

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		February 2011
GEF Project ID:	2665 MSP		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P055848 (WB)	GEF financing:	200,000	190,001
Project Name:	Southern Cone Development Marketplace (SCDMP) 2005	IA/EA own:	60,000	191,000
Country:	Regional: (Argentina), Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay	Government:	0.0	20,000
		Other*:	20,000	95,001
		Total Cofinancing	80,000	306,001
Operational Program:	Multi-Focal: Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, and Land Degradation	Total Project Cost:	280,000	496,002
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Several	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		June 2005
		Closing Date	Proposed: June 2006	Actual: April 2007
TER Prepared by: Oreste Maia-Andrade	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 12 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 22 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 10 months
Author of TE: Carter Brandon		TE completion date: January 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: August 2010	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 31 months

* 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	S	S	N/A	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	N/A	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	S	N/A	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

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

Yes, the overall analysis provided by the TE is satisfactory and might be considered a good practice. However, it does

not report sufficiently either on cofinancing or country ownership.

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 Implementation Completion Memorandum (ICM or TE).

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) submitted for CEO Endorsement, the “program objective and rational” was:

- “To help generate innovative ideas that contribute to the strengthening of environmental values among young people in Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay. [...] The principal purpose of all World Bank Country-Level Development Marketplace initiatives is to help fund projects that provide local innovative solutions to development problems that have the potential to expand from a local level to address the problem on a national or regional level [...]”

According to the TE, the “Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Development Objective” was:

- “To fund innovative NGO approaches to global environmental issues – and to generate and share knowledge with the development community.”

Considering the two stated objectives, as well as the expression “Original (and Revised)” in the TE, it is inferable that there were no practical changes during implementation, but simply a rephrasing.

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)?)

According to the Implementation Completion Memorandum (TE), the “Original (and Revised) Trust Fund Activities/Components” were:

- “Within the framework of the Southern Cone Development Marketplace (SCDMP), the grant financed 20 projects with global environmental benefits, each receiving a US\$ 10,000 grants. The broader SCDMP, beyond including a total of \$1 million in awards (all at \$10,000 per winner), included a Knowledge Forum bringing together different actors from MERCOSUR and Chile, such as, NGOs, the media, academia, think-tanks, government officials and grassroots organizations. The overall theme of the SCDMP was Youth; and the theme of the GEF-financed window was Youth and the Environment, focusing on environmental project with global environmental benefits.”
- “The SCDMP and Forum took place in Buenos Aires on 29-31 of May, 2005. The GEF selected projects with innovative environmental activities involving youth and at the same time mainstream global environmental awareness in Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay. Eligible focus areas were Biological Diversity, Climate Change, International Waters and Land Degradation, four of the operational programs of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). Overall eligibility was formulated as broadly as possible to foster competition during the Development Marketplace event. Nevertheless, during the selection process the projects were obviously evaluated on the basis of their compliance with the objectives of the Grant.”

Again, considering the expression “Original (and Revised)” in the TE, it is inferable that there were no practical changes during implementation, but simply a rephrasing.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)				
Original objectives	Exogenous conditions changed,	Project was restructured	Project was restructured	Any other (specify)

not sufficiently articulated	due to which a change in objectives was needed	because original objectives were over ambitious	because of lack of progress	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

