Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2634	
GEF Agency project ID		P088964, P087318	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Guangxi Integrated Forestry Development and Conservation Project	
Country/Countries		China	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 3: Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Guangxi Forestry Bureau	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 2006	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2012	
Actual date of project completion		December 2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		5.25	5.25
Co-financing	IA own	100	100
	Government	99.35	254.27
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		5.25	5.25
Total Co-financing		199.35	354.27
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		204.60	359.52
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2013	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Richard A. Owen, Random Dubois	
TER completion date		December 2014	
TER prepared by		Aditi Poddar	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi and Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	NR	HS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	Moderately Likely	NR	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	NR	S
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	NR	S
Quality of Implementation	N/R	S	NR	S
Quality of Execution	N/R	HS	NR	HS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	NR	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project, as stated in the Project Document (PD), was to improve the conservation of the globally significant biodiversity of the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region (GZAR) by ensuring effective *in-situ* protection of threatened and globally important forest habitats and rare and endemic species. Guangxi is one of the largest and most important representatives of the karst ecosystem in the world. GZAR is also a designated timber production plantation area. However, annual timber consumption in the Region is much higher than the annual production. Thus, there is a growing demand for timber in Guangxi, and inadequate protection from illegal logging and unsustainable use of non-timber forest products (NTFP) have led to the loss of natural forests and threatened its unique biodiversity (PD, pgs. 9-10).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the main Development Objective is to improve the effectiveness of forest management and institutional arrangements in timber production, watershed protection and nature reserves management in selected areas of the GZAR. Progress towards the attainment of this objective was to be measured by monitoring: (a) timber production efficiency such as planting survival and plantation growth rates under different institutional and partnership arrangements between forest farms and communities/households, as well as individual households; and (b) the increase in the vegetation cover in targeted watershed areas. The Development Objective was targeted to be achieved through the 4 different project components described below.

1. *Expanding timber plantations* - Under this component, the project would finance:
    a. The establishment of approximately 200,000 ha of fast-growing, high-yield timber plantations.
    b. The improvement of nursery management, including the establishment of four central nurseries and facilities to produce high-quality planting materials to enable the introduction of superior genetic materials and management technologies.

2. *Increasing ecological forest cover* - This component would contribute to the objectives of the GZAR government program, *Integrated Management of Protection Forests in the Upper Reaches of the Pearl River,* by developing and demonstrating models that would combine economic, environmental and social benefits. Under this component, the project would finance the establishment of approximately 18,000 ha of multiple-use protection forests in 25 GZAR counties including the development of a BioCarbon Fund pilot plantation.

3. *Strengthening management of nature reserves* – This component would finance:
    a. The development and implementation of management plans for five globally significant, high priority nature reserves for demonstration purposes including staff training and capacity building.
    b. Targeted biodiversity survey and research to increase knowledge, particularly of karst biodiversity (outside the nature reserves), to better integrate biodiversity conservation into the broader landscape.
    c. Activities which will strengthen collaboration between nature reserves and local communities.
    d. Development and implementation of a simple participatory monitoring and evaluation system focused on the nature reserves and building on the experiences of previous GEF-financed biodiversity projects in China.

4. *Enhancing institutional and management capacity* - An integrated institutional and management capacity-building program would be implemented that would:
    a. Strengthen the capacity of the Guangxi Forestry Bureau (GFB) to develop and implement a sustainable provincial forest sector development and protection strategy and support priority policy studies, guidelines, and regulations revision.
    b. Implement applied research programs to generate operationally usable technologies to improve commercial forestry development, ecological forest protection, and biodiversity conservation.
    c. Disseminate research results, technical guidelines and lessons learned to GFB staff and beneficiaries.
    d. Establish a simple project monitoring and evaluation system to monitor project performance towards the achievement of its development objectives and assess the project's environmental and socio-economic impacts.

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

No, there were no changes to the Global Environment Objectives or the Development Objectives.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The project's objectives were relevant to the Government of China's policy priorities on natural resources management and to the needs of the GZAR. The project was supportive of the government's policy on forestry development, watershed management, climate change and biodiversity conservation. It complemented the National Forest Protection Program, the Sustainable Forestry Development Strategy 2002 and the Forestry 11th and 12th Five Year Plans. The project also conformed to the national *Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan* (1994), which was prepared with support from the GEF Pre-Investment Facility during the GEF Pilot Phase in China. The *Action Plan* identified two of the project areas as centers of China's biodiversity. The conservation of Guangxi's unique and rich biodiversity is also listed as a priority in several national biodiversity strategies (TE).

