggest either very poor planning, or inconsistent financial measuring.

The project did increase the number of visitors, and thus the revenue available to the Uganda Wildlife Authority and the Uganda Wildlife Education Center. The TE speculates that the rate of return on investment could be as high as 17%. (TE pg. 19)

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 4.4 Sustainability | Rating: Moderately Unlikely |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|

The TE concludes that there is good evidence for sustainability of development and global environment outcomes, and thus rates the risks to sustainability as moderate. (TE pg. 23) But the TE also states that “it is really not possible to confirm that long-term conservation of biodiversity was ensured. In the short-term, improved capacity at UWA and marking boundaries has improved the prospects for biodiversity in the face of competing economic pressures.” (TE pg. 19) It is clear that many significant risks remain, therefore sustainability is rated moderately unlikely.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is assessed along the following 4 dimensions:

Financial Risks –(Moderately Unlikely) The project has contributed significantly to the financial sustainability of the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), the Uganda Wildlife Education Centre (UWEC), and many Protected Area parks and reserves. UWA successfully built up its reserve fund to \$5.7 million, which will provide some flexibility in the event of poor-revenue years and increase the sustainability of its operations. (TE pg. 18, 23) The TE reports that the ongoing activities of the Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry are adequately covered through internal budget allocations, and that UWEC is ensured financial sustainability through a combination of ongoing gate revenues and establishment of a small endowment fund to cope with revenue volatility. (TE pg. 13) The TE lists the following advances toward financial sustainability:

- The Public –Private partnership model has demonstrated benefits for both conservation and business, appears likely to lead to financial sustainability of wildlife reserves which had been viewed as a liability by both local communities and local governments. The Ziwa Rhino sanctuary on private land is quite promising. The partnership in managing Kabwoya Wildlife Reserve has resulted in an increase in wildlife populations. (TE pg. 23-24)
- Concession management for tourism facilities in the parks improved. New concession agreement templates were prepared with favorable terms for UWA and indeed new concessions were implemented. Although the old agreements with unfavorable clauses like the “exclusion zone” remain in force. (TE pg. 24)

However, the TE reports that, at the close of the project, there were no donors active in the tourism sector, and that financial risks posed by securing threats remained high. (TE pg. 11) Although the project has significantly advanced the capacity of Ugandan wildlife institutions to finance themselves, there are still significant risks that affect long term sustainability.

Socio-political Risks –(Moderately Unlikely) Security issues prevented the protected area boundary marking of 279 km out of 1,436 km planned. (TE pg. 7, 17)

Local security negatively impacted project implementation at Murchison Falls National Park, Kidepo National Park, and Bokora-Matheniko Wildlife Reserve, and there was a resulting severe decline in visitors. (TE pg. 11, 36) The TE includes the following report from the UWA:

“The project was borne at a time when there were security threats in most of protected areas. In Murchison Falls National Park, the Lord’s Resistance Army insurgency had been ongoing for years with negative impacts on both the tourists and the wildlife... Bitter memories of the attack on Bwindi killing several tourists and a UWA staff were still vivid. Allied Democratic Forces ...[affected] Semliki National Park, Rwenzori National Park, Queen Elizabeth National Park, Kibale National Park and Toro Semliki Wildlife Reserve. These armed conflicts within and around protected areas meant a fresh look at the law enforcement operations of the organization. A special force (SWIFT) comprising the UWA rangers and Uganda Peoples Defense Forces (UPDF) was created to combat these threats and ensure the safety of visitors and wildlife.” (TE pg. 46)

Declines in visitors affect park revenue, and thus security issues affect the financial stability of the project. The project improved security issues in some parks, and as a result, roads and trails opened, customer care enhanced, and technological tools (e.g friend-a-gorilla internet-based project) increased the financial sustainability of UWA. (TE pg. 23) It seems security issues remain a threat to project sustainability, particularly in some areas.