a. Relevance	Rating: 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, a Development Marketplace “typically supports bottom-up solutions involving the civil society and grass-root organizations, which is an important pillar of the Bank's development strategy across the Southern Cone.” For this reason, the TE understands that “the Bank’s commitment in the youth sector in the Southern Cone, which was considered strong even prior to the Development Marketplace, has been strengthened tremendously in all four countries (Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay). Ten of the winning proposals were presented by organizations in Paraguay, nine in Chile and one in Uruguay (Argentina NGOs were not eligible for the GEF-financing window due to the presence of a GEF-financed Decentralized Medium-Sized Grant Program in Argentina).” To the TE, the “tremendous” involvement of youth in the four countries was “generated by the project competition and the Knowledge Forum,” and the Bank managed to forge new partnerships and was able to explore new and innovative methods of cooperation and outreach. Over two thousand proposals were received, and the SCDMP grew, due to World Bank fund-raising with other donors, governments, and the private sector, from providing for only 25 awards to 100. “As a result, a great number of initiatives with a youth connection have been implemented in these countries in recent years, such as the Small Grants Program (which focused on youth issues for two years); a youth ESW (“Today's Youth in Argentina - An Untapped Potential”); a youth network (Y2K) established, and a youth employment program.” Since the project’s outcomes were consistent with the overall theme of the SCDMP, which was Youth; and the theme of the GEF-financed window was Youth and the Environment, focusing on environmental project with global environmental benefits; the outcome is rated as satisfactory. 	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: 4
<p>Moderately Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, “the projects’ outputs range from: (i) theoretical and practical workshops and training being undertaken, (ii) hands-on activities such as tree planting, installation of solar panels, application of sustainable land management practices, (iii) the elaboration of outreach material like tourism guides, flyers and videos, to (iv) innovative awareness-raising initiatives being undertaken such as radio programs, theatre plays and art workshops. Through the projects’ self-reporting mechanisms on indicators and over-all rating it was clear that almost all projects perceived that they had fully achieved their objectives. The TE also noticed that “one of the unique characteristics of the projects has been the focus on increasing both environmental and civic values by providing youth with knowledge on global environmental issues and the capabilities to voice their views and apply this knowledge as well as improving their self-esteem through hands-on activities.” Despite the positive aspects, the outcomes were not fully commensurate with the expectations, since two projects were cancelled after the first disbursement (one in Chile and another in Paraguay). Also, a significant geographical imbalance is noticed in the location of the eighteen-implemented projects, because only one project took place in Uruguay and the other seventeen were either in Chile or Paraguay. Since Argentine projects were ineligible, had the project in Uruguay also failed, half of the countries involved in the SCDMP would have not benefited from the funds. Considering these shortcomings, effectiveness is rated as moderately satisfactory. 	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, “considering how many different activities were carried for \$200,000 of GEF financing, including the project competition, the Knowledge Forum, and the implementation of 20 projects, the degree of efficiency can be rated as high. Furthermore, the impacts of the project activities on the communities involved per dollar invested are considerable.” To the TE, “looking at the overall impact of all the project activities it is impressive how large a number of 	

youth that have been reached by the different activities. The results achieved for such minimal funding brought about tangible global environmental benefits (outputs) at the local level. The broad spectra of outputs include: (i) incorporation of environmental concerns and knowledge into tourism, such as training youth to work as guides in ecotourism ventures, producing environmental guides, etc.; (ii) education and awareness-raising on alternative energy sources with concrete practical application to provide sanitary hot water; (iii) generation of work opportunities and extra income for the youth involved as the organic products that were grown and sold at the local markets; (iv) innovative ways of putting across knowledge and awareness on issues such as biodiversity conservation, sustainable development, use of natural resources, through theatre, participatory art projects using recycled material, and start up micro-companies, to mention a few; and (v) practical initiatives such as tree planting to contain erosion, or technical assistance to apply sustainable land management activities practices.

- The funds have really made a difference, capacitating a large number of beneficiaries and youth for a relatively small total amount of money, thus assisting in raising environmental awareness and giving rise to an interest in conservation, energy efficiency, sustainable development and environmental values in general. The activities have not only brought about capacity-building at the individual level but also in terms of the institutional capacity of the recipient organization in project implementation and financial management. Considering the comprehensive outcomes described in the TE, but having noticed their minor shortcomings as described above, the project is considered very cost-effective and its efficiency then rated as satisfactory.

