Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2631	
GEF Agency project ID		G FSP 6 / JO	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Mainstreaming Sustainable Land and Water Management Practices in Jordan	
Country/Countries		Jordan	
Region		Middle East	
Focal area		Land degradation; International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Land degradation (Strategic Program 1); International Waters (Strategic Program 3)	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) (referred to as Lead Project Agency)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		IUCN - partner	
Private sector involvement		N/A	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		August 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.350	0.350
	Co-financing	0.142	0.142
GEF Project Grant		6.445	N/A (6.445 at PIR 2015)
Co-financing	IA own	9.943	N/A (6.230 at MTR)
	Government	3.110	N/A (6.760 at MTR)
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	8.755	N/A (5.510 at MTR)
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	1.137 (beneficiaries)	N/A (0.930 at MTR)
Total GEF funding		6.795	N/A (6.795 at PIR 2015)
Total Co-financing		23.088	N/A (22.964 at PIR 2015)
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		29.883	N/A (29.759 at PIR 2015)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2016	
Author of TE		n/a	
TER completion date		February 14, 2017	
TER prepared by		Punji Leagnavar	
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	MS	MU	-	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	-	ML
M&E Design		NR	-	MU
M&E Implementation		NR	-	MU
Quality of Implementation		NR	-	S
Quality of Execution		NR	-	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project stated its purpose as: The Project shall minimize the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the integrity of Southern Highland ecosystems of the Jordan territory in line with the Hashemite Kingdom's National Action Plan (NAP) objectives (TE, p.5)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The goal of the project was: To reduce land degradation and promote the integration of an ecosystem-based approach into public-supported productive and poverty reduction activities; the latter designed to improve economic productivity of land, increase water use and irrigation efficiency and support communities affected by land degradation and water scarcity, supporting Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) best practices at the local level and contributing to SLM and IWRM mainstreaming at all levels (TE, p.5)

The expected outcomes as listed in the Project Document are (ProDoc, p.26-35).

- Outcome 1: Sustainable land and water management integrated into community-based natural resource planning.
- Outcome 2: Institutional structures and capacities enhanced at national and local levels to promote awareness, coalition building and scaling-up of SLM and water management for integrated ecosystem management and climate-proofing of rural production systems.
- Outcome 3: Land and water users in replicable PDEs adopt SLM and water management practices wherever they provide the greatest long term livelihood benefits
- Outcome 4: Effective information management to support decision making is developed and implemented from the project to the national levels
- Outcome 5: A model for participatory management (building on the existing ARMPII's management structure) implemented capable of ensuring the achievement of the projects objectives and goals, while ensuring continuity of selected activities for SLM beyond project life

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

No changes to the Dos or GEOs, but the outcomes changed since the Project Document.

In the CEO Document, outcome 5 changed to be: (1) Directorates of Agriculture, Water and environment following up and adopting activities beyond the international funding phase; and (2) Financial resources available to undertake activities and build up a funding mechanism for sustainability purposes. The indicators and targets also changed throughout the duration of the project. For instance, the project initially targeted to develop 55 Community Action Plans (CEO Endorsement) and by the PIR 2013, it only targeted to develop 35.

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 relevance of this project is rated *satisfactory* in the TER and TE. Below addresses the relevance to the GEF-4, national priorities in Jordan and to the beneficiaries of the project.

Relevance to GEF-4 strategy: The project was relevant to the strategy of GEF-4, specifically the Land Degradation and International Waters focal areas. For Land Degradation, the project aimed to mitigate the negative impacts of land degradation and desertification, and supported sustainable land management (SLM) interventions. It also catalyzed SLM investments, which is consistent with the LD Strategic Objective 1 and 2. In regards to International Waters, the project addressed the overuse and conflicting uses of surface water (one of the four water-related GEF-4 priorities). It supports the IW SP-3 because it works to promote water management practices and facilitated conflict management among water users in the East Dead Sea sub-basin. The project was also highly relevant to the MENARID Programme in GEF-4's programmatic framework (CEO Endorsement, p.9).