Environmental Risks- (Moderately Likely) The TE reports communities neighboring parks now tangible benefits through revenue sharing and tourism developments, which increases the willingness and success of park rangers to help manage problem animals, curb encroachment and poaching. Perhaps as a direct result, the TE reports that the environmental situation has improved, and that giraffe, mountain gorillas, elephants, buffaloes, hippo, Ugandan kob and other species' populations have increased and sightings of ostrich, kudus, and cheetah have been more frequent. (TE pg. 24) The TE points out that disease outbreaks (ebola, anthrax, SARS, Avian Flu) are a recurring threat in this area, one that executing agencies must be highly adaptive to address as situations arise. (TE pg. 11) Perhaps the greatest environmental risk is oil exploration, mentioned very briefly in the TE. Oil exploration is occurring next to seven national parks and seven wildlife reserves. The TE reports that UWA is monitoring the impacts of oil exploration, but that it is unclear whether mitigation measures are adequate. (TE pg. 24) If oil is found in this economically poor, governmentally weak region, the environmental risks will be very high.

Institutional Risks – (Moderately Unlikely) The TE reports that during project implementation, high level political interference and/or inaction frequently created prolonged project risks. One example of this was the UWA Board's interference in the procurement process, its replacement with an "illegitimate" board, and the lack of a permanent Board by project end. (TE pg. 8, 12, 13, 23) These risks required ongoing mitigation responses from project implementing agencies, especially from the Uganda Wildlife Authority. There were slow internal mechanisms for redress or correction of these problems. (TE pg. 10, 11) Three major cases of political interference occurred throughout the life of the project which adversely affected implementation progress and effectiveness: a) attempted de-gazettement of the Pian Upe protected area to accommodate foreign investment in cattle ranching; b) tacit government support of encroachment by the Basongora cattle keepers in Queen Elizabeth (QE) National Park; and c) appointment in 2010 of an illegal UWA Board and its subsequent firing of all senior staff. (TE pg. 26)

However, the TE reports the following project achievements that mitigate institutional risks:

- The capacity to undertake wildlife surveys and environmental monitoring was enhanced. The UWA itself has a core cadre of trained and experienced staff both in the field and at its headquarters to the extent that even when there was a disruption in governance at the top, the institution remained largely stable. Field staff have been able to carry on and provide continuity in UWA operations. (TE pg. 23)
- The project developed and embedded a corporate culture for operations that espouses planning, accountability and results-oriented performance based on periodic 3 tier appraisals with reward systems. (TE pg. 23)
- There is increased positive visibility of the Uganda Wildlife Authority in Uganda and beyond. The UWA is a major employer and a catalyst for investment in the tourism sector and in rural areas neighboring the PAs. UWA is present at International Trade Fairs, International Conventions and meetings e.g., IUCN, Parks Congress. (TE pg. 23)
- Boundaries for almost all PAs were clearly marked, which is an important step to checking encroachment. Other management infrastructure is in place including workshops for vehicle maintenance, offices and accommodation. (TE pg. 24)

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?

Funding from this project was expected to come from the GEF, the World Bank, and the Government of Uganda. The Government of Uganda failed to provide its promised funding, and the shortfall was made up by the World Bank. There was no other co-financing in this project.

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?

Project implementation was delayed with a slow start, and severe implementation challenges. The completion date was extended by two and a half years. The implementation delays were due to security issues in some parks, lack of availability of counterpart funds on a timely basis, severe political interference by government actors and subsequent procurement delays. (TE pg. 8, 26)

Five years elapsed between project preparation, when original project costs were estimated, and project implementation, when construction of UWA infrastructure actually started. As a result, the costs of cement, steel and other construction materials increased substantially, and thus the project could not be completed as envisioned, due to lack of funds. (TE pg. 8) Government corruption in the UWA Board also caused significant procurement delays. (TE pg. 26)

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:

The TE reports that this project was in line with country priorities, and with the goals of Uganda's National Environmental Action Plan. However, evidence in the TE suggests that not all levels of government supported this project or enabled its implementation. The government did not meet its obligation for counterpart funding: \$3 million was promised, but zero was delivered. The government also did not increase funding to the Tourism and Wildlife sector, despite the increasing tourism revenue.