The project was consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy 3, which focuses on biodiversity conservation. It was particularly aligned with strategic priority BI - *Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas* - as it enhanced the sustainability of Guangxi Province's nature reserves system and strengthened the management of five nature reserves of global biodiversity and a few other sites which were important watershed management areas. As the watershed management areas were located near to the project nature reserves, they act as 'corridors' for the distribution and dispersal of wildlife. Thus, the project also contributes to GEF strategic priority BII - *Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors* (PD).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

The Terminal Evaluation rates project effectiveness as Highly Satisfactory, and this TER concurs with that rating.

The project exceeded targets set in the PD for multiple indicators, and successfully met the targets for the rest of them. The TE reports that the project either successfully met or exceeded its targets for the Global Environment Objective (GEO), the Development Objective (DO) and all four components. Targets were exceeded for the three indicators of the DO whereas the GEO indicator of populations of key indicator species in the 5 project nature reserves remained stable or increased. There are some discrepancies in the way project components are stated and the results monitoring matrices provided in the PD and TE. In its outcomes matrix, the TE leaves out some indicators for activities that are noted

under various project components. Information regarding these indicators has been collected from other parts of the TE. For instance, the establishment of 4 central nurseries was a part of Component 1 but was not mentioned in the results monitoring matrix in the PD or TE. Similarly, the PD does not specify indicators for "activities to strengthen collaboration between nature reserves and communities" under Component 3, but the TE notes the number of committees formed, which could serve as one of the indicators. However, a better indicator is needed for this sub-component, as just the number of committees formed does not show how effective these were in strengthening relationships. There is also a discrepancy in the number of staff and households trained under Component 4 as stated by the TE (pg. xiii) and as stated in the summary of the borrower's TE (pg. 46).

Under Component 1, "Expanding Timber Plantations", the project exceeded its targets for afforesting areas with high survival rates and the number of participating households. The TE mentions that 4 central nurseries were upgraded and production capacity was increased by 45 million plants.

All three indicators for Component 2, "Increasing Ecological Forest Cover", show that the project exceeded its targets. Area of multiple-function forest established, tons of carbon sequestered and area of degenerated and karst areas closed for regeneration were all higher than planned in the PD.

Component 3, "Improving Management of Nature Reserves", was also executed successfully. The Nature Reserve Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score was higher than the target and the project reserves maintained a higher score than non-project reserves. The indicator species from each reserve also increased in numbers. Additionally, one new high biodiversity site was discovered and a protection plan was put in place.

Under Component 4, "Enhancing Institutional and Management Capacity", the GFB adopted a forestry strategy, monitoring and evaluation systems were developed, guidelines and technical advisory bulletins were developed and staff and households were trained. Thus, targets for each sub-component were successfully achieved.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

Some minor issues affected the efficiency of project implementation, however most of these were overcome by the end of the project. The TE (pgs. 7-9) reports that project implementation was generally on schedule. Components 1 and 2 were completed two years ahead of schedule. The progress under Component 3 was slow initially due to high staff turnover in the Biodiversity Office (BO) of the GFB; however, it was completed on schedule with special efforts taken by the BO. Coordination and communication structures were set up at provincial and county levels, which resulted in better project management. Additionally, technical assistance was provided by skilled advisory groups and the World Bank. The TE also reports that extensive training was provided which ensured sound technical knowledge in the implementation.

Some delays and difficulties were experienced during project implementation. The TE reports that ice storms damaged 26,330 ha of project plantations, which cost US $48 million to remedy. However, all damaged areas had recovered by the end of the project. The delays in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) reforestation pilots have been attributed to severe weather conditions and to rigid operational procedures for this particular program. The site selection criteria led to the selection of poor quality sites that were on a high elevation. These sites were hit by ice storms and a three-year drought, which together damaged 1,866 ha of plantations, which was replanted. The government's land re-allocation program led to boundary disputes in some CDM areas. The TE notes that these sites were not replaced with other sites outside the program areas.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

The TE rates project sustainability as Moderately Likely, and this TER concurs with that assessment. Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes are detailed further along the following four dimensions:

Financial sustainability (**L**) – The provincial government has allocated a grant of RMB 75/ha for forest watershed management which is expected to cover the costs of plantation maintenance. While the TE (pg. 47) states that the timber plantations will continue to get technical and financial support since Guangxi is a key timber base, it is not clearly stated what this support will look like. It does note, however, that there is sufficient investment available to continue the improvement of the nature reserves.

Socio-political sustainability (**L**) – The TE reports that all the entities, including the forest farms, involved in the carbon finance program had committed to continue implementing forest management practices and measuring Carbon Emission Reductions until the end of the crediting period. The CDM program will also be an incentive for the village community to continue forest management. There is a risk that continued low carbon prices might lead to the disinterest of the community in continuing the program, but the TE suggests that low carbon prices should not be a real threat since the maintenance costs of the program are low.

Institutional sustainability (**L**) - The TE reports that project management has been transferred to local project entities. Project activities have been integrated into the county government forest management system. A monitoring system is in place for the CDM program. As part of component 3, the training and capacity building activities that were carried out would help in ensuring that the improved management of nature reserves is continued.

