

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 2423		Review date: 02/10/2010		
IA/EA Project ID: GFL/4821		at endorsement (Million US\$)	0.395	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name: Assessment of existing capacity and capacity building needs to analyze POPs in developing countries		GEF financing: IA/EA own:	0.115	0.115
Country: Global		Government:	0.746	0.719
		Other*:	0.060	0.060
		Total Cofinancing	0.921	0.894
Operational Program: OP14: Persistent Organic Pollutants		Total Project Cost:	1.316	1.278
IA: UNEP		Dates		
Partners involved: UNEP Chemicals, World Bank, MEDPOL, Canada, GTZ, Convention Secretariats		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Jan 2005
		Closing Date	Proposed: Jan 2007	Actual: June 2008
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by: Ines Angulo	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 24	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 42 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 18 months
Author of TE: J. Albaiges, UNEP		TE completion date: Feb. 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: Feb 2009	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 0

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	HS	S	S	HS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	L	ML	ML	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	HS	HS	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	S	HS	HS	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

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

Yes, this terminal evaluation report is comprehensive, including detailed assessments of project outcomes, costs, implementation, and sustainability.

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

No such findings were noted in the report.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

As stated in the Project appraisal document, the overall objective of the project was “to assess the convention-driven country needs for laboratory analysis [of POPs] and the conditions necessary to conduct them in a sustainable manner, including on a regional basis if appropriate.” Additionally, the project launched a pilot study to examine “the feasibility of establishing a fully equipped laboratory in a developing country that may be able to analyze all twelve POPs.”

There were no changes in the global environmental objectives of the project during implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

The development objective of the project as stated in the Project appraisal document was to “assist Parties in developing country regions or regions with economies in transition to provide their contribution to the global evaluation” of POPs pursuant to the Stockholm Convention (p. 5). This project was designed to assess national laboratory capacities with the aims of (i) developing an inventory of laboratory capacity for POPs analysis, (ii) certifying POPs laboratories based on criteria established in this project, and (iii) developing or strengthening laboratory capacity in three regions (p. 8).

The expected project outcomes as outlined in the Project appraisal document were to:

- a) Establish a Core Group and hold 2 Core Group Meetings; one at the start of the project and one before starting the feasibility study;
- b) Analyze past experience and lessons learnt to establish what has worked and what has not;
- c) Analyze existing capacity worldwide and regionally based on earlier efforts and responses to the UNEP Chemicals questionnaire;
- d) Analyze and compare the needs and requirements for analysis from a national point of view with those of the Stockholm Convention effectiveness evaluation;
- e) Evaluate the needs for (i) harmonization of analytical sampling/identification/ quantification methods, (ii) accreditation of laboratories, (iii) quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) and (iv) round robins for POPs;
- f) Identify technical and political conditions for sustainability, including the economic and qualitative feasibility of regional labs, especially with regard to keeping technical expertise, to ensure that the regional laboratories would be sufficiently used;
- g) Identify suitable countries with urgent data development needs e.g. in the Southern hemisphere and convene 3 regional workshops with participants from countries with either existing laboratories (to be upgraded) or from countries interested in setting up laboratories;
- h) Perform a feasibility study based on the outcome of b) to f) above in a developing country in one region;

There were no changes in development objectives during implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or an unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