During implementation, there were significant problems with government interference and illegitimate actions that negatively affected the project. Government actors attempted de-gazettement of the Pian Upe protected area to accommodate foreign investment in cattle ranching, supported encroachment by the Basongora cattle keepers in Queen Elizabeth National Park, falsely imprisoned UWA rangers and staff, appointed an illegal UWA Board, and fired all of UWA senior staff. (TE pg. 26)

It seems the commitment and ownership from the Uganda Wildlife Authority, and the Uganda Wildlife Education Centre, were quite high. We can conclude that country ownership was not uniform, and that a severe lack of investment with the goals and outcomes of the project from

some government sectors severely delayed the project, inhibited the completion of project components, and presents a serious risk to the sustainability of project achievements.

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory |
|------------------------------------|--|

The TE reports that the project’s M&E design at entry was weak. (TE pg. 11) The M&E design did not link either performance indicators or output indicators to project objectives- this is visible in Table 1 and 2 of this document. The project’s original 8 performance indicators were substantially revised after the Mid Term Evaluation, as they did not accurately measure project achievement of the environmental and development objectives.

The Project Document calls for internal monitoring by the project, external monitoring by IDA, and an independent annual review that would include an evaluation of project implementation progress and financial management aspects of project implementation. (PD pg. 57) The Project Document does not provide a specific budget for M&E activities (PD pg. 47) The Project Document does call for Annual Financial Statements and Project Progress Reports, but does not specify due dates or responsible parties for these. (PD pg. 50) There is no time frame for M&E activities specified.

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

The TE reports that the revised set of key performance indicators were established with baseline data, and captured the sustainability issues of the development objectives, but that these could have “more explicitly captured the improvement of cost effectiveness of the management of cultural and wildlife assets.” (TE pg. 11)

According to the TE, each executing agency (MTTI, UWA, UWEC, DAM) was individually responsible for its respective M&E reporting. (TE pg. 11) There seem to have been lessons learned, reported, and applied throughout project implementation, and that monitoring data were essential to decision-making. (TE pg. 10-11) A UWA, M&E relied on a custom-developed system through bilateral assistance during the earlier ICB-PAMSU period. (TE pg. 12)

It seems there was an M&E system in place, and that the information provided by the M&E system was used to improve and adapt project performance. The Mid Term Review resulted in improvements to the project. However, each executive agency followed their own M&E systems, and there is no evidence that an independent evaluation was performed, or that the prescribed annual reviews were performed. With the information available, it seems there were

moderate to noticeable shortcomings in M&E implementation, and thus it is rated moderately satisfactory.

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 Unsatisfactory |
|--|--|

The implementing agency was the World Bank (WB). The TE states that, although the WB benefited from lessons learned and information from previously implemented projects, it underestimated governance risks, and did not select performance indicators appropriately. The original performance indicators were of poor quality and had to be revised and restructured, as they did not accurately measure the achievement of subcomponents. This poor planning in part contributed to the three major implementation challenges: (1) the procurement delays and interference of the UWA Board, and subsequent lack of a Board between 2004-5, (2) a country-wide issue with lack of counterpart funding which impacted the budget allocations, and (3) political interference at high levels in the gazetting and management of protected areas and UWA. The TE reports that the WB's response was timely and appropriate in dealing with the first two challenges, but not sufficient in dealing with the third. (TE pg. 26)

The TE reports that three major cases of political interference occurred throughout the life of the project which adversely affected implementation progress and effectiveness: a) attempted de-gazettement of the Pian Upe protected area to accommodate foreign investment in cattle ranching; b) tacit government support of encroachment by the Basongora cattle keepers in Queen Elizabeth National Park, false imprisonment of UWA rangers and staff; and c) appointment in 2010 of an illegal UWA Board and its subsequent firing of all senior staff. The TE notes that the response of the WB focused primarily on mitigating reputational risk rather than taking a strong stand as to the legality of such actions. (TE pg. 26)

The WB team remained proactive and responsive during the project, responded promptly to implementation issues, such as requests for reallocations of funds and extension of the closing date, and supported the arrangement of private/public partnerships. However, there were significant shortcomings in the WB's response to key implementation issues. The TE rates the overall WB performance as moderately unsatisfactory, and the TER reviewer concurs.

