1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2139	
GEF Agency project ID		595634	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Transboundary Agro-ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera TAMP)	
Country/Countries		Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda, and United Republic of Tanzania	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD SP-1 - Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management; LD SP-3 - Investing in New and Innovative Approaches Sustainable Land Management	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) in Rwanda; Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) in Uganda; Division of the Environment, Vice President's Office (DOE/VPO) in Tanzania, and Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MINAGRI) in Burundi	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 20, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 2014	
Actual date of project completion		June 30, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.725	0
	Co-financing	0.415,000	0
GEF Project Grant		6.363,700	6.363,700
Co-financing	IA own	0.551	0.365,158
	Government	18.929,610	17.988,535
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	5.090	5.491,144
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0.353,600	0
Total GEF funding		7.088,700	6.363,700

Total Co-financing	25.339,210	23.844,837
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	32.427,910	30.208,537
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	July 30, 2015	
Author of TE	Jean-Joseph Bellamy, Ingrid Hartmann, and Bancy Mati	
TER completion date	February 16, 2018	
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	ML
M&E Design		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	S
M&E Implementation		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MS
Quality of Implementation		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MU
Quality of Execution		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is "to address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystem health and functions in the Kagera basin through the introduction of adapted agro-ecosystem management approaches" (PD pg 33).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective is "to improve the livelihoods and hence contribute to reduced poverty of rural communities in the Kagera Basin through more productive and sustainable resource management practices that are technically feasible and socio-economically viable" (PD pg 33). The project intended to achieve its objective through the following four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agroecosystems and restoration of degraded lands;
Outcome 2: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land;
Outcome 3: Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin; and
Outcome 4: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin.

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

The project did not revise the objectives or activities, however, the indicators were shortened to make it more appropriate to measure progress.

4. GEF IEO 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 was aligned to GEF objectives under the Land Degradation focal area and strategic programs for GEF-4. "The project is particularly well aligned with the Strategic Program 1 (SP-1 element b) when considering that the main focus of the project is on restoration of the health and functioning of the different agro-ecosystems in the Kagera basin through promoting sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management" (TE pg 31). The project also contributes towards Strategic Objective SO-2 and TerrAfrica/SIP programme's of demonstrating and upscaling successful and innovative sustainable land management practices to reduce degradation and deforestation, and also generating livelihood benefits for local land users as well as global environmental benefits (PD pg 22, TE pg 31). In addition, the project is also consistent with the four countries' commitments to the Convention to Combat Desertification, and Convention on Biological Diversity. The objectives of the project are relevant to the national policies of the Kagera countries.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The project had four main outcomes to support the adoption of an integrated ecosystems or landscape approach for the sustainable management of land resources in the Kagera Basin. It was successful in implementing information sharing activities, establishing by-laws, transferring technologies, and carrying out SLM interventions. However, the project was ineffective in building institutional capacity, transforming laws at the national level, and it failed to improve the enabling environment for implementing SLM (TE pg 33). All the four outcomes were only partially successful, and thus, the TER gives a Moderately Successful rating to the effectiveness of the project.

<u>Outcome 1: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands</u>:

Under this outcome, the project carried out transboundary coordination, information sharing, exchange visits, studies, and conducted regional meetings and workshops. It met most of its targets for:

identifying transboundary issues, optimized exchange of information among countries and sectors for effective collaboration, and coordination and early warning across river basin. It also identified control and management of bush fires, control of erosion and flood risk, water resource management, river bank and lakeshore protection and management, wildlife management, and control of crop pests and diseases movements and outbreaks. However, the TE points out that "the focus was mostly in identifying transboundary issues, but limited further activities followed the studies conducted under the project" (TE pg 20). Also many of the activities were treated as a national problem instead of a transboundary issue, and as a result "it did not create a common identity among the various initiatives implemented in each country and supported by the project" (TE pg 20). Hence, the targets under this outcome were only partially met.