<p>a. Relevance</p> <p>Project outcomes were consistent with the GEF OP-14 on persistent organic pollutants and national priorities regarding implementation of the Stockholm Convention. Strengthening the analytical capacity of laboratories in developing countries is relevant for the creation of Convention related National Implementation Plans (NIPs) and for fostering a POPs Global Monitoring Plan (GMP). The outcomes from this project will also help the Parties to the Convention implement the provisions for monitoring and for the effectiveness evaluation as set out in Article 16.</p> <p>The project relies on the experience gained by the UNEP Chemicals Unit through its on-going capacity-building program and the great number of workshops on POPs awareness raising, on management of POPs, from the POPs Global Monitoring Program and other technical issues related to the convention. The project is directly linked to UNEP Governing Council decisions encouraging countries to ratify the POPs Convention and to take actions to facilitate voluntary implementation of the Convention prior to its entry into force.</p>	<p>Rating: S</p>
<p>b. Effectiveness</p> <p>This project has successfully met or exceeded targeted outputs in analyzing county needs for laboratory capacity and producing tools for enhancing the global monitoring of POPs. Project outcomes are largely commensurate with expected outcomes, with the only change being in the design of the feasibility study. The TE report notes that the methodologies used for building a databank of laboratories, creating the technical documents, and training activities were “sound and efficient” and rates most project outputs highly (p. 8).</p> <p>The project was implemented in two phases. Phase I identified analysed and established the needs of countries to fulfil the requirements of the Stockholm convention for the sustainable monitoring of POPs. During this phase inter-calibration studies were performed and a set of criteria was established to classify laboratories. The project collected data on 204 laboratories from all five UN regions, highlighting certain gaps in analysis capacity in a number of sub-regions. This information, accessible via an online database, is a major project outcome and critical to the implementation of a Global POPs Monitoring Program.</p> <p>Phase II of the project successfully addressed the strategic priority of developing countries’ capacities to monitor and analyze POPs in accordance with international standards, and to contribute to the global effectiveness evaluation undertaken by the Conference of the Parties. During the regional workshops at phase 1 it became clear that the creation of regional POPs laboratories, funded by multiple countries in the region, was not desirable and that countries preferred to build upon existing national laboratories by having them assessed, trained, and improved. The Core Group accepted this change and subsequently, a broader approach was taken. This did not affect the indicators or the outputs, but did disperse investments. Instead of focusing on a central regional laboratory, the project created a network of laboratories with vastly improved capacities.</p> <p>Nine pilot laboratories, in seven countries, were selected for the Phase II feasibility study. Activities were implemented through on-site training sessions at the nine laboratories, including the introduction of new performance based methods, validation of these methods, and adoption of quality assurance/quality control regimes.</p> <p>The project workshops and training sessions brought together national, regional and international level stakeholders as well as academic experts. The project also implicated private companies in providing technical support and supplying consumables. The only weakness in project outcomes noted in the TE report is the weak involvement of stakeholders from the public policy sector (p. 9).”</p>	<p>Rating: HS</p>
<p>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</p> <p>Based on information in the TE report, project implementation proceeded smoothly and all the targeted project outcomes were achieved in an efficient and in a timely manner. The actual project costs were slightly less than outlined in the Project appraisal document budget, due to the private sector contributions. The TE report notes that the “resources initially allocated for each activity, supplemented with those additionally leveraged, were efficiently utilized to achieve the planned results.” The TE report does not provide a comparison of the cost-effectiveness of this project with other, similar, GEF funded projects, but does rate project efficiency highly in relation to the planned activities and timeline. This rating is supported by the project record from the APRs.</p> <p>Based on information in the APRs, the project was extended twice and closed in June 2008, 18 months later than planned. This was due to a delay in approving the last procurement of laboratory spare parts and consumables for the feasibility study. However, from the APRs and the TE report, all project activities appear to have been completed by June 2007. This delay had no impact on the cost-effectiveness of the overall project.</p>	<p>Rating: HS</p>

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

The project has had impacts at the national and international levels. The primary impact is the improved performance of the participant laboratories. The pilot laboratories are now better equipped in terms of instrumentation and personnel capacity. These labs are fully acquainted with the quality control aspects of POPs analysis, are participating in inter-calibration exercises and implementing measures to further enhance their capabilities. These laboratories are in some cases training other national labs in POPs analysis and disseminating project results. At the international level, elements of the guidance document produced by this project on the criteria for POPs analysis have been included into the Stockholm Convention guidance document for the Global POPs Monitoring Plan, which was adopted by the 3rd Conference of the Parties in 2007.