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

The executing agencies in this project were the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Uganda Wildlife Education Centre (UWEC), the Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry (MTTI), and the Department of Antiquities and Museums (DAM). Each of these four executing agencies were

responsible for a different project main component, and the achievement of the corresponding performance indicators (see Table 1 and 2 in this document, pgs. 4, 7). From Table 2, it is clear that the project achieved almost all of its key performance indicators, and that many of these were surpassed.

The TE reports that UWA's field staff often demonstrated commitment well beyond the call of duty, even in the face of harassment and imprisonment. UWA management worked well with the Project Coordination Unit with respect to procurement, financial management and reporting functions, despite the UWA Board's political challenges and resulting delays. (TE pg. 27)

The TE notes that the executing agencies suffered delays or cutbacks due to government actions outside their control, but that these did not seem to harm their overall performance. In mid project, funds that were transferred from Ministry of Finance were misappropriated within MTTI before they entered the project controls. The situation was resolved over a three-year period thanks to cooperation between the PAMSU task team and government auditors, during which the UWA suffered a cash shortfall that hindered implementation of some activities. The MTTI suffered from staff turnover and high reliance on external consultants, and it seems capacity building efforts did not improve the situation. The performance of some of the implementing agencies was diminished by high rate of senior staff turnover especially at UWA in the areas of financial management and procurement. (TE pg. 27, 28)

The TE rates each of the 4 executing agencies: MTTI—Moderately unsatisfactory, UWA—Satisfactory, UWEC—Satisfactory, DAM—Satisfactory. (TE pg. 28)

Despite the governance weaknesses, political interference, procurement and implementation delays, cost overruns, lack of security in some parks, the executing agencies “carried out their responsibilities and contributed to a generally successful project” that “transformed” PA management in Uganda, and met most of its development and environmental objectives. (TE pg. 28) It is clear that most of the failures in project execution were caused by an unsupportive external environment. Therefore, the quality of project execution is rated satisfactory.

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 TE reports that there were positive changes in environmental stress and status during the course of the project. The Ziwa Rhino Sanctuary and the Kabwoya Wildlife Reserve were both established through this project, and the latter has resulted in a tremendous increase in wildlife populations like Ugandan kobs, water bucks and buffaloes. (TE pg. 23, 24)

Populations of key animal species – buffalo, waterbuck, elephant, Ugandan cobb, hippo and lion-increased significantly, from a baseline of 0 to one of 100%. (TE pg. 18) This increase is ascribed to a natural regeneration of species, since rangers were more effective on duty, and were able to better control poaching and encroachment in PAs. (TE pg. 19)

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.

The TE records the following changes in human well-being that occurred by the end of the project:

- The Ugandan Wildlife Authority initiated community conservation programs in many parks to provide poachers, gold miners, smugglers and others alternative work and livelihoods, on condition of stopping their illegal activities. UWA's anti-poaching campaigns have resulted in the exchange of illegal hunting equipment for access to improved alternative livelihood options, including goat rearing, ecotourism, mountain trail maintenance, invasive species removal. These programs have been successful and have empowered communities to protect the parks. (TE pg. 20)
- The project constructed new infrastructure, including more than 160 structures, ranging from kitchens and junior staff housing to new offices, new boreholes and upgrading generators. New housing was made available to approximately 50% of staff and 90% of the protected areas now have good office infrastructure. (TE pg. 17)
- The number of Protected Areas showing conflict with communities decreased from a baseline of 19 down to 2 by project's end, an 89% achievement of the target. (TE pg. 19)
- The Uganda Wildlife Authority helped create The Clouds Mountain Gorilla Lodge, a community owned Eco-Lodge in southern Bwindi. The communities have a concession of six of the available eight gorilla permits per day. The Lodge is operational and the communities are earning good revenue through a concession with the investor. The communities also sell food and crafts to tourists. Since 2008, the Lodge has earned more than UgSh 500 million for the communities. This money has been used to start saving schemes for the communities, providing heifers and piggery for households as well as improving community social infrastructure. (TE pg. 21)
- Under the project's Revenue Sharing Program, 20% of Park gate (entrance) revenues are shared with local communities, which has increased community support for the Protected Areas, and has increased compliance with grazing restrictions and cooperation in reducing poaching. (TE pg. 21) Thanks to the Revenue Sharing Program, several projects including classroom blocks, health centers, provision of clean water to communities, rehabilitation of roads and bridges, as well as livelihood improvement projects such as goat rearing, bee keeping, provision of irish potato seed have been implemented in community areas around protected areas. Since 2009, the focus has also changed to problem animal control projects like elephant deterrent trenches around Queen Elizabeth and Murchison Falls National Parks that have helped to reduce the human-wildlife conflicts. (TE pg. 22)
- The project supported the construction of the Bwindi Community Hospital. (TE pg. 22)

