

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2035	
GEF Agency project ID		2496	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening Protected Area System of the Komi Republic to Conserve Virgin Forest Biodiversity in the Pechora River Headwaters Region	
Country/Countries		Russia	
Region		Europe and Central Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO1: Catalyzing the Sustainability of Protected Areas SP3: Strengthened National Terrestrial Protected Area Networks	
Executing agencies involved		Government of Russia – Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Some financial support from NGOs	
Private sector involvement		Co-financing from the LLC Gazprom Transgaz Ukhta, LLC Lukoil Komi, LLC Gold minerals. Partnership to generate financial support for protected areas.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 22, 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.35	0.35
	Co-financing	0.89	NA
GEF Project Grant		4.5	4.5
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	12.59	49.18
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.63	7.43
	Private sector	1.411	3.79
	NGOs/CSOs	0.27	0.71
Total GEF funding		4.85	4.85
Total Co-financing		16.79	61.04*
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		21.64	65.89*
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		November 2014	
Author of TE		Stuart Williams	
TER completion date		January 25, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

* Excluding the co-financing component of the Project Preparation Grant, for which the TE does not report financial figures.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Komi Republic is key repository of biodiversity for the Scanadinavian and Russian taiga and Ural montane forest tundra ecosystems (PD p.5). However, the Komi Republic's Protected Areas system suffers from many weaknesses, which this project aims to improve.

The environmental objective for this project is "A representative and effectively managed network of protected areas ensures conservation of pristine boreal forest and taiga ecosystems in the Komi Republic" (PD p.23). This overall goal for the project is "a comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed national system of protected areas in the Russian Federation ensures conservation of globally significant and threatened ecosystems" (PD p.23).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project documents do not specify development objectives for this project. However, the environmental objective may be treated as the development objective of the project.

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

There were no changes in project objectives during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory, and so does this TER. The project was well aligned with the priorities of Russia and the Komi Republic, as well as with those of the GEF.

In 2001, Russia adopted a Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and a National Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan. “Among other priorities, the National Strategy and Action Plan underlines the need to conserve forest ecosystems, and particularly forests of the Northern-European Russia and Ural regions. The Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan set a number of objectives related to the conservation of forest biodiversity” (PD p.34). The Komi Republic being an important area for conservation of forest ecosystems and biodiversity, this project clearly supports Russian conservation priorities.

The project is also well aligned with the priorities of the Government of the Komi Republic. The Komi Republic “has established a protected area system (PAS) to safeguard its globally significant biodiversity covering 14.6% of its territory, which is almost double the Russian average” (PD p.6). The Komi Republic Government has shown commitment to improving the functioning of its Protected Areas system (PD p.8) and developed several laws related to natural resources management within its Protected Areas (PD p.12). A clear sign of alignment is that the Komi Republic Government “initiated the project and provided cash co-financing for the preparation stage. Its very strong support is reflected in the co-funding commitment to the planned UNDP-GEF intervention” (PD p.6).

The project is also well aligned with GEF priorities, supporting the Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1 (Catalyzing the Sustainability of Protected Areas). This project “will contribute to the sustainability and maturation of Russia’s protected area system by creating the enabling environment for the protected area system of Komi Republic needed to better capture the biodiversity values of the Scandinavian and Russian taiga and Ural montane forest tundra ecoregion. The project will result in an improved coverage and representativity of these two ecoregion, supported by increased systemic, institutional and individual capacities.” (PD p.23)

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

The TE rates project effectiveness as highly satisfactory. This TER rates effectiveness as satisfactory due to achievement of all its outcomes, but noting some shortcomings in the way that outcomes were

achieved, for example the fact that the expanded Komi Republic Protected Areas system will only be fully effective by 2030.

According to the TE, “the project achieved its overall objective of establishing the protected area system of the Komi Republic. There were only minor shortcomings but the project has built the foundations to ensure these minor shortcomings are overcome. “(TE p.viii) In the following sections, we examine the extent to which the three main project outcomes have been accomplished and assess the overall effectiveness of the project in meeting its objective.

Outcome 1. The Protected Areas system of Komi Republic is redesigned so as to better capture globally significant biodiversity

Under this outcome, a Strategic Plan has been approved to increase by 1,22,993 the number of hectares of pristine forest ecosystems to be included as part of the expanded Komi Republic Protected Areas system by 2030 (TE p.43). As part of the strategic efforts, a ‘gap analysis’ was conducted to assess the biodiversity of the Komi Republic, and to identify areas warranting inclusion into the protected area system. The Strategic Plan adopted will not only increase the area under protection, but also ensure that the protected areas are more representative of the Komi Republic biodiversity. This outcome appears to have been achieved as there is a firm commitment from the Komi Republic to have fully implemented the Strategic Plan by 2030. However, it must be noted that it was planned for this to have been implemented by project end.