Relevance to Jordan's national priorities: The project was relevant and corresponded with national priorities related to conservation and agriculture. The country developed the National Strategy for Agricultural Development (2002-2010) which emphasized sustainable agriculture, the protection of natural resources and solutions to soil degradation. The project also supported Jordan's National Water Strategy by specifically working on ecosystem-based approaches to water planning, investments in

water harvesting, water reuse for irrigation and water information management (CEO Endorsement, p.10).

Relevance to beneficiaries: Small and medium farmers and communities in the arid regions of Jordan are vulnerable to climate change and need the tools and methods to confront climate variation. This project was relevant to their needs as it helped improve ecosystem resilience and integrity. The project targeted 11,000 direct beneficiaries (~1,900 households) in terms of adoption of best practices for SLM, improved water management and improved livelihoods (CEO Endorsement, p.11).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory

The TE rated project effectiveness as *moderately satisfactory.* This TER rates it as *moderately unsatisfactory*. The project experienced significant delays in the beginning of the project, and thus had to redefine its implementation approach and readjust targets for the project. Overall, it was able to achieve some of the project outcomes because it readjusted those targets. But those target values were a fraction of the ambition of the project. For example, at the time of the CEO Endorsement the project aimed to have "At least 7000 land and water users adopt SLM and IWRM leading to up-scaling of good SLM practices and improved irrigation efficiency" as a success measure for outcome 3. At the time of the MTR, the project readjusted that target to be only "2,000 ha targeted by SLM practices". So, even though the project was able to achieve some of the newly adjusted targets, they were small compared to the expenditure and original scale of the project. Below is a discussion on each outcome:

- *Outcome 1: Sustainable land and water management integrated into community-based natural resource planning*
  According to the TE all of the targets for this outcome were achieved. The outputs were focused on developing local associations and partnerships for agro-ecosystems, and developing participatory action plans with local communities. Examples of some of the accomplishments under this component include: the formation of 10 Water Use Associations, 35 Community Action Plans, 13 agro-ecosystem plans for local villages (Karak, Tafilah, and Ma'an), and 26 participatory meetings (TE, p.27).

- *Outcome 2: Institutional structures and capacities enhanced at all levels to promote awareness, coalition building and scaling-up of SLM and IEM while improving climate-proofing of rural production systems*
  The project initially had high targets to meet under this outcome. For example, it aimed to have 'at least 7000 land and water users adopting SLM and IWRM practices', and that '9000 ha of soil and water conservation and 5000 ha of indigenous vegetation would be rehabilitated' (CEO Endorsement, p.18). As the project went further into implementation, it scaled down its targets. Most of the targets for this outcome were achieved, and those that were not fully achieved, were very close to meeting the target. The project developed a series of outreach and educational

activities and its largest impacts were that it provided training to 5185 farmers, facilitators and engineers. Another achievement was that the project organized study tours for 100 farmers on sustainable land management. Some of the targets that it failed to meet 100% were: (1) that the project was supposed to develop academic curricula on environmental awareness, but because of time constraints did not; and (2) the project only gave 20 training sessions instead of the 24 planned (TE, p.28).

- *Outcome 3: Land and water users in replicable PDEs adopt sustainable land and water management practices that provide long term livelihood benefits*
  The activities conducted under this outcome build upon a previous GEF program, and test and pilot various on-farm sustainable land management practices (water and soil conservation measures, income generating activities, etc.). Activities also focused on building community investments to replicate Project Demonstration Agro-Ecosystems (PDEs). Even though piloting and testing of land and water management practices was implemented, the project was not able to meet its target levels for various activities which have to do with the long-term adoption of practices. For example, soil conservation measures were supposed to reach 2,000 ha, and at the time of the MTR, the project fell very short of that goal. Because the project could not purchase the necessary equipment to treat the land, only 400 ha of rangeland and agricultural land were treated (only meeting 20% of the target). In addition, the project had a target of constructing 4000 irrigation pools, but was only able to build 527 pools, about 14% of the original target (TE, p.26; MTR, p.viii).