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 – The TE reports the following changes in capacities:

- New infrastructure, including the construction of more than 160 structures, ranging from kitchens and junior staff housing to new offices, new boreholes and upgrading generators. New housing was made available to approximately 50% of staff and 90% of the protected areas now have good office infrastructure. (TE pg. 17)
- Training, equipping and housing UWA staff contributed to the sustainable and more cost effective management of Uganda’s wildlife. Field staff were trained and equipped and staff morale improved through competitive pay packages, provision of uniforms and equipment such as tents, radios, and vehicles. There was a major improvement in staff performance: 1) accountability was enhanced in checking expenditure and revenue leakage; and 2) there was an increase in revenue collection of up to 40% without a corresponding increase in visitation, while expenditure on fuel and vehicle maintenance fell by approximately 30%. (TE pg. 17)
- Uganda Wildlife Authority generated revenues have steadily increased since 2002, from UgSh 5.8 billion in 2002/03 to UgSh 26.8 billion in 2010/11, a 364% increase in 8 years. The increase in revenue is attributed to the project’s support for capacity building within UWA (Financial Procedures Manual), and to the higher numbers of tourists attracted by the increase in wildlife numbers in protected areas (from 40,000 visitors in 2002 to 170,000 visitors in 2010). (TE pg. 17)
- 600 kilometers of park boundaries were newly surveyed and 1,157 kilometers of park boundaries were marked – representing about 80% of all PAs in the country. This demarcation is a prerequisite for the sustainable and cost-effective management of wildlife assets. (TE pg. 17)

b) Governance – The TE reports the following changes in governance:

- The project supported the completion and implementation of the Protected Areas Strategy Plan. The objective of the PASP was to rationalize and demarcate the boundaries the PA system of Uganda to ensure that it protects a high quality, representative sample of the country's biodiversity heritage and eco-systems, is manageable in the long term, and provides a suitable basis for a sustainable tourism sector. The PASP included both newly proposed PAs as well as the elimination of some "paper parks". The final plan was approved by Parliament and 22 PA were officially gazetted as the country's new official park system. The project supported the boundary demarcation of all 22 PA's as well as the continued consultation with local communities. (TE pg. 17)
- Management plans for Rwenzori National Park, Semliki National Park, Ajai Wildlife Reserve, Toro Semliki Wildlife Reserve and Mt. Elgon National Park were developed using project funds. (TE pg. 46)

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.

The project reports an unintended impact of the tourism levy. A significant positive outcome was that, within the tourism policy development supported by the project, a Tourism Levy was established that would support the long-term development of the sector and contribute to national treasury. In addition, at the district level a local Hotel Occupancy Tax has also generated in excess of 2 billion Ugandan shillings. (TE pg. 22)

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.