Environmental sustainability (**ML**) – For the plantations in general, there are three potential environmental risks – pest and disease attacks, fire and severe weather conditions. However, measures have been put in place to reduce pest and disease attacks through planting blocks smaller than 8 ha and having at least 3 clones in site. To prevent fires, fire monitoring has been included in the forest bureau's management system. The risk of increased incidence of severe weather conditions such as ice storms and droughts due to climate change remains, which could decrease plantation yields.

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 majority (more than 97%) of the project's funding was through co-financing from the country government and the implementing agency - the World Bank. Thus, it was essential to the project. In addition, the Guangxi government increased its counterpart contribution to cover increased costs when the US dollar depreciated. This additional funding was also important to achieve the outcomes in time.

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 mentioned in the 'Efficiency' section, there were some delays in the CDM program due to severe weather conditions and rigid operational procedures. The plantation sites that were damaged were restored. Some sites had disputes regarding boundaries but they were not replaced with other sites. However, these delays did not affect the project's outcomes or sustainability much.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership for this project seems to be high with different Guangxi government bodies involved. Depreciation of the US dollar led to an increase in project costs, but the Guangxi government increased its counterpart contribution to fill the gap between project funding and actual costs rather than reducing the scope of the project. The project could thus reach its original objectives as stated in the PD. It also mobilized resources to restore plantation damaged by ice and drought which ensured that the project met its targets for components 1 and 2 on time. The TE notes that the Biodiversity Office made "exceptional efforts" to ensure that component 3 was completed on time, especially since it had a slow start.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The PD specifies that the provincial and county Project Management Offices, the BO and nature reserve Project Management Groups would carry out the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the entire project. It refers to a detailed plan that was reviewed and agreed upon. A computerized baseline data system was to be set up to monitor project implementation, performance of different entities, contracts, outcomes, and loan schedules. In the PD annex, a results and monitoring framework with SMART indicators and targets is also provided. For instance, one of the indicators for Component 1 is the number of hectares of afforested area with a tree survival rate of more than 90%. This indicator measures the progress on the goal of expanding timber plantations, which it is does with a very specific and easily measurable number. The target was set to 200,000 ha which seems achievable and realistic since the project exceeded the target and had a higher tree survival rate than 90%. The GEF's protected areas Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) was used to establish a baseline score for the targeted nature reserves and it was to be used for the mid-term review and closing as well. The experience and results of the biodiversity conservation components were to be documented and the resulting reports shared with the Management Office and with the Steering Committee of the China Biodiversity Partnership and its Advisory and Coordination Group. The project's progress and outcomes were to be measured regularly and the results included in the project semi-annual reports. Under Component 4 of the project, provisions were made to build the capacity of project institutions to complete the required M&E activities. Annex 5 (PD pg.67) also shows a dedicated budget for M&E in the project cost summary.

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

M&E implementation was largely without problems. The TE (pg. 10) reports that data was gathered on time and the entities responsible for various parts of the regular monitoring carried out their duties. It also mentions (TE pg. 7) that progress reviews were used to identify problems in implementation, which then led to the improvement of the management for the implementation of component 3. Since very detailed information about the outcomes is available, it can be safely assumed that the data collected was useful in tracking project progress towards objectives. The only problem with M&E implementation was the delay in establishing the computerized platform. However, according to the TE, the platform had been set up by the end of the project and it was expected that the GFB would continue to use this system for monitoring its afforestation and reforestation activities.

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**

Project implementation does not seem to have had any major shortcomings. The project design was appropriate, realistic and technically sound. The implementing agency ensured that safeguards were applied, lessons learned were incorporated and training was provided when needed.

The project was also supervised regularly and assistance was provided when problems arose, for instance, when delays arose in the implementation of component 3. The TE finds that the agency provided sound advice especially in the more innovative CDM programs by bringing experts.

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

The Guangxi government and the GFB went beyond the strict scope of the project with their funding support and operational efforts, respectively. As mentioned in the country ownership section, the TE (pgs. 23, 24) reports that there was high government ownership of the project reflected by the increased counterpart funding from the Guangxi government and the extra efforts put in by the GFB to recover from the damage caused by severe weather. The GFB also set up an effective coordination system allowing all the relevant agencies to work together smoothly. The staff was dedicated and skilled and responded to problems promptly which led to the rapid resolution of several challenges such as the slow implementation of the CDM program.

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 additional 214,000 ha of high productivity timber plantations have the capacity to produce approximately 32.7 million cu. m. of timber and thus reduce the pressure on natural forests in the Guangxi (TE, pg. 20). The TE does not provide details on the duration within which this additional timber will be available. Adherence to guidelines with respect to safeguarding habitats and conserving soils led to the Forest Stewardship Council certification of three forest farms at the time of the writing of the TE.