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: 3
Moderately Likely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, “about half of the recipients were able to leverage additional national resources on the basis of the GEF/World Bank SCDMP award.” However, these remarks refer only to the information that could be gathered; the TE stated “since our supervision activities stopped with the final report, we have no systematic information on which projects have had follow-on activities.” • The project is reported to have exceeded the expected cofinancing by about 380 percent (from 80,000 to 306,001), which certainly points to a likelihood of sustainable cofinancing for the achievement of GEF objectives. • Despite the extraordinary counterpart financing, there is no clarification in TE about which were the co-financed activities, then it is not possible to measure which aspects of the project would be more sustainable than others. Therefore, sustainability of financial resources is rated as moderately likely. 	
b. Socio political	Rating: 4
Likely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the TE, considering the small size and the short duration of the projects the sustainability aspect is rather complicated, since many of the activities concerned pilot-initiatives. However, the main sustainability indicators used for the project were the forging of new partnerships or raising of additional resources as a direct result of the grant-financed project activities. Fourteen of the 18 projects that completed implementation reported that they had managed to create new partnerships; and half also raised additional funds totaling almost US\$ 20,000 (which represents nearly 10 % of the Grant awarded to the 20 projects). For these reasons, the overall risk to sustaining the outcome of projects over the long and medium-term has been rated as low. • According to the TE, there is a high replicability of the activities “particularly regarding the training, capacity-building and awareness-raising initiatives that could either be scaled-up or incorporated as components of larger projects.” The lessons learnt regarding the implementation of hands-on activities involving youth and focusing on global environmental issues “can be drawn upon for other projects in the region or for similar projects in other regions.” These factors certainly increase the project’s socio-political sustainability, and allow for a “likely” rating. 	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 4
Likely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considering the project’s nature of a development marketplace, aimed to help to generate innovative ideas, 	

<p>there were no references in the TE to sustainability of institutional framework and governance beyond comments about the contributions of project activities “in creating networks and new partnerships for the recipient organizations, as well as leveraging additional funds.” Therefore, considering the achieved capacity building, training on M&E, and knowledge sharing, sustainability of institutional framework and governance is rated as likely.</p>	
d. Environmental	Rating: N/A
<p>Not Applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although, according to the TE, the GEF funds have contributed to “raising environmental awareness and giving rise to an interest in conservation, energy efficiency, sustainable development and environmental values in general”, environmental sustainability is not a criterion of analysis within a development marketplace per se. 	

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

<p>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?</p>	
<p>Cofinancing was not reported in detail in the TE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is reported to have exceeded the expected cofinancing by about 380 percent (from 80,000 to 306,001), which certainly characterizes cofinancing as fundamental for the achievement of project objectives. However, it is not possible to evaluate if cofinancing supported activities were well integrated in the project, because there is no explanation about which were the co-financed activities. Although the TE provides a useful explanation as to how the GEF funds were used, there is a mention about how the project was able to realize higher level of cofinancing. Reporting on relevance, it is mentioned that the World Bank fund-raised with other donors, governments, and the private sector, from providing only 25 awards to 100. According to the TE, half of implemented projects “raised additional funds totaling almost US\$ 20,000 (which represents nearly 10 % of the Grant awarded to the 20 projects).” Cofinancing is also mentioned with regard to risk to development outcome (financial sustainability), as follows: “About half of the recipients were able to leverage additional national resources on the basis of the GEF/World Bank SCDMP award. However, since our supervision activities stopped with the final report, we have no systematic information on which projects have had follow-on activities.” 	
<p>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?</p>	
<p>Minor delays were observed, but did not compromise the project objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, “once the 20 winning NGOs were selected for GEF financing, there were minor delays brought about by the preparation, approval and signing of all legal documents, and the processing of the first disbursements. This is attributable to slightly different legal requirements in each of the four countries; a lack of a country office in Chile; and the workload presented by 100 SCDMP grantees in total. As a result some of the projects received the funds a month or so later than expected which caused initial delays in the implementation but without compromising any project objectives.” 	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>Country ownership is quickly mentioned in the PAD, but not clearly analyzed in the TE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the PAD, with regard to “country drivenness”, it is mentioned that “the Development Marketplace funds projects proposed by Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), NGOs, and groups associated with these organizations based on their own ideas for how to achieve development and conservation results. Thus, projects are essentially bottom-up, proposed by those on the ground closest to the problem(s) being addressed. To ensure that the bottom up approach is aligned with national and regional priorities, the Southern Cone Development Marketplace will subject each potential project to a review, led by World Bank Country Office staff with GEF experience, to (1) validate the legitimacy of the executing team, (2) comment on the implementing group’s implementation record, and (3) identify any potential conflict with relevant GEF strategies and WB programs. Jury members will be required to reject those rare projects that conflict 	