Outcome 2: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land:
This outcome was partially successful in conducting activities but due to lack of political willingness and low visibility of the project some of the targets were not achieved. The project implemented sensitization activities, and established community catchment committees for further planning of SLaM integration on landscape planning. It also established by-laws, which were mainly implemented to address issues of pasture development. But the implementation of the by-laws depended on the support from the traditional authorities such as local Elders. The TE also notes that "Low visibility of the project in some of the countries, weaknesses in the design of a policy advocacy mechanism and probably an unrealistic assessment of the capabilities of the project committees and their influences might be other reasons. Also, the number of inter-sectoral workshops and meetings with concerned ministries and institutions were insufficient; additionally, most of these workshops and meetings took place at the beginning of the project and few thereafter" (TE pg 23). The project was far from mainstreaming SLaM in government systems and bringing about legislative changes.

Outcome 3: Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin:
As per the TE, the project prepared training materials on SLM technologies, and disseminated the technologies through the training of trainers (ToTs) and demonstrations. Training included dissemination of monitoring technologies, such as hydrological monitoring and the recording of rainfall data. Some of these technologies were transferred to communities in Burundi and Rwanda. "The transfer of technologies created a lot of enthusiasm from all sides, which was reinforced by the fact that innovatively the project successfully integrated traditional knowledge into the best practices from WOCAT. Combining this transfer of technologies with the FFS (farmer field schools) approach promoted by the project turned out to be highly successful" (TE pg 23). However, the TE notes that the project failed to develop "lasting capacities of related institutions, which should sustain these results over the long-term" (TE pg 24). The project should have focused on building the capacity of related institutions and developing an enabling environment to provide adequate policy, legislation and governance frameworks.

Outcome 4: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin:
The project supported interventions in pilot communities, micro-catchments, and other key targeted land units such as pasture/range, wetlands/riverbanks, and woodlots. As per the TE, the project implemented SLM activities in 17,097ha of land, the farmer field schools directly impacted 23,649 of farm households, two sites were identified and equipped for sediment monitoring in Burundi and Rwanda, and 49,161 ha of pasture lands were improved, mostly in Burundi, Tanzania and Uganda,

through closure to grazing, grass reseeding and removal of invasive species. However, the project had flaws in the coordination, and monitoring system. “These weaknesses prevented a good feedback loop to the project implementation team, which should have used this farmers’ own experience to improve the approach. Additionally, institutional research was not promoted by the project, even though it would have been instrumental in providing important quantitative data on environmental flows and agricultural production factors” (TE pgs 25-26).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE states that the project did not efficiently use its finances for the four outcomes. For outcome one on transboundary issues, the project’s establishment of transboundary mechanism was low despite the budget allocated for it. Also, it spent little financial resources on institutional and legislation issues under outcome two. However, the knowledge exchange on implementation of SLM and FFS was cost efficient. In terms of time efficiency, the TE notes “the initial time inefficiency manifested in various delays in the first project phase as reported in the MTR was compensated later during the second phase of the project” (TE pg 32). The project team was also highly active in implementing the activities which helped in effectiveness of the project (TE pg 33). As the project had certain shortcomings in financial management but did well in time efficiency, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to project’s efficiency.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately Likely

The TER finds that the risks to sustainability of the project are moderately low as the financial resources were committed by two of the project countries and there were no threats to environmental sustainability. However, the institutional framework to ensure institutional sustainability seemed low due to ineffective project implementation in capacity building. The TER gives a Moderately Likely rating to the overall sustainability of the project.

Financial resources: The TE reports that Rwanda and Uganda had shown commitment to support financially the project achievement, while in Tanzania there was an improvement in governmental support and investment and saving capacities of communities like VICOBA. “Financial capacities have also been developed at the community level that should contribute to the financial sustainability of project achievements at this level. The project intervention has substantially enhanced the savings of communities and also established saving institutions in villages within the project sites; it even led to the foundation of an own District Bank in Uganda” (TE pg 37). Thus, the financial risks for this project seem moderately unlikely.

Socio-political: The TE does not assess the socio-political risks in the project’s sustainability, but it mentions that although most governments had positive attitude for the project, none of them “changed their policies and development frameworks to integrate the SLaM approach supported by the project” (TE pg 13).

