

# GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		220	
GEF Agency project ID		206	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development in the Federal Islamic Republic of Comoros	
Country/Countries		Comoros	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		2-Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Rural Development, Fisheries and Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		one of the beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement		No involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		8/26/1997	
Effectiveness date / project start		11/24/1997	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		11/23/2002	
Actual date of project completion		11/23/2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.35	2.35
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.59	0.29
	Government		
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		2.35	2.35
Total Co-financing		0.59	0.29
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.94	2.64
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Nov-2002	
TE submission date		11/7/2002	
Author of TE		Dominique Roby	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Baastel	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Antonio Del Monaco	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		05/20/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	N/A	N/A	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	N/A	N/A	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	U
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	U
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	UA
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	U
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/A	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project document states that the project is to play a lead role in reducing further loss of unique ecosystems and valuable habitats of the Comoros, and to effectively manage biological diversity.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective proposed at the start of the project as described in the PD, is the following: “Through implementation of the biodiversity components of the National Environmental Policy and the Environmental Action Plan, biodiversity conservation contributes to the sustainable development of the Comoros and maintains the islands’ unique natural heritage.”

The immediate project objectives to be achieved are:

- (1) To create a participatory institutional framework to oversee biodiversity conservation and management at all levels.
- (2) To build the capacity for biodiversity management at the local, regional, and national levels.
- (3) To mobilize financial mechanisms at the national and local levels to ensure the sustainability of biodiversity conservation efforts.
- (4) To establish a national network of marine and terrestrial protected areas in accordance with the priority sites as nationally identified.
- (5) To design and implement action plans for the conservation of species with global significance both inside and outside the national network of protected areas.
- (6) To strengthen public commitment to biodiversity conservation through information and awareness raising activities.
- (7) To initiate environmentally sustainable economic development alternatives to reduce pressure on endangered species and degraded ecosystems.

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

There was no change reported.

## 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.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The Project for the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development in the Comoros is in line with the National orientations, especially with the Environmental Action Plan (PAE) and the National Policy on Environment (PNE). According to the TE, through its various components, the project meets a series of PNE objectives and sub-objectives. The approach selected by the project in order to meet its objectives is also in line with the PNE implementation strategy and action plan which include strengthening or revising of certain laws or sectoral codes concerning protected areas, implementation measures regarding the training of specialists, population education and awareness-raising, and the conservation and development of the national heritage. The project design based on PA participatory management is also consistent with the basic principles of sustainable development adopted by the country. The Declaration on Sustainable Development recognizes the essential character of community participation in the country’s development and the fundamental nature of the linkages between sustainable development and sound natural resource management.

The project is also relevant to GEF strategies that focus on conservation of biodiversity. According to the PD, the Comoros Islands have a rich terrestrial ecology and marine biology which is threatened by population pressure. Therefore, this project is relevant to the operational program of the GEF “Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems “.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
--------------------------	--

According to the TE, the project contributed to establishing protected areas and to improving PA management by building capacity of key local actors. TE states that the project activities have had important positive outcomes in that they strengthened capacities, in particular within the grassroots communities, established a legal and operational framework and developed technical skills for the collaborative management and sustainable use of biodiversity. The following results were achieved by the project:

- (1) the Mohéli Marine Park is operational with collaborative management agreements with each of the riparian villages. Although they do not know the legal texts, communities are aware of the prohibitions concerning them. Regulations are effectively enforced, in that the violators are denounced by the ecoguards and the public at large.
- (2) The village communities established in the vicinity of Livingstone fruit bat nesting sites were made aware of the significance of the conservation of this species. This resulted from their involvement with Action Comores in identifying areas to be protected and steps to be taken to preserve nesting sites.
- (3) The Marine Turtle conservation Action Plan is being implemented in coordination with project partners and the communities concerned.
- (4) Partnerships were created with several organizations, the Centre of the Study and Discovery of Marine Turtles of La Réunion, the Jersey Wildlife Trust the Bristol Zoo, Action, Comores UK and Megaptera, which will be involved in the conservation of threatened species.
- (5) A considerable sum of knowledge was acquired by the project team in terms of project management, negotiating with the communities, teamwork, and participatory management of protected areas with grassroot communities.