- with GEF strategies, ensuring alignment with corporate priorities and programs.”
- In the TE, the amount of cofinancing demonstrates some commitment of governments. However, country ownership is not clearly mentioned in the TE, which limits to stating that the Development Marketplace “typically supports bottom-up solutions involving the civil society and grassroot organizations, which is an important pillar of the Bank’s development strategy across the Southern Cone.”

4.4 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): 5
Satisfactory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PAD mentions that objective, program outcome and component indicators for this MSP “will be monitored directly by the Southern Cone Development Marketplace team every 6 months. At the project level, each project will have specific indicators related to its particular objectives, and because the range of activities funded varies so broadly, these indicators are also expected to be quite different.” Considering the project’s size and its marketplace nature, the fact that there is no indicator to capture project activities in all the MSP funded projects, with the exception of “percentage complete” that would be used to follow project progress, the adequate plan to monitor results and track progress, the M&E design at entry is satisfactory. 	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): 5
Satisfactory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TE also mentions that “during implementation, each recipient organization evaluated its achievement of the objectives on the basis of the indicators established. The rating was from 1-5. Based on the self-reporting, the level of achievement was high, as only a few projects reported that they had not fully achieved the individual project objectives whereas the majority rated their implementation progress as a 5.” The TE mentions that “through the projects’ self-reporting mechanisms on indicators and overall rating it was clear that almost all projects perceived that they had fully achieved their objectives.” Based on the information provided by the TE, considering that the M&E system proposed at entry was applied adequately to the SCDMP, the project implementation progress monitoring might be considered satisfactory. 	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): 4
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): 4
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.
Moderately Satisfactory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TE rates the Bank performance as satisfactory, and the SCDMP competitions and selection process as highly satisfactory, following evaluations by both regional management and observers from the Bank’s DMT office. Also, “an important part of the supervision task for the DMP-team consisted in visiting the projects, learning more about the activities and beneficiaries, and assisting in resolving potential problems that occurred during project implementation. Almost all the projects received field visits (15 of the 20 projects).” However, according to the TE, “once the 20 winning NGOs were selected for GEF financing, there were minor delays brought about by the preparation, approval and signing of all legal documents, and the processing of the first disbursements. This is attributable to slightly different legal requirements in each of the four countries; a lack of a country office in Chile; and the workload presented by 100 SCDMP grantees in total. As a result some of the projects received the funds a month or so later than expected which caused initial delays in the implementation but without compromising any project objectives.” Moreover, according to the TE, more information on GEF priorities and objectives would ideally have been communicated early in the project design phase of the SCDMP to better ensure that project proposals had a clear global environmental focus. Some proposals only indirectly achieved global benefits and instead focused more on local or regional environmental problems. The World Bank team worked with the winning NGOs to better focus their projects and \$10,000 grants on outputs oriented to global benefits. As explained in the TE, however, there were no measures of outcome indicators under the overall project design. Therefore, considering these moderate shortcomings, but having in mind that, according to the TE, they have