Outcome 2. Increased institutional capacity for management of protected areas within the Protected Areas System of Komi republic

One of the most important achievements under this outcome has been the establishment of the Komi Republic Protected Area Functioning and Nature Management Support Center (PA Centre), an organization with the mandate to manage the republican protected areas within the Komi Republic. The project successfully leveraged private sector investment to fund the PA Centre. \$US 709,000 was contributed by gas, oil and mining firms, as well as by visitors to the Centre. The project also successfully established the ‘Union of Protected Areas of the Republic of Komi’ or the ‘Non-Commercial Partnership’ (NCP), a partnership between the two federally protected areas of Komi, the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Institute of Biology. The NCP was set up to better manage the protected areas. At project completion, the PA Centre was in a good financial position, and local residents showed increased support for local protected areas. However, there is no strong evidence that the capacity for management is really present within the PA Centre. Overall, this outcome also appears to have been moderately satisfactorily achieved. (TE pp.44-46)

Outcome 3. Application of business planning principles result in diversified revenue streams for the Protected Areas system of Komi Republic

Business plans were developed, identifying revenue sources amounting to \$US 1,500,000 per year, much in excess of the target \$US 250,000 per year. It was the first time business plans for protected areas were developed in Russia. Actual revenues for the two main protected areas were lower than

expected, but expected to increase over time. Despite not having fully met its revenue targets, the project still successfully diversified revenue streams for protected areas and increased revenues. This outcome should be considered to have been satisfactorily achieved.

Overall, the project appears to have built the foundations for the continued development of the Protected Area System of the Komi Republic. Outcome 1 contributed to larger and more representative protected areas. Outcome 2 contributed to setting up management institutions for the protected areas. Outcome 3 contributed to the financial sustainability of the protected areas. The project’s objective was “a representative and effectively managed network of protected areas ensures conservation of pristine boreal forest and taiga ecosystems in the Komi Republic”. Whether the management is indeed effective is still in question, but there is no doubt that the project successfully implemented the activities it had planned and achieved the planned outcomes.

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

The TE rates efficiency as highly satisfactory as “a number of steps were taken to ensure cost efficiency and the project also leveraged significant funding from government, private-sector and non-governmental organizations” (TE p.viii). For the same reasons, this TER also assigns a score of ‘highly satisfactory’.

The project carried out a great number of activities with a relatively low budget. The team ensured the procurement process was competitive despite the great number of processes and contracts awarded during the project (283 competitive tenders, 110 requests for quotation, 53 contracts with individuals and 166 contracts with organizations). The team even increased the efficiency of the procurement process by coherently grouping together pieces of work to be awarded and procuring them under one process. (TE p.53)

The project team even went out of its way to reduce costs, seeking tax exemptions on various pieces of equipment that needed to be imported. This was time consuming, but “saved the project the equivalent of RUB 225 million” (equivalent to \$US 2.9 million).

Finally, the project successfully leveraged additional funds, “both in cash and in-kind from the federal and republican governments, non-governmental organisations, the private sector and from other international donors. Two substantial grants from the Government of Germany’s ICI and the EU’s ClimaEast Program, respectively, were managed and implemented by the project team. This represented outstanding efficiency and good value for money.” (TE p.53)

For going over and beyond to maintain low project costs and improve effectiveness, a rating of highly satisfactory is granted.

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

According to the TE, “the sustainability of the processes and impacts (insofar as the project has had impacts) are likely. A few factors remain that may undermine the sustainability (some of which were beyond the control of the project), including the unpredictable political situation and, in the long-term, the desire to explore for and produce oil and gas”(TE p.ix). This TER agrees with the TE and also rates sustainability as likely. Four aspects of sustainability are discussed below.

1. Financial Sustainability – Likely

The project developed the tourism infrastructure, which will contribute to generating revenues for the Protected Areas. The business plans developed for the protected areas are strong and will ensure the financial sustainability of the project. According to the TE, “the only aspect of financial sustainability to which there is a risk is the maintenance of tourism infrastructure in which the project invested. If there are any reductions in tourism (for any reason), the tourism infrastructure will be the first thing that the protected area authorities will neglect” (TE p.53). That being said, this should not pose a risk to the existence of the protected areas.

2. Socio-Political Sustainability – Likely

As discussed above, local populations are now more aware and supportive of protected areas in the region than they were before the project. The project improved tourism infrastructure, and revenues from tourist activities will benefit local populations. Despite there not being a marketing strategy to increase tourism in the area, tourism will most likely continue to benefit the area. Social risks are insignificant, and there do not appear to be any significant political risks to the Protected Areas following project end. Eventually, the pressure to explore for and produce more oil and gas might create political pressures to start exploiting the Protected Areas, but no such pressure exists at the moment.