An unintended impact has been the establishment of a de-centralized approach for satisfying the provisions of the Stockholm Convention. Instead of relying on a central regional laboratory for all POPs analyses, this project has demonstrated that POPs monitoring can be accomplished through a network of laboratories (like the 9 in this pilot project) specializing in different types of analyses. The pilot laboratories from this project also have the potential to play a major role in the coordination of regional information for the Global GMP report and future GEF projects.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: ML
The participating countries have not committed sustained funding for the pilot laboratories participating in this project. But, the coming into effect of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) and government policies regarding POPs as well as the Global Monitoring Plan present possible business opportunities for these laboratories. These laboratories will be providing data and scientific experience to the regional POPs networks and to the regional reports required for the Convention's effectiveness evaluation. Private participation in this project was stronger than expected and may positively influence the sustainability of project outcomes through public-private partnerships.	
b. Socio political	Rating: MU
Based on information in the TE report, there are socio-political risks to the sustainability of project outcomes. The report notes that the project has done little to implicate political stakeholders or to counteract the generally "low-priority given to environmental protection in the political agenda." Diffusion of project results has been limited to a narrow tranche of scientific and policy experts. Environmental NGOs or civil society have not been implicated in the project and this presents risk to the sustainability of some project outcomes.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
National policies on POPs must be adopted to ensure the sustainability of project outcomes at the national level. The outcomes from Phase I of the project are being incorporated into the implementation framework for the Stockholm Convention by the UNEP. Based on the 2008 APRs, the laboratories participating in Phase II have stable management and institutional support through links to the UNEP and with each other. Implementation of the Global Monitoring Plan will help to strengthen the institutional framework under which these laboratories are operating and decrease the risks to sustainability.	
d. Environmental	Rating: L
Potential risks might arise from the improper disposal of laboratory chemicals and wastes. However, in this project all the pilot laboratory facilities were inspected and found appropriate for analyzing POPs. The laboratory facility evaluation included an assessment of environmental hazards and safeguard procedures according to international standards.	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
The project has developed a ranked database of laboratory facilities in the participating countries and a set of criteria for evaluating laboratory capacity for POPs analysis.
b. Demonstration
The pilot study upgrading 9 regional laboratories has shown that a regional approach to POPs analysis in developing countries is feasible and efficient. The outreach materials and reports, available in the website, will not only contribute to the diffusion of the results but also to encourage further stakeholder participation. Several presentations made at international conferences and authored publications will also enhance the visibility of the on-going projects on POPs.
c. Replication
Some of the participating laboratories have begun to organize training activities for other national labs and the project

experience is being used as a reference in designing new project on supporting the implementation of POPs monitoring.
d. Scaling up Outcomes from Phase I of the project are being incorporated in National Implementation Plans and into the UNEP's Global Monitoring Plan for POPs.

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The actual cofinancing amount of 0.894 Million (approx. 70% of total project costs), was slightly less than the proposed amount (\$0.921 M) due to lower than expected project costs. Co-financing included both cash (\$0.575 M) from donor countries and in-kind contributions (estimated at \$0.345 M) from the participating countries and from UNEP. Cofinancing was critical for achieving project objectives, as it funded preparatory work as well as the feasibility study, in-country training activities, the upgrading of laboratory infrastructure, and the testing of the guidance document.
b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The project closed 18 months later than planned, although all activities were completed by June 2007. The last procurement of laboratory spare parts and consumables in the context of the feasibility study was finalized with considerable delay by UNEP, leading to an extension of the project.
c. 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.
This project had a weak level of country ownership. The project was designed to address Convention-driven country needs, but it was not initiated by the participating countries. The main component of the project was technically rather than policy driven, therefore, country ownership by individual national governments has been limited. The national 'Focal Points' were involved in the planned activities, sending questionnaires and participating in the identification of participant laboratories, but had little substantial engagement with the project. This has not affected project outcomes in the short-term, but may have long-term implications for sustainability. The TE report notes that the project has not effectively improved countries' capacity to make policy decisions relating to POPs. This is a serious drawback considering that government officials at the policy level are responsible for preparing the ratification of the Convention and ministries will be charged with developing and executing a National Implementation Plan.