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

The project seemed to have had some impact on poverty through an increase in incomes. Of the 118,000 households that participated in the timber production component, approximately 38% were classified as poor, and 46.7% of these were ethnic minorities. In addition, the CDM program generated a total income of USD 636,868 by project completion, 60% of which went to households and 40% went to planting entities. Through component 3, total seed grants of USD 369,180 were distributed to households to help develop alternate livelihoods. Furthermore, capacity building through training on silviculture, afforestation and forest management was provided to more than 171,290 farmers (TE, pg. 20).

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 carried out various capacity building activities for different groups that are important to sustain the positive changes made by it. Forest agencies' and nature reserves' staff was trained on sustainable forest management techniques. Local communities were trained so that they could become partners in biodiversity conservation. They were also trained to develop skills for alternate livelihoods, which would reduce their reliance on natural resources (TE, pgs. 20,21).

b) Governance

The CDM program put in institutional mechanisms for carbon trading which are readily available for use by other regions if and when they decide to enter the carbon trading market. Additionally, the lessons learned from setting up the carbon sequestration program could be used to set up similar programs in other parts of the country (TE, pg. 20).

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

No unintended impacts are reported in the TE.

8.5 ***Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale***. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The project demonstrated three new approaches to conservation and natural resources management, which can be scaled up and replicated. As mentioned earlier, one of them is the CDM program with carbon credits, which has set up the foundation for carbon trading readiness. The second is the model used to restore the ecological and hydrological balance in the Pearl River Basin, which engaged the local communities in hill closures and gave them limited harvesting rights. The TE states that this approach along with incentives for ecological forestry has strong potential to be scaled up. Finally, the third approach is the community engagement and culture change activities used for biodiversity conservation. As mentioned before, this approach makes the community a partner in conservation and also improves their lives (TE, pgs. 20,21).

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 lists the following lessons (pgs. 24, 25, 49, 50)

1. Integrating production forestry and protected area management is a more holistic approach to forest resources management. The project demonstrated that an integrated forest management approach including timber production, protection of forests, biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration is the most effective way to ensure sustainable use and management of forests.
2. Participation of communities and households in the project planning process is an effective tool to generate ownership and project sustainability. The project's use of participatory methods ensured that local communities were involved in project design and implementation – this in turn ensured that there was high community ownership in the long term. High community ownership for long-term forest management ensures that the sustainable practices introduced in the project are carried on and that the project's social objectives are achieved.
3. Building an appropriate mechanism to promote community participation in natural resource management and creating mutually beneficial relationships for nature reserves and the surrounding community is crucial for the sustainability of biodiversity conservation. The Conservation Coordination Committees set up by the project enabled the surrounding

community to participate in conservation activities through regular consultations and by jointly addressing common concerns with the nature reserve. The public awareness and skills enhancement program gave the communities reason and resources to explore alternate livelihoods options so as to reduce their dependence on natural resources.

4. A strong research-extension-training linkage is fundamental to new technologies and best practice transfer. The research team provided technical advice and superior planting materials to the forest agencies and communities, which ensured that there was a transfer of best practices and new technologies.
5. For innovative projects, there is a need to provide additional orientation to leaders and staff during preparation, followed by more comprehensive training during implementation. The nature reserve management and CDM components were innovative and required the staff and managers to change their perspectives on forest management. However, despite provision of training, the staff was only able to fully understand the activities and components by the Mid-Term Review. Thus, there is a need for additional training and orientation at the beginning of such projects.
6. Developing and putting in place an afforestation carbon sequestration trade mechanism like the CDM program enables the carbon sequestered by trees to serve as a "virtual cash crop" to promote sustainable forestry management. The income from the sale of carbon credits creates an additional incentive for the local communities to participate in sustainable forest management practices.
7. The challenges of using current afforestation/reforestation methodologies under the CDM are complex and this makes replication difficult. A number of reasons make programs like the CDM difficult to implement and thus replicate. High initial costs make them unattractive to the community so a pre-payment mechanism has to be set up. Additionally, a lack of flexibility makes it difficult for the program to adapt to changes, and due to the site selection criteria degraded areas are chosen which increase costs. The TE states that the program needs to become more flexible and streamlined for it to be replicated.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

No recommendations are provided in the TE.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE assesses relevant outcomes and impacts for most project activities but some have only been reported in passing or without clear indicators.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent and has justified its ratings along with presenting valid evidence.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses all aspects of sustainability and provides details on risk mitigation measures and exit strategy.	**HS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are derived from all parts of the project and are presented with strong evidence from the project.	**HS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes details of co-financing and project costs per component but not by each activity. It also gives the economic rate of return for the plantations.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	It provides a good overview of M&E design and implementation but does not provide a rating.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

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