not compromised “any project objectives”, quality of implementation is rated as moderately satisfactory.
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): 4
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.
Moderately Satisfactory: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the TE, “none of the recipients had any prior experience in working with the World Bank or any other international organization, which made reporting requirements related to the implementation progress and financial management a new and sometimes overwhelming experience. Under the circumstances and with additional training before project implementation, the activities were carried out satisfactorily. 18 of the 20 selected projects were fully executed and complied with the established reporting requirements.” However, two out of twenty selected projects were cancelled (due to lack of interest and construction problems respectively, according to the TE). In addition, no further explanations were provided with regard to the circumstances of the “sometimes overwhelming experience”, which would allow agencies to reformulate and maybe clarify requirements in order to increase their accessibility to small partners and field executors. Without further clarifications about these circumstances, execution cannot be rated higher than moderately satisfactory.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the <u>outlined</u> outcomes-to-impact pathway?				
Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)				
Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Intermediary States	Impacts
<p>To Organize a Knowledge Forum bringing together different actors from MERCOSUR and Chile, such as, NGOs, the media, academia, think-tanks, government officials and grassroots organizations</p> <p>To Select and Fund 20 projects with global environmental benefits, each receiving a US\$ 10,000 grants</p>	<p>New partnerships were forged, raising additional resources as a direct result of the grant-financed project activities and promoted knowledge sharing</p> <p>Theoretical and practical workshops and trainings</p> <p>Hands-on activities, such as tree planting, installation of solar panels, application of sustainable land management were undertaken</p> <p>Positive capacity building impact: at the institutional level, project management and training on methods for M&E and financial reporting</p>	<p>Generation of work opportunities and extra income for the youth involved in the SCDMP, through the organic products that were grown and sold at the local markets</p>	<p>Development Marketplace to be recognized as a fundamental means to forge partnerships and networks among environment communities and stakeholders</p>	<p>Innovative ideas were generated, contributing to the strengthening of environmental values among young people in the Southern Cone</p>
b. What are the actual (<u>intended or unintended</u>) impacts of the project?				
Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the				

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.

path to project impacts and to impact drivers (Impact drivers are the *significant factors* that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

Considering the assessed outcomes and presented impacts, it is inferable from this project that impact drivers were:

- **Networks and partnerships:** According to the TE, “the project activities contributed in creating networks and new partnerships for the recipient organizations, as well as leveraging additional funds. Many organizations started collaborating with other stakeholders in the community, for example schools, universities, municipalities, and private companies to mention some.”
- **Capacity Building:** Many recipients “emphasized the positive capacity building impact that the projects had at the institutional level, in particular in terms of managing a project and receiving training on methods for monitoring and evaluation and financial reporting. Other positive results were the knowledge sharing that the projects brought about at the local level mainly thanks to the new partnerships forged.”
- **Bottom-up solutions:** According to the TE, the Development Marketplace “typically supports bottom-up solutions involving the civil society and grass-root organizations, which is an important pillar of the Bank’s development strategy across the Southern Cone.” For this reason, the TE understands that the Bank’s commitment in the youth sector in the Southern Cone, which was considered strong even prior to the Development Marketplace, has been strengthened tremendously in all four countries (Argentina, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay).
- **Awareness raising:** The TE also noticed that “one of the unique characteristics of the projects has been the focus on increasing both environmental and civic values by providing youth with knowledge on global environmental issues and the capabilities to voice their views and apply this knowledge as well as improving their self-esteem through hands-on activities.”
- **Reliable financial source:** The TE evaluates that “the funds have really made a difference, capacitating a large number of beneficiaries and youth for a relatively small total amount of money, thus assisting in raising environmental awareness and giving rise to an interest in conservation, energy efficiency, sustainable development and environmental values in general.”

c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?