3. Institutional Sustainability – Likely

The project built two institutions – the PA Centre and the Non-Commercial Partnership – to ensure institutional sustainability. The Komi Government is committed to ensuring the continuation of the PA Centre, and the PA Centre staff has been given adequate training to be able to pursue its work following project end. The sustainability of the NCP is less well assured than that of the PA Centre. For example, the NCP does not have a business plan of its own, and it is unclear how the recurrent costs will be covered following project end. However, the NCP is only a secondary institution, and the minor risks regarding its future are unlikely to affect project outcomes.

4. Environmental Sustainability – Likely

There are no environmental risks to the project.

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?

Co-financing for the project has turned out to be much higher than expected. Indeed, "significant additional funds were leveraged over the course of the project. This was not simply limited to the two additional grants that were implemented by the project (which in itself represents excellent cost effectiveness) but the project leveraged further funding and co-finance from the government and from the private sector" (TE p.28). The federal and regional governments increased their financial contributions to conservation activities and contributed to ensuring that expected outcomes of the project were achieved.

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?

There was a long gap between the development of the project concept in 2001 and the actual start of the project in 2008. This long preparatory phase saw the project transform from a forest management project to a project about protected areas. During implementation, it took longer than expected to establish the PA Centre, which required a one-year project extension. This potential risk had not been considered at the design stage.

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:

Country ownership for the project was very good. Indeed, the Government of the Komi Republic supported the project at all stages and the districts were also very involved. (TE p.53) This support and ownership is further exemplified by the higher than expected amounts provided by Governments as co-financing.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory because the design does not have any major shortcomings, and it includes all components necessary for a strong M&E framework.

The logical framework specified SMART indicators that reflect project objectives and activities very well. All aspects of a standard M&E framework were planned from the start – monitoring reports, data collection, evaluation activities, responsibilities, plan for learning and knowledge sharing, budget, etc. The project successfully collected baseline data so as to better measure project achievements in the later stage of the project.

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

The TE rates M&E Implementation as satisfactory due to the good adaptive management displayed as part of the project and regular M&E was conducted. This TER agrees with this rating.

According to the TE, the MTE “proved useful for course adjustment for the project and making some useful recommendations” (TE P.30). For example, the MTE recommended several adjustments to the logframe and to the course of activities, most of which were made.

M&E activities appear to have been implemented smoothly, with regular UNDP visits, yearly Project Steering Group Meetings and yearly reviews of project progress (PIRs and Annual Project Reports). Quarterly and thematic reports were also produced, and both the mid-term and final evaluations took place as planned. (TE p.30)

The TE criticizes the team for having “underestimated the logframe’s importance as a tool both for driving the implementation of the project and for the evaluation of the project’s progress” (TE p.viii). Indeed, the team appears not to have used the logframe when planning project activities, which the Project Manager has confirmed. The manager “stated that he “had no experience with logframes” and he “had underestimated [the logframe’s] importance” as a tool both for driving the implementation of the project and for the evaluation of the project’s progress” (TE p.17). This does not appear to have negatively influenced M&E activities as all required monitoring activities took place.

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: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The TE rates project implementation as highly satisfactory because “the support provided by UNDP was also outstanding” (TE P.viii). This TER on the other hand, rates project implementation as satisfactory due some weakness in the project design that subsequently affected the project performance.

UNDP carried out several project visits and established a very good collaboration with the project team. Overall, the support it provided during project implementation appears exemplary. However, according to the TE, “the project design was less than optimal” (TE p.23). More specifically, the TE blames the project design for not having taken into consideration the delays that might come up in setting up the PA Centre, and for not having paid enough attention to the feasibility issues related to setting up the planned Ecological Fund (which was transformed by the Project Team into the Non-Commercial Partnership).

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

The project executing agency was Russia’s Ministry of Natural Resources. The TE rates project execution as highly satisfactory. This TER agrees with this score due to exceptional implementation done by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and, particularly, the great level of adaptive management shown.

According to the TE, “there can be little doubt that the successes of the project can be largely attributed to the quality and dedication of the team. This is particularly true of the Project Manager who not only carried out his own roles and responsibilities but he provided significant support and backed-up all his team members (...) The project was implemented in an exemplary manner. Stakeholder participation was excellent and inclusive; transparency was high – almost to a fault! (...) With the political capital and personal connections that the team and execution agency brought to the project, and with professional dedication with which the project was implemented within the Komi Republic, the Executing Agency Execution was also outstanding” (TE pp.vii-viii). Overall, the project team appears to have been composed of dedicated, effective and pro-active staff that had the project’s best interests at heart.