- *Outcome 4: Effective information management to support decision making is developed and implemented from the project to the national levels*
  Outcome 4 developed various information management systems that would help monitor land resources and land changes from to natural processes and human interventions, and from the project interventions. The heart of this outcome is that these systems would ultimately be embedded in the decision making governance of the government ministries. The project did develop environmental information systems and create awareness raising activities for them. Thus it met some of its targets for the outcome (these targets were purchasing software, servers, training, developing brochures, videos, etc.). However, there is no evidence that shows that there were activities to embed the information, nor evidence to show that ministries mainstreamed the information from the field into its decision making (TE, p.30). Because of that, the achievement of the outcome was only moderately satisfactory.

- *Outcome 5: Directorates of Agriculture, Water and environment following up and adopting activities beyond the international funding phase; Financial resources available to undertake activities and build up a funding mechanism for sustainability purposes*
  This outcome focused on project sustainability within the government agencies and also to ensure that financial sustainability mechanisms are integrated into the project. The outputs for the outcome were that a strategy for institutional arrangements and financial support to the long-term implementation of SLM and water management activities developed, and that that the capacity of national actors scale up sustainable practices. The project was not able to ensure additional

financing for the project, nor was there evidence to show that the government ministries fully integrate the project lessons into other decision making. The project thus, was not able to meet this outcome.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory

The project faced some challenges during implementation that have not allowed it to effectively use and disburse its finances. The challenges were that there was a 2 year delay to initiate the project due to staff hiring, limited human/technical resources in the team, lack of adaptive management, and extensive procurement procedures. By the middle of implementation, the project still wasn't able to cope with these obstacles and the MTR rated efficiency as *unsatisfactory*. In order to deal with the shortage of resources, the project had to outsource project activities to national institutions and other NGOs. Although this allowed the project to function somewhat, it affected the delivery of the outputs and larger impact as activities were scaled down (MTR, p.21). The TE notes that however, the project picked up after the first three years and was able to operate more efficiently than the first half of the project (TE, p.9).

As well, even though the project scaled down activities, it operated under the same budget. This means that more funds were used for a "lower impact" or for fewer results, thus reducing project efficiency.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately likely

The TE rated sustainability of project outcomes as *moderately likely*. This TER agrees with this rating; below is a presentation of the various dimensions of sustainability:

- *Financial sustainability*: the sustainability of project outcomes in regards to financial risks is considered to be moderately likely. Even though the government has not committed to future financing of the project, the partners of the project/NGOs could continue supporting the project activities (either in-kind or through new activities) and potentially scale it (TE, p.34).
- *Socio-political sustainability*: The approach of the project was rooted in community empowerment and there are signs that many of the communities have built their own capacities to confront land degradation in the Southern Highlands. Those land management practices have resulted in better water availability, higher incomes, and higher crop production. The benefits that the project has been able to create will likely be a driving force in keeping the project activities operating. Thus, socio-political sustainability is considered to be moderately likely.
- *Institutional Framework and governance sustainability*: This dimension is considered to be moderately unlikely. The TE notes that the largest form of institutional and governance risk to the sustainability of the project is the fact that the Ministry of Agriculture (and other government agencies) lack the appropriate staffing and human resources to continue the project and/or scale it in other regions of Jordan. Not only are they understaffed, but they lack

the capacity to respond to the often dynamic and changing needs of the project, which poses a hindrance to ensure activities continue.