The TE reports the following evidence of adoption of GEF initiatives at scale:

- The UWA and UWEC are now able to generate financial resources to sustain their operations beyond the completion of this project. **Mainstreaming – Established.**
- The project supported the completion and implementation of the Protected Areas Strategy Plan. **Mainstreaming – Established.**

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 TE lists the following lessons learned:

- **Governance.** Project design should have a robust assessment of the governance challenges and plan mitigation measures accordingly. While implementation is possible even in the face of ongoing governance issues, shortfalls in implementation and increased costs are likely to occur as a result. Bank management should be proactive and supportive of task teams in the presence of significant governance failures, and should have a plan to address such failures more directly. In the case of PAMSU, no governance strategy was in place at the project start
- **Long-term engagement in the sector and consistency of the supervision team** are assets in using adaptive management methods to resolve issues. In a complex project with multiple implementing agencies adaptive management by an experienced team is important, because the team is better able to work with a number of different IAs to identify areas of joint interest and mediate any non-productive competition among IAs.
- **PAMSU Investment phase.** A phased approach allowed for the implementing agencies to, first, build a basic operational capacity and, then to benefit more fully from substantial field investment was appropriate under the circumstances. The phased approach permitted the identification and improvement of institutional capacity. In addition, where weaknesses

could not be corrected in certain institutions, those institutions could be excluded from subsequent investments. PAMSU implemented this latter lesson by allocating proportionately more follow-on investment support, as well as greater independence in managing their own components to the most successful institutions – UWA and UWEC.

- Decentralized Decision-making. Decentralized institutional support is critical when protecting a vulnerable natural and cultural resource base. The decentralization of the decision-making process from UWA headquarters to the field, empowered the previously disenfranchised field-based staff and allowed some autonomy for each protected area in terms of the development of management plans, the disbursement of funds against annual operating plan and the evaluation of the revenue-generating potential of each PA. The phased capacity building of the financial management system at HQ, and subsequently in the field, allowed HQ to have careful control over the financial management system while vastly improving financial reporting from the field. All of these factors in turn contributed to more effective protection during a transition period.
- Effective capacity building may take far longer than a single project cycle. The two projects together, ICB PAMSU and PAMSU worked well in succession to provide a sustained effort to build capacity for wildlife management in the Uganda context.
- In developing an environmental program, competing needs of ecosystems and commercial development need to be balanced. There needs to be an acknowledgement that some people in the government and amongst the citizenry may wonder why there is a focus on animals when the economic future of Ugandan people depends on the country being developed commercially. The high priority of environmental protection is not a given among every interest group and the case needs to be made continuously that there are substantial economic benefits of environmental protection.
- It is critical to estimate construction costs as accurately as possible to avoid confusion in project implementation. In PAMSU, because UWA infrastructure costs were so seriously underestimated, the project team had to re-prioritize what exactly could be financed with the available funds. This meant that some areas would not have new housing and others would have less new housing, contrary to expectations. The inability to meet housing construction targets also gave fuel to critics who questioned the efficiency of project expenditures.
- Donor Coordination. Effective donor coordination is itself an effective risk mitigation strategy. The focus of the EU and others on tourism in the early stages permitted PAMSU to focus more effectively on its specific objectives relating to conservation and protecting the critical habitats during the project period. At later stages many donors left the sector due to governance issues and the Bank was relatively isolated at a critical time.
(TE pg. 28-29)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not explicitly list recommendations, other than those that may be deduced from the lessons learned.

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? | The TE includes an assessment of relevant outcomes and impact of the project. It effectively and clearly reports on the progress of the performance indicators. Although it list the project components, it does not clearly or rationally list or discuss the implementation of these components in an organized manner. In general, the TE adequately addresses the project's achievements of the development and environmental objectives. | S |
| 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 is complete and convincing, and the ratings are well substantiated. | HS |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The project very thoroughly discusses project sustainability, and the risks posed during and after project implementation. | HS |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | The lessons learned are supported by the evidence and are comprehensive. | HS |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The TE includes the actual project costs, in total and by project component. | HS |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | The TE evaluates M&E in the design phase and during implementation. But more information is needed here. | MS |
| Overall TE Rating | | HS |

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(11) + 0.1(22) = 3.3 + 2.2 = 5.5 \sim 6$$

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

The documents available to the TER writer were the Project Document, the Terminal Evaluation, and the Implementation Status and Completion Report from June 2010.