However, some major gaps in the achievement of objectives were noticed by the TE. The efforts made within the project resulted mainly in the establishment of structures and the elaboration of basic documents. One of the project main objectives was to create a PA network. The process of the creation of protected areas is under way but it needs to be consolidated and supported to ensure durability, at the time of TE, only one PA had been established. According to the TE, it is also important to support mobilization of the expertise developed within the project as it is not yet incorporated in any structure and the entities in charge of environment have developed no expertise in connection with the establishment of a protected area based on collaborative management agreements with village communities. Moreover, another major objective of the project that was not achieved is the creation of a trust fund. Finally, the last major shortcoming was that only one specie (marine turtle) was the subject of an action plan, while the PD identified three species for priority conservation.

4.3 <b>Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	--

Overall the efficiency of the project is Moderately Satisfactory.

According to the TE, information on the inputs (financial and human resources) allocated for the implementation of each project activity was absent, and therefore it was difficult to evaluate the

efficiency of the project. An activity budget was established only as projections and only for two years, and it is impossible to know the actual use that was made of the resources budgeted for this period.

However, according to the TE, there was “a disproportion between the objectives as initially set and the resources allocated to achieve them, in terms of time”. This project based on an iterative approach and working with the village populations to interest and involve them in the collaborative management process as envisioned, while also undertaking the elaboration of the legal texts to frame the process, raising awareness among the public at large, establishing a sustainable funding mechanism, formulating action plans for the conservation of threatened species and other activities would have required considerably more time. The project attempted to develop all the capacities required for biodiversity conservation in a difficult context, a politically unstable one, where everything had to be done. A larger team might not necessarily have made the task easier. The TE states that the only requirement was that key positions be filled by very competent people.

Moreover, the fact that the location of the coordination office in Moroni, Ngazidja is far from the main project implementation site caused delays in management and operations and a doubling of certain expenses. The fact that the language for communication and production was English also caused some delays in project implementation as none of the Comorians on the team, except the technical advisor, were proficient in this language.

The Capacity 21 funds were not allocated to the project. Thus, the total budget available to implement the project was cut by US\$595,000. This situation necessitated negotiations with other financial partners, such as the French cooperation. In the end, additional funds were allocated to the project to offset this budget cut, in addition to unforeseen gains.

A last point that needs to be mentioned is the fact that some of the Target for Resources Assignment from the Core (TRAC) resources were used for non-project activities, which took away some resources allocated to project implementation, but without really impacting its efficiency. The TE does not specify why this happened.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Unlikely</b>
--------------------	------------------------------------

The overall sustainability of the project is rated as moderately likely.

The process of creating protected areas is underway and the population is increasingly aware of the importance of protecting these areas to promote the sustainable use of biodiversity. The grassroots communities are the direct project beneficiaries, the project team thus focused its information

gathering efforts regarding the impact of the project on the villages involved in the Park collaborative management. The village communities have been made aware of the prohibition measures and appear to abide by them. In general, they also seem to understand well the collaborative management agreements signed by the associations. However, the development of the Mohéli Marine Park was limited to the coastal and marine areas in the southern part of Mwali island, without including the land areas upstream. According to the TE, this decreases the chances of conservation of the ecosystems and resources of the coastal marine environment which is exposed to the impacts of the activities and deforestation occurring within watershed located upstream of the Park shores.

Financing of Mohéli Marine Park operations is not assured. The project did not put into place stable and autonomous sources of funds based on which it could have implemented biodiversity conservation projects. External funding is thus required to ensure the continuity of those measures.

The village communities have not acquired sufficient capacities to negotiate collaborative management agreements. This may come from the fact that they have not been associated with the decision process which led to the identification of the Park's management scheme and management plan.