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

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): MS
The Project appraisal document did not set-up a separate monitoring and evaluation plan, but did include a logical framework and described the institutional arrangements for project M&E. The logical framework included a set of adequate and relevant indicators to measure progress towards objectives. The only weakness in the M&E plan was the lack of baselines at the beginning of the project. The Project's Core Group (UNEP, World Bank, MEDPOL, GTZ) was charge with oversight of onsite monitoring and evaluation activities.	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): S
Based on information in the TE report, the project's M&E plan was well implemented. The Core Group overseeing the project identified the need for baselines and implemented the necessary changes to the log-frame during implementation. There was a clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress which facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards objectives. Overall project performance was monitored through half-yearly reports to GEF and annual PIRs by UNEP Chemicals.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? There was no specific budget line for the M&E implementation. The TE report mentions that this was part of the UNEP in-kind contribution to the project.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? The TE report notes that the Core Group used M&E results to "improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs, (p. 25)." The project did apply the recommendations from the first regional workshop to shift focus from	

creating new regional labs to increasing the capacities of existing ones.

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.

The implementation of the M&E system can be considered a good practice as it provided real time feedback to the project management.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S

b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.

The IA for this project was UNEP. Overall, project implementation proceeded smoothly. The project was well designed with clearly defined objectives, and outputs that were feasible given the timeframe. The project document identified and properly determined the roles and responsibilities of the different participants. A Core Group, which consisted of representatives from the World Bank and the Secretariat of the Basel Convention (SBC) as well as from the three donor countries, namely Canada, Germany, and Japan provided on-going guidance and assistance. The choice of executing agency, UNEP Chemicals, was appropriate as this agency managed the process that led to the adoption of the Stockholm Convention on POPs.

The Core Group provided leadership for the project, establishing the work plan, timetable and the list of necessary documents for workshops. The Core Group was responsive to the priorities of participating countries and adapted the second phase of the program to develop existing national labs. Based on information in the TE report, the UNEP was efficient in providing the necessary supervision to the project team, as well as administrative and financial support. No administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints influencing the effective implementation of the project were identified, except for UNEP's delay in authorizing a final procurement of laboratory supplies. This delay was attributed to unspecified 'logistical issues' by the TE report and the 2008 PIR.

The financial aspects of the project were handled in duplicate by the UNEP Offices in Geneva and Nairobi. This arranged contributed to the transparent and reliable control of the project. The financial controls, including reporting and planning, were adequate. The TE report notes that all project expenditures are well documented. Excepting the delay in approving the final procurement for lab materials, the flow of funds to the project was timely.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale) HS

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

UNEP Chemicals was the executing agency for this project. UNEP was able to build on the experience gained through its on-going program of activities related to the Stockholm Convention. Overall, the project was executed according to the proposed timeline.

The EA maintained a strong focus on achieving project outcomes. The project manager was effective in coordinating project activities, responding in a timely manner to questions from the countries/laboratories, and providing technical expertise as requested. Based on information in the TE report, the designated country Focal Point persons were satisfied with the quality of interactions with the UNEP Chemicals team. The EA was instrumental in coordinating donations to the project from the private sector and in disseminating project results at international scientific conferences.

Management input from the IA and the Core Group adequately supported the project team. Project reports are detailed and realistic, reflecting the strengths and limitations of the implementation process. The project management team was also very successful in taking adaptive management measures, as in the case of expanding the feasibility study into include labs from seven countries. This was critical to ensuring country participation in the project.