- *Environmental sustainability*: One of the environmental risks that might affect the sustainability of project outcomes is the risk of climate change. Climate variations might affect the resilience of the interventions of the project, specifically water management techniques (use, storage, availability) (TE, p.10). This is particularly relevant because the pilot sites are in areas that are subject to recurrent droughts (TE, p.36). This is considered moderately 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 project was not able to obtain all of the co-financing that was originally planned. The CEO Endorsement estimated that there would be approximately USD 22.9 million. The MTR showed that only USD 19.4 million was materialized. The MTR was used as the co-financing evidence because the TE did not have information on co-financing. The USD 1 million delta did not radically affect the project outcomes, as it was mentioned in the project documents that the largest contributor to the ineffectiveness of the project was due to delays and administrative burdens.

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?

As previously discussed the project suffered from many delays during the start of the project and during project implementation. These causes are because of: a 2 year delay in hiring a project team and adequately staffing the team with technical experts, bureaucratic processes such as procurement and contracting within the Ministry of Agriculture, and weak M&E systems within the project. These delays ultimately left the project to adjust its level of ambition, and as the TE notes "weakened achievement of the project goal" (TE, p.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 government of Jordan and the Ministry of Agriculture, in particular, did not display a high sense of ownership of the project. However, the project succeeded in forming a real sense of community ownership through community organizations, especially the Water Users Associations. This community-oriented association is based on the concept of shared resources and local governance and led to many communities having improved water management systems (TE, p.11).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory

The M&E design at entry is rated as moderately unsatisfactory as there were many shortcomings that ultimately led to a weak monitoring framework and ability for the project to partake in adaptive management.

The M&E design had some confusion and lack of consistency between the project components, expected outcomes and outputs. Sometimes components are seen as outcomes, and some of the project documents list more than one version of the same outcome. For example, in the CEO Endorsement, outcome 5 is different in the project framework and results framework. In the project framework it states that outcome 5 is: (a) Directorates of Agriculture, Water and environment following up and adopting activities beyond the international funding phase; and (b) financial resources available to undertake activities and build up a funding mechanism for sustainability purposes (CEO Endorsement, p.2). However, in the results framework it states that the outcome is: 'A model for participatory management (building on the existing ARMP-II's management structure) implemented capable of ensuring the achievement of the projects objectives and goals, while ensuring continuity of selected activities for SLM beyond project life' (CEO Endorsement, p.21).

Outputs were also not correlated with the outcome in some cases. For example, for outcome 5, the outputs that were chosen were inappropriate to monitor the achievement of the outcome because they focused on project management/efficiency (hiring staff on time, developing contracts), and not on project sustainability, which is the crux of the outcome.

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

The M&E implementation is rated as *moderately unsatisfactory* as there were many shortcomings in the execution of M&E throughout the project. First, *t*he TE noted that there was a delay in setting up the M&E system, which didn't allow the project to be as flexible as it could have in the beginning. The TE also noted that there was no quantitative data that was found that actually measured the impact of reducing land degradation (such as increase in plant cover, reduced soil erosion, etc.), which is the main

objective of the project (TE, p.30). Some other failures were that the PIRs and MTE focused on reviewing the components, not the outcomes. Thus, they reviewed achievement of the activities and not on the larger achievement of the project impact. The PIRs also did not give quantitative data/information when the indicator requested quantitative targets and the MTR did not review Component/Outcome 5. (TE, p.3).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Satisfactory

The project documents do not mention any major issues in regards to the quality of IFAD as the implementing agency. This is probably because the organization was implementing the next phase of an existing project (ARMP-II) and it had prior institutional set-ups and protocols in place to make it efficient. The TE says that "IFAD cooperated well with the project management and ensured that that the delays for disbursements are reduced" (TE, p.36).