Considering the assessed likelihood of outcome sustainability, it is inferable from this project that the apparent risks to impacts were:

- **Lack of systematic information:** According to the TE, “about half of the recipients were able to leverage additional national resources on the basis of the GEF/World Bank SCDMP award.” However, these remarks refer only to the information that could be gathered; the TE stated “since our supervision activities stopped with the final report, we have no systematic information on which projects have had follow-on activities.”
- **Lack of transparency regarding cofinancing:** There was no clarification about which were the co-financed activities, then it is not possible to measure which aspects of the project would be more sustainable than others.
- **Lack of thorough information about framework and governance:** There were no further references to sustainability of institutional framework and governance beyond comments about the contributions of project activities “in creating networks and new partnerships for the recipient organizations, as well as leveraging additional funds.”

d. Evidence of Impact

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?			N/A
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the <u>scope</u> ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?			N/A
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)			N/A
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the			

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
Not Applicable:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although, according to the TE, the GEF funds have contributed to “raising environmental awareness and giving rise to an interest in conservation, energy efficiency, sustainable development and environmental values in general”, environmental status is not exactly a criterion of assessment within a development marketplace per se. 			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?			N/A
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?	X		
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
Yes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnerships and additional funding: According to the TE, considering the small size and the short duration of the projects, many were just pilot-initiatives, it is rather difficult to assess socioeconomic changes. However, new partnerships or the raising of additional resources were interpreted as important aspects. Fourteen of the eighteen projects that completed implementation reported that they had managed to create new partnerships; and half also raised additional funds totaling almost US\$ 20,000 (which represents nearly 10 % of the Grant awarded to the 20 projects). For these reasons, the overall risk to sustaining the outcome of projects over the long and medium-term has been rated as low. 			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?			
No negative impacts were reported.			
e. Monitoring of impacts			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?			N/A
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?			N/A

6. 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

Following is the summary of the good practices listed in the TE:

- One of the main lessons learned from this SCDMP is the importance of providing early training to NGOs involved in project preparation in order to ensure higher project quality and greater compliance with GEF-specific procedures. Such training should include work on basic indicators, definition of global benefits, financial reporting, sustainability and overall GEF priorities.
- Some of the most successful project initiatives intended to integrate the global environmental issues into dilemmas faced by the youth on a daily basis -- such as lack of employment, or energy scarcity, or food shortages -- thereby making something potentially very abstract surprisingly concrete. The involved youth were thus able to apply the acquired knowledge in very concrete ways, such as in creating local job opportunities or replacing unsustainable source of energy with alternative sources. This mix of theoretical and

practical concepts enabled the youth to better apply knowledge relating to the global environment to their daily lives.

- The Bank’s SCDMP team that had successfully managed the DMP project competition and knowledge forum mostly stayed on for the supervision phase. This improved the mutual understanding of the necessary monitoring and evaluation activities. In fact, field visits by the Bank’s team helped create strong bonds between the World Bank and the recipient organizations.
- According to the TE, there is a high replicability of the activities “regarding the training, capacity-building and awareness-raising initiatives that could either be scaled-up or incorporated as components of larger projects.” The lessons learnt regarding the implementation of hands-on activities involving youth and focusing on global environmental issues “can be drawn upon for other projects in the region or for similar projects in other regions.”

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

According to the TE:

- To increase the proportion of strong proposals received, the Bank could have strengthened in its application materials the importance of strict GEF eligibility criteria. This would have reduced the number of proposals received with questionable global environmental benefits.

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

7.1 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.

7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
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 TE does not report on cofinancing in detail. Also, information about country ownership could have been developed.	4
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The TE has not gathered “systematic information on which projects have had follow-on activities.” Also, there were no further references to sustainability of institutional framework and governance beyond comments about the contributions of project activities “in creating networks and new partnerships for the recipient organizations, as well as leveraging additional funds.”	4
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The TE does report the total costs and the use of the grant by percentage in each area (conservation, biodiversity, education etc.) However, it does not explain the actual cost by activity, by implemented project, or by cofinancing.	3
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?	5

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION

REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

No other sources were consulted.