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

1. The project has revealed that the effective contribution of developing countries/regions to the implementation of the Stockholm and Basel Conventions is a long-term process. The weaknesses of the laboratories and the needs for strengthening their performance have been evidenced. The initiated capacity building program demands a continued effort with an appropriate strategy at UNEP/GEF level. A good example in this direction is the laboratory databank built in the pilot phase of the project that will be maintained by UNEP, to serve the effectiveness evaluation and other activities of the Conventions.
2. In this program, the training of human resources is of particular importance. This activity, that was conveniently included in the feasibility study and successfully accomplished, encompassed not only practical training but also QA/QC activities. These have demonstrated their usefulness in providing the means for the laboratories to test their skills following the training programme and, therefore, should be continued in one way or the other.
3. However, besides the achievements of the present project, the technical difficulties encountered in performing comprehensive analysis of POPs in developing countries have been well documented. These refer from the availability of reference materials and other consumables or the lack of adequate instrumentation, to the limited expertise in the analysis of the matrices of reference in the GMP (air, blood and mother's milk) or the restricted access to open literature for updating the analytical protocols.
4. The adoption of a regional approach in implementing all these activities has proved to be the most convenient. To summarize, countries with similar problems and levels of development have very specific needs for capacity building that can be better addressed if the activities are organized on-site. A network of regional laboratories, assisted with dedicated workshops, provides the most adequate organization for identifying data gaps and priorities, developing on-going and collaborative research actions, and enhancing ownership/awareness of the outputs.
5. An important aspect in the whole process is the implication of the different project stakeholders, at national, regional and international levels. The project has successfully engaged the academic sector but the policy sector has been less directly concerned. On the contrary, the participation of private companies has constituted an unexpected success. Based on the experience, all these actors have to play a more important role in the future.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

1. Taking into account the key role that POPs analysis plays in the implementation of the Stockholm and Basel Conventions (e.g. NIPs, GMP, etc.), the production of guidance documents and enhancement of expertise in order to obtain reliable data for the different matrices, both on a geographical and temporal basis and the further mobilisation of financial resources should be continued through UNEP
2. The project outreach materials (including all reports) should be synthesised into reference materials for the further development of the Conventions. These documents should specially consider the adaptability of methods to the conditions in developing countries (e.g. low cost methods). A guidance document on monitoring (e.g. on what, where and when to sample) is particularly necessary as a complement of the GMP guide.
3. Creating an effective regional network of POPs laboratories is important. Based on the experience of the present project and the lessons learned, a more elaborated strategy for strengthening the regional implementation of the Convention should be adopted by the COP, under UNEP guidance. This strategy should enhance the visibility and links between regional laboratories, establish working groups and continue proficiency tests and inter-laboratory studies, as well as extend on-site laboratory capacity development to cover other POPs and other countries.
4. The mechanisms for stakeholder participation in projects aimed at building capacity should be improved to involve the policy makers and ministries responsible, to encourage basic laboratory investments, and to assist in developing POPs management actions. This will also contribute to the sustainability of the technical infrastructure.
5. A specific program for associating commercial companies to this initiative could bring important benefits. In any case, establishing a background support for the laboratories of these countries/regions, in the form of supply of basic consumables (e.g. standards, CRM, etc.) and access to information updating, should be seriously considered by the SC Secretariat and endorsed to UNEP/GEF for implementation. This could be complemented with a series of sponsored training events (e.g. "summer schools") and inter-calibration studies, as part of the laboratory capacity building activities.
6. As the potential long-term impact of the project is expected to be seen in a few years time, a review of the open literature should be performed periodically (e.g. every 4 years) by UNEP, as part of the assessment of the Convention, with the formulation of recommendations to fill the observed gaps.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

No other sources were consulted.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE report provides a comprehensive assessment of outcomes and impacts relative to the project's objectives.</p>	S
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The report is internally consistent with no major evidence gaps. The overall ratings are more favorable than the IA ratings in the last PIR.</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report contains a brief assessment of sustainability and the various types of risks.</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are well supported by the project experience and are comprehensive.</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The report contains detailed information on actual project costs by activity, as well as information on actual co-financing amounts.</p>	HS
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The assessment of the M&E system is brief and doesn't detail how the M&E system was used to improve performance or adapt to changing needs.</p>	S

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.