There is also a lack of an operational mechanism to support integration of biodiversity and environmental concerns in sectoral policies.

Moreover, the institutional context did not permit the creation of the National Council for Sustainable Development, which would have contributed to institutional sustainability because of an increased capacity for independent planning.

Finally, training did not always contribute to filling the gaps in terms of capacities to assume functions required to design and implement conservation actions using a participatory approach. Mobilization of the expertise developed within the project was not incorporated in any structure and the entities in charge of environment have developed no expertise in connection with the establishment of a protected area based on collaborative management agreements with village communities.

## **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?

According to the PD, the expected financing was a joint contribution of UNDP-GEF of US\$2.3 million representing 80% of the total budget, and of the UNDP Capacity 21 Programme of US\$0.6 for the remaining 20%.

However, during most of the implementation, the Capacity 21 funds were not allocated to the project and it is only during the last quarter of 2001 that it was definitely confirmed that they would not be allocated. According to the TE, this confirmation was not accompanied by an official letter from UNDP specifying that the amount initially allocated would not be available. The total budget available to implement the project was thus cut by US\$0.6 million. Since the contract was passed directly with the Government, IUCN, as an executing agency, could not negotiate nor demand that UNDP meet its commitment. The TE states that as a result, the project found itself compelled to seek additional financial resources. This consisted in negotiations aimed at having the French Government bear the cost of the TA's salary under a cofounding arrangement and a request for support to the French Cooperation.

Additional funds were thus allocated to the project to offset this budget cut, in addition to unforeseen gains:

- (1) an amount of US\$150,000 from TRAC resources, an internal UNDP fund, was allocated to the project in May 2002 to cover the costs of equipment procurement and operationalizing the PMM, the training costs of the UNDP programme officer and the operationalizing of the DGE.
- (2) An amount of US\$83,420 from UNDP resources was allocated informally (no formal documents) for the elaboration of the projected trust fund arrangement.
- (3) In 2002, an amount of US\$20,000 from the French Cooperation was attributed for the inauguration of the PMM and for awareness and information activities such as the Turtle Newsletter.
- (4) Gains were recorded as a result of favourable currency exchange rates, increasing the budget by an amount of US\$88,000.
- (5) In 2002, the project was awarded the Equator Prize in the amount of US\$30,000.

The impact of non-disbursement of Capacity 21 funds concerned mainly the amounts allocated to the technical advisors, the consultants, training activities and supervision by IUCN (TE, pg.18). For the locally-managed budget, the shortfall concerns mainly travel and mission expenses, some training costs within workshops, expenses for office maintenance, equipment and field material and education and awareness-raising material, insurance and operation and maintenance costs for the project vehicle and boat, and the fund for conservation activities. Therefore, even though the project came up short of the expected cofinancing, it did not have major impact on the outcomes.

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 did not experience major delays. Some minor delays were recorded by the TE, however they did not have any impact on the overall project schedule:

- (1) The direct payment request procedure is a long one and, on several instances, project schedule was affected by disbursement delays. UNDP's control of each expenditure normally takes one month, but sometimes required more time.
- (2) The location of the coordination office in Moroni, Ngazidja, reduces the relevance of the TA and NC who find themselves removed from the main project implementation site. This causes delays in management and operations and a doubling of certain expenses.
- (3) Upon the departure of staff members holding key positions within the team, it had been suggested that UNDP recruitment procedures be followed. This was the subject of a recommendation by the Steering Committee at the time of the replacement of the national project coordinator. This recommendation was subsequently invalidated by the General Director of Environment. This had an impact on project activities, due to the additional work involved and resulting delays.

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 ownership from the local community was strong. However, ownership from the government was very weak. According to the TE, except for the Mwali Regional Environment Service, which collaborated closely with the project, the DGE did not support significantly the project and failed to understand the role expected of the Government in terms of providing orientations and guidance to the project as the legal executing agency. No administrator in charge of protected areas was appointed at the General Directorate for Environment, which means that there was no guarantee that the project staff would be able to implement the expected activities. Thus, ownership from the DGE was a failure and this could have an impact on the sustainability of the project gains as it is not yet operating independently.