One of the ways in which the executing team distinguished itself was though its ability to adapt to new circumstances and drive the project forward in spite of obstacles. According to the TE, “the project team also focused on the *pragmatic* aspects of establishing the protected area system within the Republic of Komi – rather than following the project document to the letter or, indeed, only targeting the results described in the logframe (TE P.23). One of the best examples of this is the way the team replaced the planned Ecological Fund, which was not feasible due to legal barriers, with the Non-Commercial Partnership, a viable and ultimately successful initiative. In addition, the project team went beyond its mandate by working very closely with small enterprises, local guides and administrations towards improving the business planning for tourism in the protected areas” (TE P.22).

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.

According to the TE, the project's impacts are yet to materialize. Logframe indicators are at an outcome level and, while this is adequate for the purpose of the project, environmental change is difficult to establish based on the data collected by the project. In addition, "there were interviewees over the course of the TE mission who did express frustration that the project had had little impact, particularly in some of the republican protected areas" (TE p.59). According to the TE, the only clear impact of the project was to reduce the incidence of heli-poaching in the protected areas. (TE p.59)

This TER is more positive, and notes that as part of the project, a Strategic Plan has been approved to increase by 1,22,993 the number of hectares of pristine forest ecosystems to be included as part of the expanded Komi Republic Protected Areas system by 2030. (TE P.43)

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.

There was no recorded socioeconomic change as part of this project. It must however be noted that the project improved tourism infrastructure, and future revenue from tourist activities will benefit local populations.

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

While it was an objective of the project for the PA Centre to have a strong management capacity by the end of the project, it is unclear whether this capacity was really in place at project end.

b) Governance

As part of the Protected Area Strategic Plan for the Republic, the Komi Republic and the Ministry of Natural Resources have committed to establish more protected areas by 2030. This approved plan will ensure future governments pursue maintain some of the project's activities.

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 reduction in heli-poaching within the protected areas wasn't expected by the project, but represents a positive environmental impact.

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.

According to the TE, "there is significant interest from other regions within the Russian Federation to replicate the experiences of the project" (PD p.ix). At project end, no replication or scaling up had taken place.

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 following lessons learned appear in the TE:

- The team composition is critical to the success of the project: a significant part of the success of the project was down to the following two factors: i) the National Project Director (NPD) was one of the original conceivers of the project and remained involved until the very end of the project, and ii) the Project Manager (PM) is a good example of what a good project manager should be: extremely dedicated, able to think adaptively, well connected and respected, and knowledgeable. ^[17]_{SEP}

- People – and personal connections – are important and specifically the personal connections and political capital that people bring to projects. All this makes the selection of NPD and PM all the more important, and this selection can make the difference between a successful and an unsuccessful project. [L] [SEP]
- Sharing experiences and leaning from other projects remains important. At the start of the project, it was useful for the NPD and the PM for the project to visit one project (the UNDP-GEF Altai-Sayan project) to glean whatever lessons from the project staff as they could. Now, six years later, the NPD and PM have equally learned important lessons that should be passed on to future project managers. [L] [SEP]
- A justified extension. At the stage of the MTE, an extension was proposed to allow sufficient time to allow for the establishment of the PA Centre. This was approved and the PA Centre has now been established and is not fully operational. In short, then, the extension was justified. [L] [SEP]

(TE p.x)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations appear in the TE:

- Projects need to retain vision on achieving outcomes and impact. Therefore, while inputs and a focus on the production of outputs can be useful and are sometimes essential, projects must examine every activity that they carry out and consider carefully how they will contribute to achieving the project's intended impacts. [L] [SEP]
- Get the logframe right! The logframe is central to driving the project forward and it is how the project's success is measured. [L] [SEP]
- Under-ambition protected area coverage – the protected area coverage targeted by the project – and ultimately in the strategic plan for the *official federal and republic level* protected area system of the Komi. [L] [SEP]
- Next steps in tourism development need to be taken soon – including developing and implementing a marketing strategy. [L] [SEP]
- Improving value for money with construction contracts by advancing, say, 65% of the value of the contract on signature - thereby negating the need for contractors to take out a loan and transferring that cost to the project. [L] [SEP]
- Transfer the information on the project's website to that of the PA Centre. [L] [SEP]
- Ensure the implementation of the protected area system strategic plan and its [L] [SEP] implementation should be transparently displayed on the PA Centre's website. [L] [SEP]

- Institutionalization of the METT (or another tool for monitoring the effectiveness of [SEP] protected area management). [SEP]
- Ensure the continuation of the transparency and accountability of NCP. [SEP]

(TE pp.ix-x)

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 report assesses all relevant outcomes and project impact, as well as project objectives. The discussion is well structured and demonstrates a sound analysis from the author.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent; the evidence is complete and convincing. Ratings are well substantiated. The report is easy to read and to follow.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses various aspects of project sustainability.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are grounded in evidence and analysis provided elsewhere in the report, and appear comprehensive	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Total costs, costs per activity and costs per outcome are reported, as well as actual co-financing received by the project.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides useful information about the project's M&E systems, and a good analysis of M&E quality.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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

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