Institutional framework and governance: The project was unable to build institutional capacity at national level as it did not transform laws at the national level and was ineffective in introducing related by-laws. However, at regional level, the Nile Basin Initiative and East African Community could play a role in long-term responsibility for transboundary cooperation, hence, ensuring the sustainability of land

and agro-ecosystem management in the Kagera basin. At community level, “the sustainability of FFS groups, which depends on their registrations as legal entities, should continue to collaborate on further promoting SLM at the catchment level, with the planning of SLM implementation activities at the catchment level to be conducted by the catchment committees” (TE pg 37).

Environmental: the TE provides a positive outlook on environmental sustainability because the project implemented SLM activities effectively in pilot communities and transferred SLM technologies including training. “Environmental sustainability was also strengthened through the handing over of knowledge produced with the support of the project to governmental institutions at the end of the project”. Thus, environmental sustainability is likely.

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?

The actual co-financing of $16,593,193 was much less than the expected amount of $24,509,210. This was due to a long delay in starting the project. Out of the four project countries, Burundi and Uganda met their co-financing commitments, while Tanzania and Rwanda fell short of providing expected co-financing (TE pgs 13 & 77).

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

The project faced a long delay in starting and there were subsequent delays in implementation. The TE mentions that some of the delays were related to late disbursements “due to FAO requirement of appropriate and timely reporting before the next instalment could be made. This requirement overstretched the reporting capacities of some local partners, which had received less formal education. In some cases, these delays to receive the funds (instalments on contract agreements) impacted negatively the scheduling of targeted agricultural activities by reporting these activities to the next season. Furthermore, these delays also impacted the FFS groups which got discouraged and sometimes lost their members” (TE pg 12).

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 the project had good ownership from the governments. Government representatives were part of the steering committee, and the national committees were highly engaged and had good relationships with the project managers. However, many of the project assignments were allocated to international consultancies, which may not have created local ownership that was particularly needed to tackle transboundary issues (TE pg 34).

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 project documents provided for a monitoring and reporting system at all three levels of project execution, performance, and impact evaluation. The project had provision for baseline information, inception workshop, semi-annual reports, quarterly implementation reviews, technical reports, and regular technical supervision missions, mid-term evaluation, and terminal evaluation. The project logframe provided performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with the corresponding means of verification. There would also be a "basin-wide information centre that will be established to monitor change in the status of natural resources, agro-ecosystems and impact on livelihoods will contribute to the preparation of these reports" (TE pgs 58-59). The project had a budget of $281,000 for M&E implementation. Considering the provision for M&E components in the project design, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating.

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

The TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E implementation as there were flaws in the use of the M&E system. The TE states that the project delivered quarterly reports on national and regional level, six-monthly reports, project implementation reviews, and mid-term evaluation. During mid-term evaluation, the project decreased the list of indicators and all of them met the SMART criteria accompanied by a set of targets. However, the TE mentions that the "limited use of the M&E system and the absence of an applied research component have led to the general lack of impact data throughout the project, particularly data on global benefits such as carbon sequestration, nutrient and hydrological cycling, but also on local benefits like yields and incomes, etc. This limitation has affected the project throughout its cycle" (TE pg 84).

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

FAO was the implementing agency for the project, and as per the TE, it provided backstopping support at the technical level. The support benefited the project and steering committee, but the support was not equal in all the four countries. Some of the project teams felt that "they did not receive advice or feedback from Headquarters. They did not know if reports were accepted or not and how reports could be improved. Additionally, these teams stated that backstopping on administration issues was almost inexistent due to unclear FAO project administration rules. The reason for these weaknesses was attributed to weaknesses of some links in the service delivery chains within FAO" (TE pg 11).

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The project was executed by a different agency in each country: the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) in Rwanda; the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) in Uganda; the Division of the Environment, Vice President's Office (DOE/VPO) in Tanzania, and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MINAGRI) in Burundi of the four project countries had a National Project Manager. These agencies set up a Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) for cross-country coordination and implementation of the project. The terminal evaluation found that RCU and project steering committees were well organized, "but the coordination among the various bodies and the project staff was not used to their full extent. As a result, the assessment expressed in the MTR, that the project is made up of four juxtaposed sub-projects, which are not really integrated and which create little synergetic effect at the regional level, remained valid until the end of the project" (TE pg 11).

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.