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-------------------------------

The M&E design is rated as Unsatisfactory.

One of the weaknesses in project preparation and design mentioned by the TE is the project logframe. The indicators identified focus on verifying the completion of activities rather than the achievement of



outputs or outcomes intended as a result of the activities. Therefore, this had an impact on project implementation as in some cases the project focused on activity completion without adequately monitoring the effects of the activity on the ultimate beneficiaries. In addition, the logframe did not specify explicitly the direct and indirect actual beneficiaries of each output and sub-output, which would have helped the project team to better monitor project outcomes.

Moreover, the PD does not mention any M&E plan.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

The M&E implementation is Unsatisfactory.

The administrative authorities in charge of project monitoring were DGE, MPE General Secretary, and the GEF Focal Point. According to the TE, the M&E was very weak, one of the reason would be the work overload experienced by the project team probably did not permit adequate monitoring of the effects of the activities, another reason could be the choice of indicators that did not allow for optimal use of the time and effort invested in the Monitoring & Evaluation exercises.

The TE recommends that when using a Project Steering Committee, Project Advisory or Overseeing Committee, it is imperative to explain clearly what their roles are to ensure that their decisions and recommendations are respected. Moreover, if and when formulating a new budget, care should be taken to include appropriate financial resources to enable adequate monitoring and evaluation of each activity.

## **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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to assess</b>
--	---------------------------------

The quality of project implementation cannot be assessed given the very limited information available.

The support from UNDP was required in view of the lack of national capacities to meet urgent needs in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. In the Comoros, UNDP provided its support several times before this project (for the elaboration of an Environmental Action Plan, for a reflection exercise on sustainable development during which the Comorian Government adopted its Declaration on Sustainable Development, etc.)

During this project, the additional raised funds were managed by UNDP. However, in the TE and in the PIR there is no information on the quality of UNDP support.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
---	-------------------------------

According to the PD, the project is executed by the Ministry of Production and Environment (MPE) of the Comorian Government, with the technical assistance of the Eastern Africa Regional Office of the World Conservation Union (IUCN). The MPE is the Executing Agency and it devolves its responsibilities as regards project activities planning and management to the Directorate General of Environment (DGE).

An issue that was mentioned by the TE but which seems to have affected only slightly project implementation is the high turnover of key individuals in charge of execution. For example, the National Coordinator, the Chief Technical advisor and the Natural Resource Management Technical advisor, among others, left and were replaced during the implementation phase. This had an impact on project activities, due to the additional work resulting from the recruitment procedures and the resulting delays in implementation.

The TE states that the support provided by the IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office was not always adequate in terms of technical expertise and presence on the ground. Moreover, the DGE did not support significantly the project and failed to understand the role expected of the Government in terms of providing orientations and guidance to the project as the legal executing agency. According to the TE, there was no administrator in charge of protected areas that was appointed at the General Directorate for Environment. This means that there was no guarantee that the project staff would be able to continue the activities and the process that they have been implementing.

The project was reviewed by the Steering Committee once per year in order to receive feedback on project management and implementation. However one of the recommendations of the Steering Committee has been invalidated by the General Director of Environment which impinged upon the role of the Steering Committee and made this project management structure inefficient

Overall the project execution is Unsatisfactory.

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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 main results obtained in terms of environment are positive, according to the TE, and the project achieved the objective of rapidly producing visible results in view of the urgent need to act for the protection of environment in the Comoros by establishing and inaugurating the Mohéli Marine Park (PMM). Studies monitoring the coral reef health status noted a regeneration of corals in some areas within the PMM. PMM riparian populations declare they saw an improvement in marine resources and their availability in PMM territory since regulations were implemented.

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.

According to the TE, an impact resulting from the stricter fishing regulations was to heighten the existing conflict among fishermen between those using lines and others using nets and guns.

No other socioeconomic impacts are mentioned in the TE and in the PIR.