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

This TER rates the quality of project execution as moderately unsatisfactory because there were several inadequacies from the Ministry of Agriculture. The mid-term review and TE noted that the project suffered from significant delays at the project start up and implementation due to the procurement bidding process. Other difficulties the government ran into that affected project execution was that project management was poorly staffed, and was not sufficient enough to execute the project activities. This also resulted in delays during project implementation (TE, p.36). There was also some tension between the Ministry and the IFAD project team since the Ministry did not want to staff the project according to the planned staffing arrangements that were agreed upon early in the project. Out of the 7 full time positions, only 3 were full time; 2 were part time and 2 were not even appointed at all (MTR, p.8).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

> The project did not collect information on direct environmental impacts as they related to land degradation, however the project was able to demonstrate some environmental impacts. 26,000 m3 of land that was previously eroded and 120 ha of land that had been reforested benefitted from sustainable land management practices. Drip irrigation also covered 55 ha of land (TE, p.42).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

> The TE noted several socio-economic impacts, some of them being: i) Strengthened human capital through training of 5,185 people in SLM; ii) strengthened social capital through the creation of 10 WUAs and support six women associations for SCGs; iii) support to 453 income generating projects; iv) creation and support to six women associations for the savings and credit groups; v) 1500 beneficiaries of the Conservation Agriculture Practices; vi) 317 beneficiaries from investment activities of concrete water reservoirs and irrigation networks; and vii) increased production from rehabilitated olive orchards (TE, p.9)

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 succeeded in training 5,185 people in sustainable land management and in forming community organizations to monitor environmental change and resource changes (TE, p.11). Many of the other capacities observed are mentioned prior in the socioeconomic change section.

b) Governance – The project invested in building the capacity of government institutions in order to create more effective governance systems for sustainable land management. It did this though training Ministry staff and MoA extension agents on SLM, accounting and environmental information systems. The development of the SLM Information System linked with the main MOA-IT center also improves governance as environmental information is more integrated into the government information systems.

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 were observed

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.

No broader adoption initiatives were observed

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 describes many learned lessons from the project:

- Take adequate actions in order to avoid the delays in project implementation; actions should be done in the project design phase or through the Grant Agreement process
- Future projects should provide sufficient qualified human resources and implement strategic activities during the first two years in order to fully benefit from their impacts
- The formulation of natural resource plans should continue to be community-based as they are the best way to identify the needs of local communities and promote project ownership
- Biophysical and socio-economic monitoring of impacts should have been conducted throughout the project to monitor project impacts
- Partnerships were crucial to the success of the project and in attaining results

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided the following recommendations:

- Address all roles and potential administrative barriers at the beginning alongside partners
- If a similar project were to occur, many activities should be done in the first two years to ensure that their impacts are maximized. These are: all trainings, community based ecosystem management plans, the design of the environmental management system and its operationalization, and the purchase of equipment needed for implementation of important SLM activities;
- Scaling up of the project should be done on multiple sites to cover a diverse watershed; to ensure successful scaling, more awareness activities should be done, incentives should be offered and equipment should be given to highly motivated farmers;
- Set up a biophysical and socio-economic monitoring program over the medium and long term in order to make sure SLM practices are documented; activate the process of adopting the national environmental information system and allocate resources for its operation. A workshop among the major stakeholders could be a step towards this adoption;
- Although community associations appear well trained and motivated, the membership needs to grow and financial resources need to be sustained; invest in them in order to continue promoting the project outcomes. (TE, p.39).

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 quality of the TE was moderately unsatisfactory because the evaluation seemed to be missing paragraphs at times, and had formatting errors that made it difficult to follow. The TE also reviewed effectiveness on activities that were not included in the project design, or previous and/or amended results frameworks.	**MU**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	At times the evidence used to explain some of the ratings wasn't sufficient enough. For example, the TE rated effectiveness based on achievement of outputs/activities and not overall outcome or objective of the project. The TE also said that efficiency could not be quantitatively assessed due to lack of information, although there was enough information in the PIRs and MTR to make a determination.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project assessed sustainability fine.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons were supported by information found in the other project documents, consistent with the narrative of the previous evaluations.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	It does not provide project costs and co-financing, but it provides the budget expenditure.	**U**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE provided a good explanation of M&E design, but not M&E implementation.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MU**

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

Mid-term review 2013