As per the TE, the project has "substantially enhanced the bio-productivity and ecological health of agroecosystems within the Kagera Basin and at the same time enhanced transboundary benefits through the reduction of water stress caused by the sedimentation due to erosion within the ecosystems of the basin countries" (TE pg 38).

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 project created “tremendous economic vibrancy in some areas; in particular where farmers could convert from extensive land management to sustainable forms of land management, and by extension improving livelihood, which allowed many farmers to build new houses and give their children an appropriate education” (TE pg 38).

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 project helped in training the farmers, providing knowledge on SLM and transferring essential technology to improve land protection and agricultural production. The knowledge exchange through “the creation of Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) and producer groups through these FFSs - gave an important signal to the traditional extension approach in place in the four countries” (TE pg 38).

b) Governance: The TE does not report any impact on governance.

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

No unintended impacts are reported in the TE.

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 does not report of any mainstreaming or upscaling of the GEF initiatives.

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 provided key lessons learnt from the project (TE pg 38):

1) Although the combination of LADA tools, the FFS approach and the WOCAT tools provided a useful framework to address combined problems of land degradation and agricultural productivity, the project would benefit from quantification of agricultural production factors and environmental stocks and flows;
2) It is more effective to promote and disseminate knowledge through CBOs than commercial service providers;
3) In order to produce a change at policy level, there needs to be more constant and targeted actions with activities focusing on the integration of policies into regulatory frameworks;
4) There needs to be a viable monitoring system for environmental services to implement PES. "Generally, the capacity of PES to generate revenues is currently overestimated; the PES approach is still in its infancy. Therefore, before a PES approach is integrated into projects or programs, it would be better to experiment first with projects which only build monitoring capacities for environmental flows and test the feasibility of PES schemes instead of integrating PES into projects, whose overall objectives are devoted to other purposes" (TE pg 38); and
5) There is a potential in enhancing income generation options for farmers solely by improving current farming technologies and integrating them into landscape or watershed planning.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE report provided following recommendations (TE pg 42):

1) "Institutional capacity development and collection of key data, such as of agricultural production factors and environmental stocks and flows within agroecosystems should receive higher attention, to enhance impacts of FAO's knowledge management strategies and facilitate adaptive learning";
2) "The SLM Monograph, the reported WOCAT tools and other technical information products should be updated with knowledge on nutrient and water flows as influenced by land degradation and the various SLaM technologies in an appropriate quantitative way. Nutrient transport through pastoralism or livestock movements in general should also be included. In particular, the project should analyze more critically the nutrient flows through integration of livestock.";
3) "Manuals should be produced for FFS facilitators and farmers themselves. They should contain clear advice on water and nutrient management through various technologies transported through SLaM and standard data. These manuals should include information such as how many animals of which type would be needed to produce how much manure; how much quantity would have to be applied on which types of soils to improve how much yields for which types of crops. The same information should be given for the application of wood-ash, compost, chemical fertilizer, and for fertilizer trees";
4) "Provide also standard figures in these manuals on nutrient demand for nutrient flows translated into farmers' practices (composting, wood-ash, fertilizations, agroforestry contrasted to nutrient demands for various crops) and provide additional training activities";
5) "Integrate carbon sequestration into SLaM planning through improved understanding of underlying carbon balances in SLaM technologies";

6) “Avoid overestimation of PES as a financing option and ensure appropriate monitoring before implementing PES schemes”; and
7) “Analyze the full working calendars of women and identify critical points where their labor burdens could be reduced or shared with men (for instance water / food fetching, fire making, cooking, etc..) and how the value of these activities could be estimated and paid for. Ensure that monetary activities do not require overstretching women’s physical capacities and instead ensure that all types of work are rewarded similarly without at the same time discriminating their access to income generating activities”.

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 IEO 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 contains an elaborate assessment of the outcomes and achievements, however, more detail under impact section is needed.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report explains the project well and provides evidence to support its analysis. This TER was conducted blind on ratings, so the extent to which ratings were well substantiated cannot be assessed..	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report's assessment of sustainability covers most factors excluding socio-political risks. The TE does not provide an assessment of the project's exit strategy.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are not comprehensive enough and need more details.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides co-financing information as well as project costs.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE assesses the M&E systems well but needs more detail.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

Other than TE and PD, the report used MTR for information.