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 had an impact on the village communities. Although they do not know the legal texts, they are aware of the prohibitions concerning them. Regulations are effectively enforced but sanctions are not always applied. The village communities have been made aware of the prohibition measures and appear to abide by them thanks to the training and awareness activities carried out by the project. The collaborative management agreements signed by the associations are generally well understood by the communities.

Additionally, the capacities of the management committee were developed in line with the role it is to play in managing the Park. However, due to its recent creation, it was not possible to reach a degree of self-sufficiency enabling it to manage the Park in a manner that would take into consideration the interests of the ten villages and the other stakeholders.

The development of the capacities of the administrative authorities in charge of environment to provide orientations for the conservation measures targeted within the project failed to produce the expected impacts. According to the TE, the DGE remained on the sidelines, with the project nevertheless providing it occasional logistical support, mostly by responses to ad hoc requests, while also depending upon this body to approve all expenditures in connection with project activities.

#### b) Governance

The implementation of this project allowed for the elaboration of the Conservation Action Plans for threatened species. CAPs for marine turtles, the Livingstone fruit bat and the coelacanth involved the participation both of the village communities concerned by these resources and of partner individuals or scientific institutions. However, the CAPs for the Livingstone fruit bat and the coelacanth are yet to be implemented, only the marine turtle CAP could be implemented during the project.

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.

According to the TE, the associations in seven of the ten PMM villages received support for IGAs: ecotourism infrastructure projects in the three pilot villages received financing (bungalow, food service areas) ; three other villages received a motorized boat; one village purchased a coffee bean huller. The ecotourism infrastructures are operational and the motorized boats and the huller were delivered. It is not clear, however, that those measures targeting village associations are adequately offsetting the losses resulting from prohibitions and restrictions ensuing from the establishment of the PA. Individuals particularly penalized are the fishermen using guns and nets who invested in their production equipment and to whom no compensation is provided. Neither do the women who can no longer exercise their fishing activities, catching octopus and using tephrosia, benefit from measures provided by the project.

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.

There is no adoption of the project initiatives mentioned in the TE, or in the PIR.

## 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.

There is no lesson formulated in the TE.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are formulated in the TE:

- (1) Integral application of the UNDP procedures for National Execution (NEX) could improve project management efficiency by reducing delays currently experienced in payments. However, the Government will need to see that the executing agency possesses the requisite capacities in terms of expertise and availability of human and material resources, so that it is capable of applying this procedure in an effective and efficient manner.
- (2) When elaborating any new logframe, establish the budget on the basis of expected results and activities planned to achieve such results within the structure of the logframe, and provide an organizational chart specifying functional and line relationships among the entities and individuals involved in the project.
- (3) Set up a time-management system in order to monitor the time allotted by the technical staff to project activities.
- (4) When establishing new PAs, locate the coordination office in close proximity to the intervention area in order to optimize management efficiency and activities.
- (5) When entering into an agreement with an agency to provide technical support, ensure that the level of the support provided is adapted to the needs and capacities of the field team and not limited to administrative support.

## 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	The report contains an adequate assessment	<b>S</b>

contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	(including a description of gaps) of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project in relation to the project objectives. Indicators were elaborated by the TE team in order to allow the evaluation team to better assess the efficacy of project activities.	
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE appears to be internally consistent. However, the TE does not provide any explicit ratings on the various aspects of project management and achievements.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE provides a clear and lucid assessment the potential sustainability of the project outcomes and suggests a detailed exit strategy.	<b>S</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	There is no section on lessons learned in the TE, which would have been useful. However, there are large sections of recommendations all along the TE report.	<b>MS</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE contains a table that compiles the funds initially allocated to the project and the available amounts at the end of the project. Total project cost has not been broken down per activity.	<b>MS</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is not assessed in the TE, and is only briefly mentioned.	<b>HU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

**Overall TE rating = (0.3 \* (5+3)) + (0.1 \* (5+4+4+1)) = 2.4 + 1.4 = 3.8 = MS**

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